Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Property Law and Blockchain Applications in International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

Between Compliance and Commitment: The Law's Contested Role in Advancing Corporate Diversity and Inclusion

Haokun Li

Beijing 21st Century School, Beijing, China
lihaokun10573@outlook.com

Abstract. In recent decades, workplace diversity and inclusion (D&I) have been high on the agendas of policymakers and businesses, driven by social movements, globalization, and labor market changes. This paper discusses the effects of law on corporate diversity and inclusion management. It will particularly focus on labor law, anti-discrimination law, and disability rights law. The study aims to examine to what extent have D&I legislations helped to safeguard workers from discrimination and encourage employers to create inclusive workplaces. The study adopts a qualitative method through literature review, comparative legal review, and empirical evidence synthesis from existing research and reports regarding employment outcomes, earning gaps, and workplace accommodations across different jurisdictions. The current literature demonstrates that employment and anti-discrimination law have seen measurable advances, i.e., reduced wage gaps, increased employment for disadvantaged groups, and more prevalence of inclusive practices. At the same time, challenges such as hidden discrimination, enforcement difficulties and global variance continue to impede the complete fulfillment of legal rights. The study concludes that the law provides an important foundation for diversity management, but inclusive working in practice requires additional organisational and cultural efforts.

Keywords: Labor Law, Anti-Discrimination Law, Workplace Diversity, Management of Inclusion

1. Introduction

Diversity and inclusion (D&I) in the workplace have been an important theme in legal research. Diversity is the presence of multiple social, cultural, and personal identities, while inclusion is the deliberate creation of spaces where differences are known, appreciated, and tolerated. Legal scholars and professionals over the last decades have realized that D&I are not only ethical imperatives but also drivers of innovation, employees' loyalty, and business legitimacy within a globalization era.

Prior research has often focused on managerial action or firm-level performance impacts of D&I, without much investigation into the legal regimes under which such measures exist and are operative. The imperative to bridge such important gaps drives this research. It will look at how law facilitates firm-level diversity and inclusion through anti-discrimination protection and promotion of inclusive practices. This paper will also reflect upon the obstacles and challenges facing the D&I legislation.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

Methodologically, this paper takes a doctrinal and analytical approach. It has drawn on labour law, anti-discrimination law, international treaties, and trans-jurisdictional cases. This investigation examines not only the law's enacting and safeguarding functions, but also its limitations and enforcement deficits in practice. By situating corporate D&I within its legal foundations, this article highlights the broader social significance of regulation in shaping equitable workplaces and provides a valuable benchmark for future research at the intersection of law, business, and social justice.

2. The protective role of law in corporate diversity management

The substance of corporate diversity management is comprised of legal frameworks that prohibit discrimination and provide equal opportunity to all employees. Organisations must satisfy the requirements of law that prescribe a minimum level of equity and protect employees from disparate treatment before they can put in place sophisticated practices of inclusion. In such a manner, anti-discrimination and labour law serve as protection shields, ensuring that employees should not be barred from possibilities or discriminated against on grounds other than work performance.

2.1. Prohibition of employment discrimination and labour law

Labour law is the main regulatory tool for protecting workers from discriminatory treatment. Work in the past has been marked by exclusionary practices, where women, minority ethnic groups, and disabled individuals were systematically denied jobs or relegated to low-status jobs with little protection. To reverse these structural disadvantages, legislatures in the majority of countries have enacted comprehensive employment protections.

For example, in the United States, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 enacted under Title VII that employment discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin is unlawful. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 also enacted the same protective provisions excluding older workers and individuals with disabilities. In the European Union, states are compelled by the Employment Equality Directive to criminalize discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation in work. The United Kingdom's Equality Act 2010 brings together the anti-discrimination legislation and enacts single-source protection against an extensive range of characteristics. Together, all the above pieces of legislation form a framework for an atmosphere of equal access to work which shall be on merit and not prejudice.

Legislative reforms have drastically cut back workplace discrimination. Audit studies have provided evidence. Bertrand and Mullainathan [1] documented that résumés bearing "White-sounding" names were requested for interviews 50 percent more frequently than résumés with "African-American-sounding" names even when they had identical qualifications, prior to anti-discrimination law coming to be implemented on a large scale. Recent research shows, though, that diversity policies inside companies, sparked by legal and reputational penalties, have flattened these gaps [2].

More importantly, legal sanctions have been successful in deterring public discriminatory action in businesses. Donohue and Siegelman [3] observed that class actions legal action under Title VII in America caused a measurable reduction in discriminatory promotion and termination policies within targeted companies, particularly the Fortune 500 companies. These findings point to the fact that, besides providing legal rights, labor law persuades employers to internalize norms of fairness. It not only exists as a defensive shield for vulnerable categories but as an active force in preventing open discrimination.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

2.2. Anti-discrimination law and equal rights in the workplace

Anti-discrimination legislation is among the primary instruments of enforcing workplace equality, not only by prohibiting direct discrimination but also by preventing unfairness in pay, promotion, training, and working conditions. Measurable impact was seen following the passing of laws such as the United States' Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, through which the race and gender disparities were ended. Blau and Kahn [4] estimate the full-time pay gender gap among U.S. workers to have fallen by some 15–20 percent during the period 1963–1985, and by even larger percentages in states where anti-discrimination laws were better enforced. Similarly, empirical studies by Goldin [5] conclude that increasing women's participation in professional and managerial jobs during subsequent decades can be attributed directly to legal enforcement tools and discrimination lawsuits.

Disability law has also generated tangible payoffs. Since the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Schur, Kruse, and Blanck [6] demonstrate a 2-3 percentage point increase in rates of employment of working-age individuals with disabilities during the initial decade. Survey data also reveal a dramatic expansion of workplace accommodations—i.e., modified workplaces, flexible schedules, and accessible technology—that enhance participation of employees with disabilities in the labor market. In the UK, research based on the Equality Act 2010 reveals that firms with disability policies saw a 7-10 percentage point boost in hiring and retaining disabled employees within five years [7].

Within the EU, the Equality Directive has been associated with measurable reductions in pay differentials and improved promotion rates for minority and marginalized groups. Bertrand et al. [8] account that countries implementing obligatory reporting and pay audits in accordance with EU directives witnessed a 3–5 percent fall in gendered wage gaps in affected sectors over a decade. Field audits further indicate that aggressive implementation of anti-discrimination laws underpinned by such regulation requirements increased the participation rate of women and ethnic minorities in training by a mean of 8–12 percent [8].

These findings establish that anti-discrimination law not merely confers formal rights but also produces measurable gains in the operation of labor markets. Despite loopholes and prejudices continuing to exist, pay differentials are reduced, access to jobs is enhanced for disadvantaged groups, workplace accommodations improve accessibility, and training and promotion opportunities are allocated more widely.

3. The promoting role of law in corporate inclusion management

Regimes of the law not only forbid discrimination and exclusion, but actively shape company practice by demanding inclusion. Whereas anti-discrimination law is perhaps a shield against discriminatory treatment, other legal instruments impose positive obligations on companies to change settings, policies, and firm cultures to accommodate diverse needs. In this sense, law is not merely a constraint, but an instrument that actively helps organizations to implement inclusive policies.

3.1. Disability rights and the logic of reasonable accommodation

The most obvious example of the positive role of law in favoring inclusion is disability rights law. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 demands that employers in the United States provide "reasonable accommodations" for employees unless doing so would cause an undue hardship. This

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

commitment is stronger than legal equality in the way that it is recognized that keeping everyone precisely equal will remain discriminatory unless one eliminates structural barriers [9]. Similarly, the UK Equality Act 2010 and the European Union Employment Equality Directive require changes in order to allow continued access to work among disabled workers.

There has been some research showing that such legislation has had quantifiable positive effects. Schur, Kruse, and Blanck demonstrate that there has been a 2–3 percentage point rise in prime-age workers with disabilities' labor market participation rates in the time span since the ADA, as well as broader embrace of job accommodations, such as accessible technology and flexible work. Despite the initial recruitment dip due to cost factors [10], the longer-term gains have been significant, including enhanced workplace accessibility, social consciousness, and structural cultural changes towards inclusivity.

3.2. Parental leave, gender, and religious inclusion

Inclusivity legislation also extends into other areas. The EU Parental Leave Directive makes provision for a minimum of four months' parental leave. It also comes with a non-transferable quota —one month each to a parent specifically to enhance gender equality within the household. Statutory provision of requesting flexible working under the Employment Rights Act 1996 (as amended 2014) in the UK compels employers to consider flexible reorganization of the job to accommodate employees with caring responsibilities.

There is strong evidence available to prove the efficacy of such policies. Chung [11] discovers that flexible rights for workers increase job satisfaction and retention, particularly for women, and despite career sacrifice in certain corporations. Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly [12] confirm that companies with affirmative gender-inclusive policies, typically prompted by legislation, enjoy tangible advantages for the promotion of women and taking part in professional development activities.

There has also been legislation aiming to promote religious-based inclusion. Title VII of the American Civil Rights Act requires employers to accommodate religious practice except for undue hardship, such as dress code, prayer breaks, and dietary restrictions. Although enforcement is not equal, these provisions also force organizations to understand religious diversity as an integral part of inclusion.

Organizational culture change occurs at the root level by inclusion-supportive legislation. Codes such as accessibility codes, anti-harassment training, and diversity departments encourage corporations to respond to system-level barriers. Dobbin and Kalev [13] show that mandatory diversity training and equal opportunity departments have been drivers of incremental cultural change in U.S. corporations, albeit less than ideal implementation. Still, researchers note that without actual organizational commitment, compliance is "symbolic," resulting in letter-of-the-law policies while actual change fails to occur [14]. However, a floor level is established by the law, by means of which regulators, employees, and civil society can hold companies accountable and thereby ensure medium- and long-term normalisation of inclusivity in company management.

4. Challenges

Despite legal systems are meant to promote diversity and inclusion, in reality, their implementation is often eroded by implicit discrimination and enforcement problems. These problems are the cause of the discrepancy between the promise of law and the continuous lack of equality in reality.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

4.1. Hidden discrimination and structural inequalities

Policies such as discriminatory hiring schemes, subtle exclusion from social networks, or the "glass cliff" approach of women or minorities being voted into leadership positions in times of crisis but not normalcy illustrate the way that inequality can persist in the absence of obvious legal protection [15]. Empirical data substantiate that implicit discrimination in hiring and promotion is still prevalent, with résumé audit tests revealing lower callback rates for minority groups even under solid anti-discrimination regimes.

Structural variations in broad social, cultural, and economic frameworks cannot be rectified by laws, even if implemented, on their own. McCrudden [16] divides formal equality—treating everyone equally—and substantive equality—doing away with system-intrinsic disadvantage being faced by different groups. The majority of anti-discrimination legislations enscripts formal equality but fails while dealing with problems such as labor segregation, gender pay gaps, or cultural stereotypes.

For instance, despite a number of decades of equal pay legislations in the United States and the European Union, women as a group continue to earn less than men. Eurostat [17] reveals that the EU's general gender pay gap is 13 percent, a number which fell only incrementally year by year, even when there is a prohibition under the law. Similarly, minority ethnic underrepresentation at executive management level is so in all jurisdictions, being a testament to barriers which cannot be surmounted through statute.

The persistence of inequalities points to a failure of the law: it is easy to outlaw discriminatory practices and mandate inclusion but difficult to challenge existing social norms or power relations. Substantive equality, according to Fredman [18], is not a one-dimensional task for law to accomplish, but a multi-dimensional practice beyond legal norms to organize redistribution, recognition, participation, and transformation.

4.2. Difficulties in legal enforcement

Even when workers suspect discrimination, it is sometimes difficult to defend their rights. Burden of proof is one of the barriers. The majority of anti-discrimination complaints require claimants to demonstrate that they were mistreated unfairly. Employers are often able to provide alternative explanations, like performance evaluation or reasonableness in business, which would be acceptable to courts [19]. Empirical studies of U.S. employment discrimination suits also reveal that plaintiffs succeed in less than 20 percent of cases, significantly less than in other civil cases [20]. Backlog trials, prohibitive lawyer fees, and intimidation by employers are some of the other deterrents for employees to pursue claims, especially when employees risk losing their jobs as well.

Enforcement is also affected by institutional capacity. Equality bodies and labor inspectorates in most jurisdictions are overburdened and under-resourced and possess weak monitoring compliance capacities. Across the European Union as a whole, the European Network of Equality Bodies (EQUINET) has repeatedly determined lack of powers of investigation and resource shortfalls are substantial barriers to effective enforcement [21]. Without monitoring, the deterrent effectiveness of legal sanctions is lost. This lack of enforcement is not merely an organizational weakness but a structural feature of the system shaped by what legal commentator Marc Galanter [22] called the inbuilt advantage of "repeat players" relative to "one-shot" litigants. Organizations as repeat players develop specialized legal expertise, enhanced resources, and a long-term perspective that allows them to navigate the legal terrain and, in most situations, reshape it in their interest. Individual

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

workers, in contrast, are typically one-shot agents who perform for high stakes, endure emotional trauma, and face intense information asymmetry.

5. Conclusion

This essay has examined the role that law has had in improving corporate diversity and inclusion. More specifically, it looked at how anti-discrimination and labor law protect employees from discrimination, and how law encourages companies towards greater equity. The essay has also discussed obstacles and challenges that constrain the efficiency of such mechanisms. This essay has come to the conclusion that law has effectively reduced discrimination and promoted inclusion, but its effects are often undermined by structural prejudices, weak enforcement, and institutionally ingrained inequalities. Genuine inclusion, therefore, must be more than complying with the law; it must be a matter of organisational and cultural transformation that transcends the law. Meanwhile, this study acknowledges its own limits. It did not make direct comparisons between different industries, and it did not employ empirical research methods such as questionnaires and surveys that could trace how the laws work in reality. Future research can then examine how diversity law operates in practice with comparative studies across sectors or countries. It can also investigate how emerging issues like algorithmic discrimination, telework, and changing global value chains could redefine the tension among law, company governance, and workplace equality.

References

[1] Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. American Economic Review, 94(4), 991–1013.
[2] Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(41), 10870–10875.
[3] Donohue, J. J., & Siegelman, P. (1991). The changing nature of employment discrimination litigation. Stanford Law Review, 43(5), 983–1033.
[4] Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. Journal of Economic Literature, 55(3), 789–865.
[5] Goldin, C. (2014). A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter. American Economic Review, 104(4), 1091–1119.
[6] Schur, L., Kruse, D., & Blanck, P. (2013). People with disabilities: Sidelined or mainstreamed? Cambridge University Press.
[7] Foster, D., & Wass, V. (2013). Disability in the labour market: An exploration of concepts of the ideal worker and organisational fit that disadvantage employees with impairments. Sociology, 47(4), 705–721.
[8] Bertrand, M., Bombardini, M., Fisman, R., & Trebbi, F. (2019). Does meritocracy work? (NBER Working Paper No. 26231). National Bureau of Economic Research.
[9] Kayess, R., & French, P. (2008). Out of darkness into light? Introducing the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Human Rights Law Review, 8(1), 1–34.
[10] Acemoglu, D., & Angrist, J. D. (2001). Consequences of employment protection? The case of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Journal of Political Economy, 109(5), 915–957.
[11] Chung, H. (2018). The flexibility paradox: Why flexible working leads to (self-)exploitation. Policy Press.
[12] Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. American Sociological Review, 71(4), 589–617.
[13] Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail. Harvard Business Review, 94(7), 52–60.
[14] Edelman, L. B. (2016). Working law: Courts, corporations, and symbolic civil rights. University of Chicago Press.
[15] Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. British Journal of Management, 16(2), 81–90.
[16] McCrudden, C. (2011). Two views of subordination: The personal scope of employment discrimination law in Jivraj v Hashwani. Industrial Law Journal, 40(4), 404–422.
[17] Eurostat. (2021). Gender pay gap statistics. European Commission.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28936

[18] Fredman, S. (2011). Discrimination law (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
[19] McCrudden, C. (2001). Thinking about the discrimination directives. European Anti-Discrimination Law Review, 1(1), 17–23.
[20] Clermont, K. M., & Schwab, S. J. (2004). How employment discrimination plaintiffs fare in federal court. Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 1(2), 429–458.
[21] Equinet. (2018). Equality bodies: Key actors in the enforcement of equality law. European Network of Equality Bodies.
[22] Galanter, M. (1974). Why the “haves” come out ahead: Speculations on the limits of legal change. Law & Society Review, 9(1), 95–160