



Government  
Equalities Office

**GENDER  
PAY GAP**  
Closing it together

THE  
BEHAVIOURAL  
INSIGHTS  
TEAM

# Actions for employers to close the gender pay gap



“

To move the dial on equalising pay, we need to debias systems, not people.

”

“To move the dial on equalising pay, we need to debias systems, not people. Human resource management must be based on rigorous evidence of what works to level the playing field, treat everyone fairly and benefit from 100 percent of the talent pool. Evidence-based design of hiring practices, promotion procedures and compensation schemes helps our organisations do the right and the smart thing, creating more inclusive and better workplaces. This updated guidance is an important step towards helping employers know what works.”

---

**Iris Bohnet** – Academic Dean, Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government and Co-Director of the Women and Public Policy Program, Harvard Kennedy School

# Contents



**Interactive document**  
Click to navigate

## 02 Actions to close the gender pay gap

## 03 Which actions to implement

## 04 Evidence categories

Effective actions

Promising actions

Actions with mixed results

Area of focus	Effective actions	Promising actions	Mixed evidence
06 Leadership and accountability	<p>Set internal targets for gender representation and equality</p> <p>Appoint diversity managers and/or diversity task forces</p>		
08 Hiring and selection	<p>Use structured interviews for recruitment and promotions</p> <p>Use skill-based assessment tasks in recruitment</p> <p>Make expectations around salaries and negotiation clear</p>	<p>Include more women in shortlists for recruitment and promotions</p> <p>Make decisions about applicants in batches</p> <p>Recruit returners</p> <p>Anonymise CVs</p> <p>Make job advert language gender neutral</p>	<p>Diversity statements</p> <p>Diverse selection panels</p>
12 Talent management, learning and development	<p>Introduce transparency to promotion, pay and reward processes</p>	<p>Offer mentoring and sponsorship</p> <p>Offer networking programmes</p>	<p>Performance self-assessments</p> <p>Unconscious bias training</p> <p>Diversity training</p> <p>Leadership development training</p>
16 Workplace flexibility		<p>Improve workplace flexibility for men and women</p> <p>Encourage the uptake of Shared Parental Leave</p>	
18 What evidence we have used			
19 Further reading			

# Actions for employers to close the gender pay gap

Employers have asked us which actions are likely to improve recruitment and progression of women, and reduce the gender pay gap.

This updated guidance summarises approaches that have been shown to improve outcomes for women.

It also indicates those which need more evidence before they can be recommended as widespread approaches. This will help employers create more effective action plans.

This guidance groups actions into four different areas of focus:

- Leadership and accountability
- Hiring and selection
- Talent management, learning and development
- Workplace flexibility



# Which actions to implement

**Every organisation is different and may face different challenges. To know where to focus your efforts, we recommend taking a data-driven approach.**

Answering the questions in Box 1 will help you identify where gender imbalance is occurring and address the specific issues in your organisation.

Targeted actions are important but gender equality in an organisation is not achieved by implementing just a few actions – it is driven by a sustained approach that reaches every part of the organisation.

## BOX 1

### Eight ways to understand your organisation's gender pay gap

Employers who use high quality data to understand the drivers of their gender pay gap will be able to target their actions and achieve the most effective results.

To identify areas for improvement in your organisation, start by answering these questions:

1. Are women more likely to be recruited into lower paid roles compared to men?
2. Do particular aspects of pay (such as starting salaries and bonuses) differ by gender?
3. Do men and women receive different performance scores on average?
4. Is there gender imbalance in your promotions?
5. Do people get “stuck” at certain levels within your organisation?
6. Do you support part-time employees to progress?
7. Do men and women leave at different rates?
8. Are you supporting both men and women in your organisation to take on caring responsibilities?

Use the full guidance<sup>1</sup> for more information on how to answer these questions.

“

**We recommend taking a data-driven approach**

”

# Evidence categories



## Effective actions

There is strong evidence that shows these actions are effective, and that they are worth implementing. We recommend prioritising these actions above the actions in the categories below.



## Promising actions

These actions are promising but they still need further research to improve the evidence of their effectiveness and how best to implement them. The government has policies in place supporting some of these actions to improve women's participation in the workforce. The government is evaluating their effectiveness and we recommend that employers evaluate their actions too.



## Actions with mixed results

These actions have been shown sometimes to have a positive impact and other times a negative impact. This might be due to how they are implemented or other factors that we do not fully understand yet. As a result, investing in these actions is a more risky use of resources. We cannot, therefore, make a general recommendation that these are good ways to reduce gender inequality.

"The business as well as the social imperative for diversity and inclusion in our workforces has never been clearer. But we have to help organisations with good guidance on the policies and practices that most make a difference. This guidance in support of improving gender balance does the legwork for employers of searching the evidence and sifting out those initiatives which offer the best chance of spurring change.

There is something concrete in here for all employers, of any size, wherever they are on their journey towards greater gender equality. Once employers act – starting with clear targets set by accountable leaders – we will improve opportunities for all, as well as drive better business outcomes."

---

**Peter Cheese – Chief Executive,  
Chartered Institute of Personnel  
and Development**



# Leadership and accountability

Leaders play a key role in driving gender equality in their organisations. The first concrete thing leaders can do is to set specific, ambitious targets.

The second thing is to create strong accountability mechanisms to ensure that every hiring manager and people manager feels accountable for diversity outcomes in their team.

**“  
Progress towards goals  
should be tracked and  
reviewed regularly  
”**



## Effective action: Set internal targets for gender representation and equality

The first thing many organisations do is set goals. Unfortunately general goals such as “we will reduce our organisation’s gender pay gap” are not effective unless they are accompanied by specific goals. High-level goals do not spur action or assign responsibility. Targets are most successful when they are:

- Specific and clear. What are you aiming to change and how big will the change be?
- Time-bound. By when will the goal be achieved?
- Challenging but realistic.
- Public.<sup>2</sup> Organisations should consider including their targets in the action plans they publish on the Gender Pay Gap reporting website, and in other public locations. Making a public commitment makes it more likely that the target will be achieved.
- Monitored. Progress towards goals should be tracked and reviewed regularly.

**Making a public commitment makes it more likely that the target will be achieved**



## Effective action: Appoint diversity managers and/or diversity task forces

Diversity managers and diversity task forces hold all parts of the organisation accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts and outcomes. Having a diversity manager is associated with better representation of women in organisations.<sup>3</sup>

However, simply appointing a diversity manager or task force is not enough. Diversity managers and task forces should be able to review hiring and progression decisions and ask for justifications for those decisions. This creates accountability. When people know their decisions may be reviewed by a senior diversity manager or task force, they pay closer attention to the information they are basing their decisions on, and make less biased decisions.

Diversity managers and task forces should:

- Have a senior/executive role within the organisation. They need to have enough power and influence to hold people accountable for making progress on equality and diversity goals.
- Have visibility of internal data so they can track progress and outcomes.
- Be in a position to ask for more information on why decisions were made.
- Be empowered to develop and implement diversity strategies and policies.

Having a diversity manager is associated with better representation of women in organisations

# Hiring and selection

Unconscious bias and stereotypes can creep in at various stages of the hiring and selection process, reducing the chances that an employer hires the best candidate for the job.

An effective way to overcome bias is to standardise processes to ensure all candidates are assessed in the same way and according to the same criteria. Even structured interviews and task-based assessments can be biased unless they are standardised and conducted in a consistent way.



## Effective action: Use structured interviews for recruitment and promotions

Compared to structured interviews, unstructured interviews are more likely to allow unfair bias to creep in and influence decisions.

Use structured interviews that:

- Ask exactly the same questions of all candidates in a predetermined order and format.
- Grade the responses using pre-specified, standardised criteria. This makes the responses comparable and reduces the impact of unconscious bias.<sup>4</sup>



## Effective action: Use skill-based assessment tasks in recruitment

Interviews alone may not give all candidates a good opportunity to demonstrate their suitability for a role. During recruitment, ask candidates to perform a range of tasks they would be expected to perform in the role they are applying for. This could involve situational judgement tasks, work samples or assessment centres. Using tasks that assess a variety of skills and abilities may help to reduce differences in how men and women are rated overall.<sup>5</sup>

Like other forms of candidate assessment, skill-based assessments need to be designed and conducted in the right way in order to minimise bias. Specifically:

- Have pre-specified scoring criteria.
- Make sure the assessment task resembles the real-life task.
- Develop the task and the scoring criteria with input from different staff members to ensure they are not too narrow or reflect gendered expectations about the role.<sup>6</sup>

Using tasks that assess a variety of skills and abilities may help to reduce differences in how men and women are rated overall



### **Effective action: Make expectations around salaries and negotiation clear**

Women are less likely to negotiate their pay on average.<sup>7</sup> This can lead to women having lower starting salaries on average than men. These differences persist over time.

Women are affected more than men by the lack of information about whether negotiating is an option or what salary range is on offer. Employers should clearly state the salary range available and they should also state whether the salary is negotiable. These are effective ways of increasing the number of women who negotiate.<sup>8</sup>

However, another reason why women do not negotiate their salaries is that they are more likely than men to face backlash, for example with people seeing them as “too demanding”.<sup>9</sup> Employers therefore need to ensure that women are not unfairly penalised when they do negotiate. Employers should monitor negotiation outcomes and starting salaries to see if any gender gaps emerge.



### **Promising action: Include more women in shortlists for recruitment and promotions**

When putting together a shortlist of qualified candidates, some evidence suggests that it is important to make sure that a certain number of women are included on the list so that individual women are not seen as “token”.<sup>10</sup>

Instead of considering whether there is a “magic number” of women to have on a shortlist, employers should set themselves ambitious targets for the gender proportions they want to have on their shortlists. This can mean specifically asking recruiters to look for equally well qualified women, or investigating whether there are equally well qualified women in your organisation who have not applied for an internally advertised role.



## Promising action: Recruit returners

Returners are people who have taken an extended career break for caring or other reasons. They may face challenges finding a new position or may take on a role that does not reflect their capability. Recruiting returners can give employers access to skilled and experienced talent seeking to re-enter the workforce.

Use our guidance<sup>11</sup> to see how to attract and hire returners. For example:

- Target places where returners are likely to be looking.
- Ensure the recruitment process is returner-friendly.
- Offer support before and during the assessment.



## Promising action: Anonymise CVs

Anonymising a CV means removing any identifying information – like the applicant's name or contact details – before giving it to the people who are doing the hiring. Removing identifying information makes it more difficult for people to tell an applicant's gender, race or ethnicity. This can prevent biases from influencing the decision-making process.<sup>12</sup>

You should consider CV anonymisation if the minority proportion who successfully make it through the CV sift is substantially smaller than the proportion who applied. For example, if 40 percent of applicants to certain roles in your organisation are women, but only 20 percent of candidates who make it through the CV sift are women, then you should try CV anonymisation.



## Promising action: Make decisions about applicants in batches

When people consider job applicants one at a time, they are more likely to end up comparing the candidate to certain stereotypes. For example, a well-qualified woman applying for a job in a predominantly male team may be rejected because she appears too different from the team's current image of a talented team member.

This can be addressed by evaluating candidates in batches to reduce bias. In the previous example, comparing the well-qualified woman to two other new candidates who have applied for the role could allow her excellent qualifications to stand out more. There is some evidence that this approach can help gender equality.<sup>13</sup>

Your organisation may already make decisions about applicants in batches if you have recruitment or promotion rounds where you evaluate multiple candidates against each other. However, some organisations may have ongoing or open recruitment or promotion processes, which mean that a decision is made about an individual candidate in isolation as they apply. If this is the case, look for points in your processes where multiple candidates could be considered in parallel and weighed up against each other.

When people consider job applicants one at a time, they are more likely to end up comparing the candidate to certain stereotypes



## Promising action: Make job advert language gender neutral

The language you use in job adverts may discourage women from applying. For example, language that highlights the competitive or inflexible nature of a job (such as ‘leader’ or ‘dominant’) is seen as more masculine and can discourage women from applying.<sup>14</sup> Highlighting the competitive aspects of a role may also have the unintended effect of attracting men who are less qualified.<sup>15</sup>

Making the language more gender neutral could reduce the likelihood that your job advert discourages well qualified candidates. There are tools available to help with this – search online for gendered language bias tools.



## Mixed evidence: Diversity statements

Organisations often use diversity statements in their job adverts, on their websites and elsewhere to communicate that they care about diversity. Unfortunately, it is not clear that they work. Little research has been done so far looking at how they affect women’s likelihood to apply to the organisation.<sup>16</sup> Slightly more research has been done on whether diversity statements make ethnic minority groups more likely to say they would apply for jobs, but the results are mixed. Diversity statements might work in some contexts<sup>17</sup> but backfire in others.<sup>18</sup>

While diversity statements are one way of trying to communicate that your organisation cares about diversity, based on current evidence you should not rely on them as a way to attract more diverse candidates.

Language that highlights the competitive or inflexible nature of a job is seen as more masculine and can discourage women from applying



## Mixed evidence: Diverse selection panels

Having selection panels with a mix of men and women seems to help women’s prospects sometimes and harm them at other times. Some studies show that the more women there are on a panel, the more likely women are to be selected for a role,<sup>19</sup> while other studies find the opposite.<sup>20</sup> The effect can also depend on the role being recruited for<sup>21</sup> or the role of women on the committee.<sup>22</sup> More research is needed to understand the conditions under which a diverse selection panel is or is not effective for improving gender equality.

# Talent management, learning and development

Many organisations invest heavily in learning and development, including unconscious bias and diversity training programmes. Unfortunately there is little evidence suggesting that these are an effective way to change behaviour.

Instead, we recommend employers to focus on transparency across all processes and enabling women to access opportunities at equal rates to men. We also encourage tracking the effectiveness of other initiatives, such as networking programmes, mentoring or sponsorship schemes.



## Effective action: Introduce transparency to promotion, pay and reward processes

Transparency means being open about processes, policies and criteria for decision-making. This means that employees are clear for example about what is involved to get a pay increase or exactly how promotions are decided. Managers also understand that their decisions need to be objective and evidence-based because those decisions can be reviewed by others.

Without transparency and the accountability it creates, it can be easier for decisions to become biased. It can also be harder for minority candidates to know what is expected of them in order to progress – or to question inconsistent or unfair decisions. Introducing transparency to promotion, pay and reward processes can reduce pay inequalities.<sup>23</sup>

Without transparency and the accountability it creates, it can be easier for decisions to become biased



## Promising action: Offer mentoring and sponsorship

Mentors provide guidance and advice to their mentee while sponsors advocate for and champion the person they are sponsoring. Some evidence suggests that mentoring programmes are somewhat effective for women from minority groups, but are not necessarily effective for women of all backgrounds.<sup>24</sup> It is not clear, based on existing evidence, whether sponsorships are more effective than mentoring, or how best to run mentoring and sponsorship programmes so they are effective. It is possible that, for mentoring or sponsorship programmes to be effective, they must give women access to and advocacy from highly influential people in an organisation.



## Promising action: Offer networking programmes

Some evidence suggests that formal networking programmes where members meet and share information and career advice can be helpful for white women but not other groups of women.<sup>25</sup> This may be because networking needs to give participants access to people in positions of power. It may be less common for minority women to get connected to people like them in positions of power via networking. More work is needed to understand the effects of networking programmes, and whether they need to have particular features in order to be successful.



## Mixed evidence: Performance self-assessments

There is some evidence that women underestimate their abilities in the workplace. They may also be more conservative in their assessment of their abilities than men.<sup>26</sup>

Managers' judgement can be unconsciously influenced when they look at employees' self-assessment scores, for example as part of 360 degree performance feedback. We know that performance appraisal scores can be biased in a particular direction by this sort of information.<sup>27</sup> This is particularly a problem if those self-assessment scores are shared with the manager prior to performance review sessions. The lower scores women give themselves mean that managers might then give women lower scores than they otherwise would have. This can affect performance-related outcomes such as pay rises, bonuses and progression.

We recommend that if a review process contains an element of self-assessed scoring, these scores should not be shared until after a manager has made their own assessment of the employee's performance.

It is possible that, for mentoring or sponsorship programmes to be effective, they must give women access to and advocacy from highly influential people in an organisation



## Mixed evidence: Unconscious bias training

Unconscious biases can influence a person's judgement without them being aware of it. Unconscious bias training in the workplace aims to make people aware of potentially harmful unconscious biases and to reduce the impact of those biases. While some types of unconscious bias training may have some limited positive effects such as creating awareness and shifting people's attitudes in the short-term, there is currently no evidence that this training changes behaviour or improves workplace equality.<sup>28</sup>



## Mixed evidence: Diversity training

Diversity training can help raise awareness but is unlikely to change behaviour.<sup>29</sup> Some research in the US has found that mandatory diversity training either does not change the number of women in management positions, or actually reduces it.<sup>30</sup>

This backfiring may occur for a number of reasons. It may be because people resent being made to do something and so do not take the training seriously. The training might also bring to mind unhelpful stereotypes which people then act upon. Alternatively the training might make people think that the organisation has now solved its diversity problems.

We therefore do not recommend prioritising the use of resources on unconscious bias or diversity training.



## Mixed evidence: Leadership development training exclusively for women

Leadership development programmes aim to teach skills including management competencies and self-confidence. While there are some very small-scale studies of the effects of leadership training programmes for women, particularly in medicine and academia, there is currently no high quality evidence that such programmes help women progress. Some people feel that these programmes imply that the women themselves are the problem. For now, organisations should not expect these programmes to narrow their gender pay gap.

There is currently no evidence that unconscious bias training changes behaviour or improves workplace equality



# Workplace flexibility

Flexible working arrangements and generous parental leave policies are increasingly important in attracting the best talent. It is important for employers to ‘walk the talk’ and ensure that take up of these policies is genuinely encouraged throughout the organisation.



## Promising action: Improve workplace flexibility for men and women

It is important to challenge the gender stereotype that it is a woman’s role to take on caring responsibilities. Improving workplace flexibility for everyone can enable both women and men to combine work with family and other parts of their lives.<sup>31</sup>

- Advertise and offer all jobs, including senior roles, as having flexible working options, such as part-time work, remote working, job sharing or compressed hours.
- Encourage senior leaders to role model working flexibly and to champion flexible working.
- Encourage and enable men to work flexibly, so that it is not seen as only a benefit for women.
- Talk to fathers about changing their working patterns when they have children, not just mothers.

It is important to challenge the gender stereotype that it is a woman’s role to take on caring responsibilities



## Promising action: Encourage the uptake of Shared Parental Leave

The gender pay gap widens dramatically after women have children but this could be reduced if men and women were able to share childcare more equally. Shared Parental Leave and Pay enables working parents to share up to 50 weeks of leave and up to 37 weeks of pay in their child's first year.

Encourage take up of Shared Parental Leave (see our guidance).<sup>32</sup>

For example:

- Inform future fathers that it is their legal right to request Shared Parental Leave.
- Provide future parents guidance and personal support to understand the scheme.
- Share and promote examples of senior leaders who have taken Shared Parental Leave in your organisation.
- Offer enhanced Shared Parental Pay at the same level as enhanced maternity pay.



# What evidence we have used

We focused on gender-related research and evidence, but we also included research on characteristics such as race/ethnicity and sexual orientation to understand what works for improving equality and diversity more generally. This acknowledges that people's experiences are not determined by a single dimension of identity.

For some actions, we have gone beyond gender and other diversity characteristics, drawing on a wider body of behavioural science research to make our recommendations. For example, there are no high quality studies on the impact of setting internal targets on equality in the workplace. We have nonetheless included this as an effective action because goal setting has a consistent effect on behaviour across a range of settings. So where the body of findings is robust and consistent across contexts, we have included the action even without specific evidence from the workplace equality context.

This guidance is based on the best evidence currently available. However, highly rigorous evidence is currently scarce in the field of gender equality in the workplace. Our judgement about whether a given action is categorised as "effective", "promising" or "mixed evidence" is based on a holistic assessment of the current evidence. In this document, we cite only a sample of the studies that were used to inform our assessment of the efficacy of a given action as it was not practical to cite them all.

This guidance will be updated as the evidence base develops.

.....  
**For some actions, we have gone beyond gender and other diversity characteristics, drawing on a wider body of behavioural science research to make our recommendations**  
.....

# Further reading

Bohnet, I. (2016). What works: Gender equality by design. Harvard University Press.

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. Harvard Business Review, 94(7/8), 52-60.

CIPD (2015). A head for hiring: The behavioural science of recruitment and selection. <https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/culture/behaviour/recruitment-report>

Government Equalities Office (2019). Women's Progression in the Workplace: Actions for employers. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/womens-progression-in-the-workplace-actions-for-employers>

Government Equalities Office (2019). Family friendly policies: Actions for employers. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/family-friendly-policies-actions-for-employers>

## Endnotes

- 1 Eight ways to understand your organisation's Gender Pay Gap, <https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk/public/assets/pdf/understand-your-gender-pay-gap.pdf>
- 2 Mento, A.J., Steel, R.P. & Karren, R.J. (1987). A meta-analytic study of the effects of goal setting on task performance: 1966–1984. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 39(1), 52-83; Epton, T., Currie, S. & Armitage, C.J. (2017). Unique effects of setting goals on behavior change: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 85(12), 1182-1198.
- 3 Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(7/8), 52-60; Castilla, E.J. (2015). Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 311-333; Dobbin, F., Schrage, D. & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5), 1014-1044.
- 4 Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2013). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(1), 241-293; Oh, I., Postlethwaite, B.E. & Schmidt, F.L. (2013). Rethinking the validity of interviews for employment decision making: Implications of recent developments in meta-analysis. In D. J. Svyantek & K. Mahoney (Eds.), Received wisdom, kernels of truth, and boundary conditions in organizational studies (pp. 297-329). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- 5 Harari, M.B, Viswesvaran, C. & O'Rourke, R. (2014). Gender differences in work sample assessments: Not all tests are created equal. *Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 30, 29-34.
- 6 De Soete, B., Lievens, F. & Druart, C. (2013). Strategies for dealing with the diversity-validity dilemma in personnel selection: Where are we and where should we go? *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 29(1), 3-12; Ployhart, R.E. & Holtz, B.C. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Strategies for reducing racioethnic and sex subgroup differences and adverse impact in selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 153-172.
- 7 Leibbrandt, A., & List, J. A. (2014). Do women avoid salary negotiations? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment. *Management Science*, 61(9), 2016-2024.
- 8 Mazei, J., Hüffmeier, J., Freund, P. A., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Bilke, L., & Hertel, G. (2015). A meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiation outcomes and their moderators. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(1), 85-104; Leibbrandt, A., & List, J. A. (2014). Do women avoid salary negotiations? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment. *Management Science*, 61(9), 2016-2024.
- 9 Bowles, H.R. & Babcock, L. (2012). How can women escape the compensation negotiation dilemma? Relational accounts are one answer. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(1), 80-96.
- 10 Heilman, M.E. (1980). The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: Varying the sex composition of the applicant pool. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26(3), 386-395. Johnson, S. K., Hekman, D. R., & Chan, E. T. (2016). If there is only one woman in your candidate pool, there is statistically no chance she'll be hired. *Harvard Business Review*, 26(04). This action has been re-categorised as "promising" instead of "effective", due to the adoption of more formal criteria for judging evidence in this version of this guidance, relative to the previous version.
- 11 For our guidance, see Returner Programmes-Best Practice Guidance for Employers [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/685064/Returner\\_Programmes\\_-\\_Best\\_Practice\\_Guidance\\_for\\_Employers.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/685064/Returner_Programmes_-_Best_Practice_Guidance_for_Employers.pdf)
- 12 For a summary of the evidence, see: Rinne, U (2018). Anonymous job applications and hiring discrimination. *IZA World of Labor*, 48v2.
- 13 Bohnet, I., van Geen, A. & Bazermann, M. (2016). When performance trumps gender bias: Joint vs. separate evaluation. *Management Science*, 62(5), 1225-1234.
- 14 Gaucher, D., Friesen, J. & Kay, A.C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 101(1):109-28.

- 15 Flory, J.A., Leibbrandt, A. & List, J.A. (2015) Do competitive workplaces deter female workers? A large-scale natural field experiment on job entry decisions. *Review of Economic Studies*, 82, 122-155.
- 16 Windscheid, L., Bowes-Sperry, L., Kidder, D.L., Cheung, H.K., Morner, M. & Lievens, F. (2016). Actions speak louder than words: Outsiders' perceptions of diversity mixed messages. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(9), 1329-1341.
- 17 Flory, J.A., Leibbrandt, A., Rott, C. & Stoddard, O. (2018). Increasing workplace diversity: Evidence from a recruiting experiment at a Fortune 500 company (CESifo Working Paper 7025). Munich: CESifo.
- 18 Wilton, L.S., Good, J.J., Moss-Racusin, C.A. & Sanchez, D.T. (2015). Communicating more than diversity: The effect of institutional diversity statements on expectations and performance as a function of race and gender. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21(3), 315-325.
- 19 De Paola, M., & Scoppa, V. (2015). Gender discrimination and evaluators' gender: evidence from Italian academia. *Economica*, 82(325), 162-188.
- 20 Bagues, M., Sylos-Labini, M., & Zinov'yeva, N. (2017). Does the gender composition of scientific committees matter? *American Economic Review*, 107(4), 1207-38.
- 21 Bagues, M., Sylos-Labini, M., & Zinov'yeva, N. (2017). Does the gender composition of scientific committees matter? *American Economic Review*, 107(4), 1207-38.
- 22 Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Rosati, F. (2015). Selection committees for academic recruitment: does gender matter? *Research Evaluation*, 24(4), 392-404; Duguid, M. (2011). Female tokens in high-prestige work groups: Catalysts or inhibitors of group diversification? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116(1), 104-115.
- 23 Castilla, E. J. (2015). Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 311-333.
- 24 Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(7/8), 52-60.
- 25 Dobbin, F., Kalev, A., & Kelly, E. (2007). Diversity management in corporate America. *Contexts*, 6(4), 21-27.
- 26 Fletcher, C. (1999). The implications of research on gender differences in self-assessment and 360 degree appraisal. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(1), 39-46; Beyer, S. (1990). Gender differences in accuracy of self-evaluations of performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 960-970.
- 27 Belle, N., Cantarelli, P. & Belardinelli, P. (2017). Cognitive biases in performance appraisal: Experimental evidence on anchoring and halo effects with public sector managers and employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 37(3), 275-294.
- 28 Atewologun, D., Cornish, T., & Tresh, F. (2018). Unconscious bias training: An assessment of the evidence for effectiveness. Equality and Human Rights Commission. Retrieved from: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/unconscious-bias-training-assessment-evidence-effectiveness>; Girod, S., Fassiotto, M., Grewal, D., Ku, M. C., Sriram, N., Nosek, B. A., & Valentine, H. (2016). Reducing implicit gender leadership bias in academic medicine with an educational intervention. *Academic Medicine*, 91(8), 1143-1150.
- 29 Bezrukova, K., Spell, C.S., Perry, J., & Jehn, K. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227-1274; Chang, E.H., Milkman, K.L., Gromet, D.M., Rebele, R.W., Massey, C., Duckworth, A.L. & Grant, A.M. (2019). The mixed effects of online diversity training. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16), 7778-7783.
- 30 Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(7/8), 52-60.
- 31 The Timewise Flexible Jobs Index 2018, [https://timewise.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Timewise\\_Flexible\\_Jobs\\_Index\\_2018.pdf](https://timewise.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Timewise_Flexible_Jobs_Index_2018.pdf)
- 32 For our guidance, see [sharedparentalleave.campaign.gov.uk](http://sharedparentalleave.campaign.gov.uk)



# Government Equalities Office

Government Equalities Office  
Sanctuary Buildings, 6th floor,  
20 Great Smith Street,  
London SW1P 3BT  
[www.gov.uk/geo](http://www.gov.uk/geo)

September 2019  
© Crown copyright 2019