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The foundation of every excellent diversity and inclusion program is a comprehensive understanding of a company’s diversity needs, strengths, and weaknesses. One fundamental component of this information is the demographic makeup of its workforce. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management, for example, requires federal agencies to develop diversity and inclusion strategies based on “an analysis of the current and future workforce for the mission critical occupations in coordination with HR, EEO and Diversity and Inclusion to then conduct a barrier analysis.”

However, obtaining this information can be very difficult, especially in areas of the world, such as Europe, where companies are generally required to gather demographic information only on gender. The hesitation of many employees to provide this information exacerbates the complexities of this task. These factors challenge multi-national corporations, in particular, to develop effective, legal mechanisms for gathering and analyzing data on underrepresented employees. This report focuses on the techniques employed by some of the world’s leading corporations to address these challenges, and it identifies the best practices for securing an accurate snapshot of the demographic composition of a company’s workforce.

U.S. Federal regulations require companies with 100 or more workers to file demographic information “on or before September 30 of each year.” This requirement ensures that corporations have guidance on gathering and retaining employee data. However, there is no legal obligation to make this information public, and many companies view this information as proprietary. Consequently, organizations have difficulty comparing their diversity progress against those of their individual counterparts. This complicates a company’s self-assessment of its diversity and inclusion program, because there is little information to determine how well it is doing in comparison to other firms of similar size and mission.*

In years past, the technology industry, in particular, was averse to making this information public for fear of bad publicity. However, this is changing as diversity practitioners and others urge these companies to make this workforce demographic data public. In the summer of 2014, Internet search provider Google, for example, decided to make it available. Laszlo Bock, Senior Vice President, People Operations, announced the company’s new policy stating, “We’ve always been reluctant to publish numbers about the diversity of our workforce at Google. We now realize we were wrong, and that it’s time to be candid about the issues.” Google’s statement obliged other major technology companies to consider releasing comparable data, and there was a flurry of reporting of hitherto proprietary information by Yahoo, Twitter, EBay, Facebook, LinkedIn, and others. The Atlantic senior associate editor Adrienne LaFrance applauded these efforts—“Some information is better than no information, isn't it?”—but she pointed out that more needs to be done:

Sharing data is part of the solution, but it has to be linked with meaningful initiatives to change corporate practices. Companies should release annual reports detailing their progress and publicly assessing the workforce diversification strategies that have and haven't worked. That's the next step.

According to research performed by Robin Schneider and Alexis Walmsley of Schneider and Ross Ltd, even many global companies have become committed to collecting and releasing demographic workforce data. The researchers report,

Whilst recognising the legal and cultural constraints that exist, the most progressive companies are clearly determined to have data that enable them to track progress, set evidence-based goals for improvement and transparently report progress.

The researchers also found that most companies gather demographic data at the recruitment stage. In addition, several companies also use a voluntary survey process, which enables employees to self-report additional information and confirm the correctness the data collected when they were hired.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission recommends self-reporting as the
best way to gather “anonymous annual data about the number of women and minorities in broad occupational categories and subcategories.”8 (A copy of the recommended form is available at http://www.eeac.org/public/03-243a.pdf.) The EEOC provides valuable recommendations regarding the self-reporting:

- Employers should resurvey employees periodically to ensure its information is accurate and up to date. Alternatively, companies could request employees to update their information or provide a page on its employee intranet “where employees could voluntarily and confidentially self-identify.”9

- Employers should ask employees if they are of Hispanic or Latino ancestry before inquiring as to what they believe their race to be.10

- Employers should not question an employee’s self-identification even if they believe he or she is of a different race or ethnicity than stated. It is important to uphold the principle of self-identification by not challenging an employee’s statements.11

- If an employee refuses to self-identify, the employer should use existing employment records or visual observation to make an educated determination. In fact, the Equal Employment Advisory Council “Suggested Employee Questionnaire” notes, “If you choose not to self-identify your race/ethnicity at this time, the federal government requires this employer to determine this information by visual survey and/or other available information.”12

The European Platform on Diversity Charters also emphasizes the collection of diversity data. The Platform provides a forum for the 5,500 companies and public institutions, which employ more than 15 million people, in 12 European nations that have signed diversity charters. The charters certify each organization’s commitment to promote “diversity and equal opportunity in the workplace regardless of, for example, age, disability, gender, race or ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation.”13 The Platform reports that only a few companies apply sophisticated diversity metrics, such as diversity scorecards, which the organization defines as integrated analyses of six components: “financial impact, diverse
customer/community partnership, workforce profile, workplace climate/culture, diversity leadership commitment, and learning and growth”. However, according to the Platform, companies are evaluating:

- The changing demographics of their workforces

- Their progress in staff engagement, talent management, employee well-being and performance management

- The success of their efforts to make their workplaces more inclusive

- The progress they are making in advancing and integrating diversity goals and programs actions across the company and incorporating them in their business growth strategies.

While emphasizing the vital importance of demographic data, the Platform cautions companies to be careful in gathering and storing this information. A transparent, state-of-the-art program is necessary to ensure employee remain confident that their personal information is protected and that it cannot be used by the company for other purposes. In addition, companies must maintain rigorous consistency in data collection and analysis. The absence of uniform procedures and policies would make evaluation of diversity metrics problematic over time and across the organization. Consequently, the organization recommends that companies

- Use best practice guidelines for gathering demographic data

- Protect privacy of information

- Adhere to all legal requirements

- Ensure uniformity in collecting data over time and across functions

In its recent publication on the use of technology to enhance human resource practices, the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) makes a comparable recommendation
when discussing the benefits and risks of data collection. According to this SHRM Effective Practice Guidelines Series report published in March 2015, technology makes HR data—including policies and procedures—more accessible and transparent to employees. Web-based capabilities will increase this transparency, as employees enjoy even greater access to their own data, as well as to HR data traditionally available only to HR staff. At the same time, concerns about privacy will increase. Few organizations manage as much personal information as do employers. . . As employers make data easier to access, the risk of jeopardizing employees’ privacy increases.17

The Legal Services Board—“the single independent oversight regulator of the legal profession and sector in England and Wales”18—has made promoting the collection and sharing of diversity demographic data a priority. In July 2011, the Board “issued guidance to regulators on diversity data collection across the legal workforce and the promotion of the transparency of this data.” Its diversity strategy is to “shed light on performance by requiring law firms and chambers to collect and publish information on the make-up of their workforce.”19 The Board recommends making this information available as prominently as possible. It believes that making this information available to the public will encourage consumers to consider a legal services provider’s diversity performance when making purchasing decisions. The Board also expects that the availability of demographic data will enable regulators “to have a direct impact on how they are regulated, so those with good response rates that are taking positive steps towards improving diversity and social mobility are treated differently (in respect of these duties) to those that do not.”20

The Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) affirms that collecting and analyzing data that identifies people on the basis of race, disability, sexual orientation, and other diversity and inclusion criteria is legal in Canada despite the belief among many people that it is not. Moreover, the Commission asserts “that data collection can play a useful and often essential role in creating strong human rights and human resources strategies for organizations in the public, private and non-profit sectors.”21 Consequently, the organization provides detailed information on how to design an effective data collection process that is sensitive to the concerns of employees. Its primary recommendation is that any data
collection process should comply with freedom of information and privacy protection legislation.\textsuperscript{22}

The Commission emphasizes that the process should be as transparent as possible, urging companies to pay particular attention to all communications related to the process to ensure that employees understand the purpose of the data gathering and how the information will be used. The Commission advises management to

- Define the purpose, goals and method for collecting data,

- Confirm that the recruitment, hiring and promotion process will remain “transparent, fair and based on merit”\textsuperscript{23}

- Delineate the benefits of the data collection to employees and the organization

- Develop a comprehensive commenting process that seeks input from all internal and external stakeholders, poses questions, incorporates feedback into the program plan, and shares with shareholders how their comments were integrated into the program.\textsuperscript{24}

The Commission recommends a six-step process for collecting diversity and inclusion data, which we have outlined in Chart 1.\textsuperscript{25}
**Chart 1: Six Step Process for Collecting and Analyzing D&I Data**

*Source: The Ontario Human Rights Commission*

**Step 1: Define**
- Clarify issues and opportunities for data collection and assess the state of D&I
- Review all policies, practices, and procedures related to D&I and workforce needs
- Review corporate culture from a D&I perspective
- Explore external context to identify best practices, outside stakeholder perspectives, and the needs of its customers and the communities it serves

**Step 2: Select Issues & Opportunities**
- Review issues and opportunities identified in Step 1.
- Do the findings of Step 1 establish priorities or issues that should influence the data collection process?
- Select priorities and opportunities and establish goals and objectives tailored to address them.

**Step 3: Design Data Collection Strategy**
- Determine the data to be collected
- Policies, processes and procedures
- Data gathering techniques (e.g. surveys, focus groups, interviews, & observed data)
- Project scope and budget

**Step 4: Collect Data**
- Obtain buy-in from senior leadership
- Establish a steering committee to oversee project, be accountable for key decisions, and ensure effective communications.
- Identify people, logistics, resources, and technologies required.
- Design communication and consultation strategy to explain the initiative and drive participation

**Step 5: Analyze and Interpret Data**
- Determine if the organization has the expertise to analyze and interpret the data internally
- Secure services of consultant if necessary
- Assess findings in terms of goals

**Step 6: Summarize and Publicize Findings**
- Create action plan that summarizes results of analysis
- Identifies barriers, gaps, and opportunities
- Specifies steps to take to address issues
- Establish attainable goals and short- and long-term timelines
- Review plan with all stakeholders and incorporate feedback
- Clarify how progress in meeting goals will be monitored, assessed and reported

**Act**
- Implement plan, monitor results, address issues, and report to stakeholders regularly on project status
One key issue to address when collecting diversity demographic is determining the self-identification categories to use. The recommended federal government questionnaire does not include LGBTQ persons or veterans in its categories. However, many companies collect information on the both categories. According to Human Rights Campaign, approximately 46 percent of the 781 employers responding to its Corporate Equality Index 2015 reported that they allow employees to voluntarily self-identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. Employers also use employee engagement/satisfaction surveys to estimate the number of LGBTQ employees. However, some LGBTQ employees remain hesitant to self-identify their sexual orientation on the surveys even though these records are supposed to be confidential and secure. Employers also use their LGBTQ employee resource groups (ERGs), but this approach has drawbacks, especially in geographically dispersed corporations.26

We developed Table 1 to provide a comparison of the diversity academic categories used or recommended by relevant organizations, such as the EEOC and SHRM.

**Table 1: Examples of Self-Identification Categories Used by Various Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Identification Category</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEOC27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhiteA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African AmericanA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsianA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual with Disabilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Veteran Status**

<p>| Vietnam Era Veteran                          | ✓      |
| Disabled Veteran                             | ✓      |
| Special Disabled Veteran                     | ✓      |
| Other Protected Veteran                      | ✓      |
| Recently Separated Veteran                   | ✓      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armed Forces Service Medal Veteran</th>
<th>√</th>
<th></th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian/Asian British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian Background</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black/Black British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/multiple ethnic Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Chinese</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White (British or Irish)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/English/Welsh/Scottish</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy or Irish Traveler</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Ethnic group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not Hispanic or Latino
* Solicitors Regulation Authority
* National Electronics Manufacturing Association
* American Bank

We included the information from the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) to bring attention to the challenge of how to classify persons who wish to identify themselves as multi-racial. The number of additional categories in the SRA survey illustrates the United Kingdom’s diversity and the importance of addressing diverse needs of a changing population. The U.S. population is growing more diverse and many of our citizens prefer to be recognized as who they are, persons of multiple racial and ethnic backgrounds. According to the U.S Census, the nation had 5.4 million interracial or interethnic married-couple households. These couples 9.5 percent of all married-couple households compared to 7.4 percent of married-couple in 2000 and 4 percent in 1990. Diversity professionals should be sensitive to this issue when gathering demographic information, as well as in their other professional pursuits.
Another key issue is how to ask about gender. According to the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), the common male-female question can raise concerns for transgender persons in particular. When gathering demographic data, employers should ask themselves if the data is relevant and essential. If not, the Campaign suggests removing the question altogether. Care should be taken to emphasize answering such questions is completely optional. The campaign also provides examples of approaches employers have used to gather information on gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The Campaign emphasizes that sexual identity is very distinct from transgender status, and employers should not pose questions that imply they are related. However, in some instances, it might be appropriate to ask if an individual is a member of the LGBTQ community. We have included the Human Rights Campaign examples in Table 2.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Female or Male</td>
<td>Female, Male or Other (please specify)</td>
<td>Gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender identity?</td>
<td>• Female</td>
<td>• Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Female to Male Transgender</td>
<td>• Genderqueer/Androgynous or Intersex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Male</td>
<td>• Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Male to Female Transgender</td>
<td>• Transgender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsure</td>
<td>• Transsexual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-dresser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FTM (female-to-male)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your sexual orientation</td>
<td>You should NOT ask</td>
<td>You might ask—Do you identify as LGBT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you identify as/are</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bisexual</td>
<td>• No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  The HRC cautions that this option might make transgender individuals uncomfortable.
B  The HRC strongly advises companies to avoid questions like this, because they link transgender status with sexual orientation.

The HRC’s concern regarding how to designate transgender status on a self-identification raises the diversity issue concerning language. A word that with which one person is perfectly comfortable may be offensive to someone else. For example, “non-White” may seem innocent enough, but someone who is Black may find it offensive, because, as noted by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, it “expresses race as a social construct rather than as a description based on perceived biological traits.”36 In addition, the term implies
that “White” is the norm against which we compare all other groups, putting all other racial
groups in a single category. It also suggests a perspective that sees race in terms of
opposition, us versus them.

We need to exercise the same awareness in all our communications with underrepresented
groups. As Kathy Castania of the Cornell Migrant Program points out, language is
constantly evolving and “speaking in a respectful way about groups in the United States can
be as unnatural as learning to drive a standard shift car with a clutch.” Nonetheless, it is
essential that we become comfortable in using words that are respectful and do not seem
judgmental. Moreover, since diversity language is so dynamic, we need to remain alert to
linguistic changes.

At the same time, we have to be careful not to use language that is too generalized and
“mask[s] important differences between racialized groups, since racialized groups are not
subject to exactly the same experiences, racial stereotypes and types of discrimination.”
In essence, there are three basic rules to follow when speaking or writing about racial and
ethnic groups:

• When possible and appropriate, use words related to job or service categories or
general terms, such as racial or ethnic group.

• When the focus is on race or ethnicity, use the category preferred by the people you
are discussing, even if you are not completely satisfied with the term.

• Demonstrate a bias towards the most precise and specific word.

In a discussion of linguist S. I. Hayakawa’s concept of the “Ladder of Abstraction”, Jan
Streever notes,

Sophistication of thought deals in the realm of abstraction, but sophistication of
writing is achieved through supporting those abstractions with concrete details ... if
the writer says the woman was dressed in casual attire, the reader's impression of
the character is not as strong, and the audience will be free to interpret the writer's
meaning in ways.
So, we should always strive for specificity in our writing, especially if we wish to engage the reader’s attention. This is especially true when we are writing about diversity, because vague, overly broad categories can be offensive to some. When we use the most precise word to describe a racial or ethnic group, we demonstrate our respect for the people we are discussing. The words Latino and Hispanic, for example, describe the extraordinarily diverse populations of 26 countries encompassing a vast area of different cultures. The Isla Grande de Tierra del Fuego—the island in Cape Horn at the tip of Chile—is 6,313.5 miles (10,160.6 kilometers) from Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, which is near that nation’s border with the United States. That is less than the 5973.6 miles (9,613.6 kilometers) separating London, England, and Tokyo, Japan.45 No wonder the people of the 26 nations do not wish to be plunked in one broad category and prefer the more accurate and precise terms related to their ethnic origins. Mexican, Puerto Rican, Peruvian, and Argentinian are much more descriptive than Latino, Hispanic, and Chicano. Of course, more often than not, we have to speak of these Latin American nationalities as a whole. In these instances, Latino is preferred over Hispanic, because the latter is a term created by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget in the 1970s to describe people Latin American heritage with Spanish-sounding names.46 Inevitably, the term excludes Latin Americans whose roots are to the indigenous people who were in the western hemisphere long before Christopher Columbus landed on the island he named San Salvador.

This issue of localization also complicates the gathering of information. In researching their report on how multi-nationals gather demographic diversity data, Robin Schneider and Alexis Walmsley found that many of the 12 multi-nationals they surveyed reported that they were unsure about the amount of demographic data that had been collected and stored in their local operations. Representatives of these companies noted,

\[
... \text{that it is only locally that some decisions can be made about what are the most pertinent demographic characteristics to monitor: “In Greater China, for example, an important cultural difference where we would want to measure fairness and access to leadership opportunities, is about whether individuals are mainland Chinese or Hong Kong Chinese.”}^{47}
\]

Schneider and Walmsley do not identify the person they are quoting or where he or she works. The researchers promised the 12 multi-nationals participating in the research that
they would not reveal company or individual names when discussing specific information. However, we do know the names of the companies studied. (They are listed in the footnote below.*) A review of the findings of the study provide valuable information on how various multi-national collect demographic data, the kind of data they collect, and if and how they distribute. Tables 3 and 4 summarize key findings.

Table 3: Categories on which Companies Report Globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital/Civil Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Faith</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only for one area of the enterprise  
† In most areas of the enterprise, but not all

Table 4: Categories on which Companies Report Internally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† AXA is a global insurance company. The BBC, the British Broadcasting Company, is the world’s oldest and largest national broadcasting network. BP (formerly British Petroleum) is the sixth largest gas and oil company in the world. Cargill is the international food conglomerate headquartered in Minnetonka, Minnesota. EDF, one of the world’s leading electric utilities serves 31.5 million customers and employs 158,467 individuals. Enterprise Rent-A-Car is the largest car rental company in the United States. Ernst & Young is one of the “Big Four” accounting firm and third largest professional services firm in the world. Google is the multinational provider of Internet-related services and products worldwide. Henkel is multinational provider of brands and technologies in three product areas: laundry and home care, beauty care, and adhesive technologies. Phillips is a multinational provider of consumer electronics, appliances, personal care products, health care technologies, and lighting products. UBS AG provides investment banking, asset management, and wealth management services. And Vodafone, the British multinational headquartered in London, is the world’s second-largest mobile telecommunications company.
The Schneider and Walmsley sum up some of the high issues raised in this report. Most global, public companies report on gender, age, and nationality, but only the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom commonly hold ethnic data. Most EMEA and APAC companies collect and retain data on nationality in the companies where they operate. When you focus on this category more closely, you find that about half of the Latin American companies collect nationality data, while only 36 percent of United States companies and 33 percent in Canada do. The numbers for some categories are very low. The study found that only two organizations (both in the United States) collected information on veteran status. Only one company, an enterprise in the United Kingdom, gathered data on religion and faith and sexual orientation, and no organization held information on gender identity expression.50

These findings suggest that the diversity and inclusion community has to do a better job convincing many multinationals to develop the information required to gain a comprehensive understanding of their diversity needs, strengths, and weaknesses. The irony of this situation is that corporate reluctance of often the result of the fear that collecting this information might be seen as an attempt to develop a more homogenous workforce not create a more diverse one. It is similar to the challenge facing homebuyers looking to settle, not avoid, homes in diverse neighborhoods. When they ask their realtor for information on a potential neighborhood’s diversity, the realtor is unlikely to provide a response for fear of being accused of racial steering. Diversity professionals serving multi-nationals must find ways to overcome this final hurdle and accelerate the evolution of global diversity and inclusion in employment.
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