1. Introduction to the *Handbook* – a review of 23 diversity and inclusion indices

Eddy S. Ng, Christina L. Stamper, Alain Klarsfeld and Yu (Jade) Han

Recently, there has been a call for greater use of national indices – developed by various supranational, non-governmental/non-profit, professional, and media organizations – to facilitate comparative research to advance equality and diversity around the world (Klarsfeld et al., 2016; Ng & Klarsfeld, 2018). These indices encompass various measures, such as economic data and perceptual measures, and rely on various methodologies from national statistics (e.g., UN Human Development Index) to organizational surveys of managers (e.g., SHRM Global Diversity Readiness Index). Collectively, they cover a broad range of dimensions including human development, gender equality, migration and integration, multiculturalism, ethnic diversity, and societal attitudes towards minorities. The indices are developed to rank countries on a number of economic, social, and inequality indicators, and to assist with public policy setting aimed at eliminating inequality and improving the welfare of socially disadvantaged groups (Cherchye, Moesen, & Puyenbroeck, 2004; Heung, 2006). National indices (e.g., UN Gender Development Index) are also related to organizational support for work–life balance (Lyness & Kropf, 2005). However, the large number of indices provides an unwieldy picture of a country’s performance on equality and diversity. These indices also do not provide information on how well the data is collected or how well the surveys are completed. Researchers have criticized that existing indices are susceptible to political influences, cultural biases, and institutional agendas (e.g., Bardhan & Klasen, 1999; Hirway & Mahadevia, 1996; Klugman, Rodríguez, & Choi, 2011; Tayar, 2017) rendering these indices misleading and unhelpful.

Existing indices suffer from several disadvantages and shortcomings (Bowen & Moesen, 2007; Mayer, 2008). Most criticisms centre on an index’s oversimplification, self-imposed constraints, choice of indicators (or items), and methodology (Klugman et al., 2011). Some indices are collected for a singular purpose but are adapted for another use. As an example, the UN Gender Development Index is derived from the UN Human Development Index, modified for gender, which is an inadequate indicator for gender inequality¹ (Klasen, 2006; Schüler, 2006). Furthermore, cross-national research experience suggests that it has been challenging to consistently compare countries across a set of agreed upon dimensions to be useful (Cherchye et al., 2004). Most indices were developed based on their relevance and availability of data. However, for indices to be useful, they should also be conceptually clear in definition, stimulate action, feasible, and reliable (Plantenga et al., 2009).

This compendium of diversity and equity indices seeks to cast light on some of the popular and frequently cited indices in efforts to benchmark and measure progress towards diversity and equity. The goal is to help us better understand the construction of these indices, their strengths and weaknesses, intended applications, and how they might contribute to research and progress towards diversity and equity goals. The compendium includes a detailed review of 23 indices ranging from broader, more general indices such as the UN Human Development

Index (HDI) supporting elements of equity (e.g., health and education outcomes) to more specific ones such as the PEW Religious Diversity Index (RDI) which focuses on the diversity of religious affiliations in a particular nation. We solicited diversity scholars who work in the area to critically review these indices. We tasked them to research the history and origins of the indices, examine the methodologies behind the construction of the indices and identify the associated strengths and weaknesses. Finally, we invited them to explore how the indices have been applied or utilized in research and practice, and to identify future opportunities for these indices.

Our aim is to unpack these indices to meet the needs of researchers, public policy makers, and general consumers of information. Scholars relying on these indices to generate research can better assess the quality of each index and understand the methodology and input data that go behind the construction of the indices. They can then interpret their results, with these caveats in mind, to draw the appropriate conclusions for a particular entity [country, region, firm]. Likewise, public policy makers should be better informed on the appropriate and valid uses of these indices to help craft more effective policies. Furthermore, agencies such as national census and statistics bureaus, research institutes and think tanks providing data that feed into these indices should also understand the methodologies behind each index. These agencies play a critical role in providing input data and assisting with the development of indices through more accurate and comprehensive data collection, meeting the standards of science. Finally, consumers of information such as prospective employees looking to join a progressive employer, customers wanting to buy from companies responsive to the needs of LGBTQ workers, and managers wishing to address the underrepresentation of women in corporate boards may rely on less biased and more objective reputational rankings.

CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION

As this is our first attempt at curating a compendium, we focus our efforts on popular and frequently cited diversity and equity indices in research. Our criteria for inclusion include indices that are: (1) developed by an internationally recognized entity such as the United Nations (UN), a major publisher such as the *Economist*, consulting firms, think tanks, research institutes or universities; (2) based on objective and quantifiable data or expert opinions, rather than individual perceptual measures; and (3) focused at the national or organizational level.

INDICES INCLUDED IN THIS COMPENDIUM

We included 23 indices organized across six different categories – general, diversity and employment, gender, sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) (Chapter 15 reviews five LGBTQ indices), migrants and multiculturalism, and religion (Table 1.1).

All of the indices in the compendium, with the exception of the UN Human Development Index, were developed after 2000, indicative of increased attention to systemic bias against women, LGBTQ, migrants, and other minority groups over the last decade. We included the UN Human Development Index (HDI) that collected data at the country and region levels useful for comparing demographic groups on life expectancy, education, and per capita income. The HDI provides a foundation for (and inspired) the development of other diversity

Table 1.1 Summary of indices by category

CATEGORIES	INDICES
General	1. Human Development Index (UN)
Diversity and Employment	2. Global Diversity Readiness Index and Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Index (SHRM)
	3. Fair and Progressive Employment Index (TAFEP)
	4. Global Tolerance Index ¹ (Richard Florida)
Gender	5. Gender Inequality Index (UN)
	6. Gender Equity Index (Social Watch)
	7. Gender Equality Index (European Institute for Gender Equality)
	8. Women's Economic Opportunity Index (Economist Intelligence Unit)
	9. Global Gender Gap Index (World Economic Forum)
	10. Gender Parity Score Report (McKinsey)
	11. Gender Diversity Index (Women on Boards)
	12. Equilar Gender Diversity Index
Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI)	13. Corporate Equality Index (HRC)
	14. LGBT Diversity Index (Parks)
	15. Comparative review of 5 LGBT indices: HRC's Corporate Equality Index (US), Stonewall's Workplace Equality Index (UK), Fulcrum's Ukrainian Corporate Equality Index (Ukraine), the Forum's South African Workplace Equality Index (South Africa), and <i>Presente's</i> Diversity and Equality Diagnostic (Peru)
Migrants and Multiculturalism	16. Migration Policy Index (British Council, Migration Policy Group, the Foreign policy Centre, University of Sheffield)
	17. Indicators of Citizenship Rights for Immigrants (WZB Berlin Social Science Centre)
	18. Multiculturalism Policy Index (Queen's University, Canada)
Religion	19. Religious Diversity Index (Pew Research Centre)

Note: ¹ The Tolerance Index is calculated for the US only, while the Global Tolerance Index is a climate score summing up perceptions of openness to racio-ethnic and sexual minorities.

and equity-related indices. Given the massive global efforts of governments and organizations, both private and non-profit, to generate progress on diversity and equity endeavors, it makes sense that the various interest groups independently designed indices to identify gaps, and monitor and track success on a broad range of equity concerns, such as demographics, attitudes, outcomes, and policies. However, data collection related to diversity and equity efforts is incredibly complex, due in part to a lack of agreement in definitions (e.g., who is a migrant, do illegal migrants count?) and the availability of comparable data. As an example, the gender indices in this compendium vary broadly in their approaches to capturing relevant information, including differences in their intended aim and scope, and the use and application of the resulting index. We will discuss each of these indices in the chapters that follow, with Table 1.2 providing detailed summary information for each index.

Scope

Out of 23 indices included in this book, 13 report on data that are linked to a geographic region or country, and 10 describe firm-level data. Indices focused on religion (Pew's Religious Diversity Index), migrants (the Migration Integration Policy Index and the Indicators of Citizenship Rights for Immigrants Index) and multiculturalism (the Multiculturalism Policy Index) all report data at the country or regional level. All the indices that assess or rank sexual

Table 1.2 List of diversity and equity indices

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
GENERAL							
(1) HDI	Human Development Index (United Nations)	General	Country, Regions	1990	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Composite statistics index that measures life expectancy, education, and income• Informs public policy and also frequently used to develop other indices such as GDI and GII	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenge to national performance measured by just GDP• Wide use for policy design	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ignores important aspects relevant for women such as access to basic human rights
DIVERSITY AND EMPLOYMENT							
(2) GDRI DIGBPI	a. Global Diversity Readiness Index b. Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Instrument (Society for Human Resource Management)	Diversity and Inclusion	Country, Regions (GDRI) Firm (DIGBPI)	2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designed to help corporate executives identify best practices related to diversity and inclusion, as well as understand how different countries faced diversity and inclusion challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diversity and inclusion treated distinctively• Multiple sources of data and triangulation process• Qualitative and quantitative data• Recognition and evidence of regional differences and similarities in the ways individual countries approach diversity and inclusion• Provides generalized best practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No follow up study to identify changes or progress in regions, countries, or companies• Most respondents are from English-speaking, historical British Empire countries, potentially biasing the results towards Western cultures• More prescriptive guidance needed regarding how to utilize region/country data to improve firm policies and efforts

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(3) FPEI	Fair and Progressive Employment Index (TAFEP)	Employment Practices	Firm (Singapore only)	2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self assessment and learning tool for organizations to improve fair employment practices• Provides framework for organizational culture change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporates organizational/ employer and employee inputs or assessment• Addresses gaps between policy and practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While TAFEP is a tripartite organization comprising of the gov't, union, and employer association, participation is not mandatory for all employers• There is no guideline or oversight on who completes the survey for inclusion in index• Leaves tolerance to forms of diversity other than ethnicity and the LGBT out of its scope
(4) GTI	Global Tolerance Index (Richard Florida, Martin Prosperity Institute)	Ethnic Diversity and LGBT	Country, Region	2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Tolerance Index is a subcomponent of Florida's Creative Index, attracting talents in building creative cities• The Tolerance Index has been conceptualized as social tolerance of ethnic diversity and LGBT and examined in research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extends US-specific Tolerance Index to other countries. Simple instrument (2 items)• Easy to implement	
GENDER							
(5) GII	Gender Inequality Index (United Nations)	Gender	Country, Region	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Captures how women are disadvantaged relative to men on empowerment, economic activity, and reproductive health• It is frequently used to guide public policy setting and supports development initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supplements shortcomings of HDI as regards women• Helps to identify areas that require interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Countries where men and women are faring equally low receive the same (good) score as countries where they fare equally high

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(6) GEI	Gender Equity Index (Social Watch)	Gender	Country, Region	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tracks and counters gender inequalities• No longer as widely used as it is outdated but continues to be cited in research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Independence from prominent transnational institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There has been no update since 2012
(7) GEI – (Gender Equality Index)	Gender Equality Index (European Institute for Gender Equality)	Gender	Country	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focuses on mainstreaming gender in EU policy areas• Monitors progress among EU member states	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very comprehensive• Underlying data richness• Includes relative (i.e., gaps) and absolute indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methodological changes in-between iterations• New calculation method is too complex for non-statisticians
(8) WEO	Women’s Economic Opportunity Index (The Economist Intelligence Unit)	Gender	Country	2010 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measures the factors that influence women’s economic opportunities• Used in gender equality studies and public policy formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reliance both on economic and non-economic factors• Use of expert judgments• Use of mixed methods for data collection and compilation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on only the formal economy (ignores the informal economy)• Relies on absolute measure of women’s accomplishments; no direct comparison to men
(9) GGGI	Global Gender Gap Index (World Economic Forum)	Gender	Country, Region	2006 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allows for comparisons of economic, education, health and political gender gaps within and between nations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides a fair comparison of the countries in a geographical region• Can track progress over time since data is collected yearly• Ease of interpretation allows for diffusion of results• Countries can identify areas needing improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns about the conceptual appropriateness of the measures• Questions about the reliability of the unique data collected for the GGGI• Questions about the validity of weighting scheme

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(10) GPS	Gender Parity Score Report (McKinsey)	Gender	Country, Region	2015 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measures the gender parity within each country and global region• Allows for comparisons both across countries and within countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wide range of indicators across three dimensions and multiple aspects of inequality at work• Goes beyond structural inequality measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No justification for 15 indicators as they relate to gender parity• Interpretation more difficult because of the combination of attainment and inequality measures• All 15 indicators weighted equally• No explanation about classification scheme• Opinion survey data may be inaccurate• Recommendations too broad to be actionable
(11) GDI	Gender Diversity Index (Women on Board)	Gender	Firm	2011 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Calculates the proportion of women occupying corporate board seats for the Russell 3000 companies• Used to compare countries on gender diversity for corporate boards	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tracks progress towards gender equity on boards• Allows trend analysis across years• Increased representative sample of US companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Insufficient goal for ‘Winning’ companies of 20% women on board (standard should be higher)• Recognizes progress of companies that enlarge boards to add women instead of increase proportion• Need to increase publicity about data and corporate success

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(12) EGDl	Equilar Gender Diversity Index (Equilar)	Gender	Firm & National and State-level	2017 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tracks the proportion of women on US Russell 3000 companies' executive boards globally and projects how long it will take to reach gender parity. State scores can be calculated at the State level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Calculated every quarter, providing longitudinal data to measure progressRegular reports available to the public for free	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Lack of intersectional data and analysisUse of binary gender constructPotential conflict of interest with clients included in the data setDoes not measure board positions held by women
SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY (SOGI)							
(13) CEI	Corporate Equality Index (Human Rights Campaign)	SOGI	Firm	2002 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Rates organizational efforts in promoting to inclusive policies and practices for the LGBT communityProvides reputational information to potential employees and consumers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Encourages or promotes workplace policies and practices supportive of LGBT workerAssesses employers on workplace protection, inclusive benefits and supportive culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The criteria used to calculate the CEI score has changed over timeConcerns about the reliability of the measuresPossible alternative data sets for a larger scope
(14) LGBT	LGBT Diversity Index (Parks)	SOGI	Firm	2010 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Measures comprehensiveness of LGBT policies of member organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Modeled after the HRC CEIOriginally composed of Italian firms, expanded to include those with Anglo-American ties	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Small number of companies, 60+ companiesFocused on Italian contextMembers (employers) are motivated to promote LGBT practices. All members are viewed as 'LGBT friendly companies'

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(15) 5 LGBT Indices	Comparative LGBT Indices	SOGI	Firm	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comparative analysis of: (1) HRC’s Corporate Equality Index (CEI – U.S.), (2) Stonewall’s Workplace Equality Index (WEI – U.K.), (3) Fulcrum’s Ukrainian Corporate Equality Index (CEI – Ukraine), (4) the Forum’s South African Workplace Equality Index (SAWEI – South Africa), and (5) <i>Presente</i>’s Diversity and Equality Diagnostic (<i>Empresas Presente: Diagnóstico de Diversidad y Equidad</i> – Peru)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reviewing multiple indices focused on SOGI allows for a comparative view of national contexts, legislative environment, and organizational (workplace) priorities• Highlights that better resourced organizations are able to rank higher in these rankings• Lack of measures on the impact of corporate policy changes on LGBT employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of national/legislative support for LGBT persons necessitates adapting or broadening the focus on broader workplace discrimination for marginalized groups• Lack of measures on the impact of corporate policy changes on LGBT employees
MIGRANTS/MULTICULTURALISM							
(16) MIPEX	Migration Integration Policy Index (British Council, Migration Policy Group, the Foreign Policy Centre, and the University of Sheffield)	Migrants	Country	2004 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides both a descriptive and normative measure of the degree to which a country has policies that support the integration of migrants into their society	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significantly increased the number of countries included in data• Wide range of integration indicators focused on migrant rights• Provides an important source of data on outcomes achieved in seven of the eight policy areas identified• Allows for benchmarking and identifying areas needing improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reliance on norms that are set at a minimal standard, and are unclear• Additive data process• Arbitrary scoring of indicators• Amalgamation of different migrant groups into one category• Lack of theoretical foundation• Lack of transparency in measure development• Unclear roles of the contributors to the index

Index Acronym	Index Name – (and Originator)	Focus	Level (firm, country, regions)	Founded ¹ current/ updated	Uses	Strengths	Weaknesses
(17) ICRI	Indicators of Citizenship Rights for Immigrants (WZB Berlin Social Science Centre)	Migrants	Country	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracks how immigrant rights have changed over time within a country • Compares immigrant rights across countries • Gauges the degree of convergence between countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index considers both individual rights as well as multicultural rights, or cultural aspects of immigrant rights • ICRI focuses on enforceable rights and implementation rather than presence of policies (e.g., MPI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks comprehension as it focuses on a narrow category of immigrants and primarily on European nations
(18) MPI	Multiculturalism Policy Index (Queen's University, Canada)	Multiculturalism	Country	2006 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on and monitors the evolution of multiculturalism policies over time • Provides comparison of nation–minority relations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for comparison of nations on operationalization of citizenship an integration laws • Goes beyond protection of basic human rights • Covers multiple minority groups: immigrants, national historical minorities, and indigenous peoples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-point scale (present, partial, absent) limiting differentiation • Rater subjectivity • Focuses on positive measures and overlooks anti-multiculturalism policies • Does not measure outcome
RELIGION							
(19) RDI	Religious Diversity Index (PEW Research Center)	Religion	Country, Region	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links with voting patterns, economic performance, attitudes towards the LGBT, balancing religious freedom with other freedoms, human rights policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well standardized • Easy to collect with just one question (self-identification rather than measuring religious practice of beliefs) • Plenty of secondary data available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores intra-religious diversity (such as denominations within Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, or Judaism) • Measures not policy nor outcome, just a demographic diversity

orientation and gender identity (SOGI) (i.e., HRC's Corporate Equality Index, Park's LGBT Diversity Index, and the Comparative LGBT Indices) are measured at the firm level. Gender appears to be represented through all three levels of data, albeit at different levels for different indices. Specifically, six of the eight gender indices – the UN Gender Inequality Index, Social Watch Gender Equity Index, European Institute for Gender Equality Gender Equality Index, the Women's Economic Opportunity Index, the WEF Global Gender Gap Index, and the McKinsey Gender Parity Score Report – all report data related to gender differences at the country and region levels. The other two gender indices, the Women on Board Gender Diversity Index and the Equilar Gender Diversity Index, report on the proportion of corporate board seats held by women in the Russell 3000 firms. The general diversity indices, the Society for Human Resource Management's (SHRM) Global Diversity Readiness Index and the Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Index, report broad country and region level data as well as best practices at the firm level, respectively. The Fair and Progressive Employment Index developed by the Tripartite Alliance for Fair and Progressive Employment Practices (Singapore's Ministry of Manpower, union and employer association) surveys employers and employees at the firm level on employment policies and practices. The Global Tolerance Index, which is a part of the Global Creative Index developed by Richard Florida (Martin Prosperity Institute, University of Toronto) reports country and regional data about openness to diversity.

In general, indices that monitor progress on gender as well as migrants and multiculturalism are focused on countries and regions, although some do survey firms. Those that are focused on SOGI, and general diversity (with the exception of Florida's Global Tolerance Index) are focused at the firm level. We conclude that while governmental policies are critical for protecting individuals facing discrimination on the basis of sex and national origin (e.g., citizenship rights and ensuring immigrant integration), businesses also serve a critical role in creating equal opportunities and providing access to resources, for attribute areas areas that lack strong governmental action or protection (e.g., SOGI).

Use

The indices included in this compendium have many similarities and differences in how their rankings are used. In our review of the 23 indices, we found that they can be used in four general ways: (1) The indices can facilitate a comparative analysis between countries and organizations. Almost all of the indices can be used in a comparative way, such as comparing economic wealth, political power, education, or other relevant factors across diverse groups, or contrasting these factors across countries or regions, or in benchmarking firms in a competitive space (e.g., in the competition for talent or consumers); (2) Several of the indices monitor policy changes or shifts over time (e.g., migrant integration), measure the comprehensiveness of policies or practices in an area of equity, and/or for ensuring compliance. A few of the indices may also be used as forecasting tools, prognosticating on future conditions and outcomes. These indices can aid governmental agencies and policy makers identify gaps, set standards, and track the progress of ongoing efforts towards greater equity and equality; and (3) Many employers and firms which participated or are featured in these indices showcase their best practices to promote their reputation. These messages – either as employers of choice or socially responsible firms – are intended to win prospective talents and consumers. We caution that the relationship between best practices and corporate reputation may be tenuous

at best (see van der Vleuten & Verloo, 2012, for a critique). Such rankings, however, do promote competition and encourage firms to improve their policies and practices to improve the outcomes for equity seeking groups; (4) Finally, researchers heavily rely on and use many of these indices as secondary data in generating insights on diversity and equity work. With few exceptions (e.g., Parks' LGBT Index), almost all of the indices have been used in research. Diversity and equity indices, when soundly and validly constructed, can be a valuable source of information and data that supports research and knowledge generation. For example, Metz et al. (2016) used the MPI to review national policies in response to minority integration. Ng and Bloemraad (2015) drew from indices to construct continuums and typologies related to country responses and compliance with promoting equity goals.

Data and Validity

Our review of the 23 indices shows that the data for their construction were derived from three main sources: (1) secondary data from other institutions such as the UN or national census or statistics bureaus, research institutes or universities, and think tanks such as the Pew Research Center; (2) organizational surveys of managers (executives) and employees; and (3) expert judgments based on policy or document reviews. The UN Human Development, UN Gender Inequality, Women's Economic Opportunity, WEF Global Gender Gap, and McKinsey Gender Parity indices all rely on data from other UN bodies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), International Labour Organization (ILO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as well as other non-profit, non-governmental organizations. Others such as Richard Florida's Global Tolerance Index, Social Watch Gender Equity Index, and Religious Diversity Index also utilize secondary data from national and supranational (European Union) surveys and Gallup and Pew Research Center. Gender indices that measure representation on corporate boards draw from the Securities and Exchange Commission (8-k) filings, and the Russell 3000 stock index. General diversity indices such as the SHRM Global Diversity Readiness and Diversity and Inclusion Best Practices indices, Fair and Progressive Employment Index, and all SOGI indices (HRC, Parks, Stonewall, Fulcrum, SAWEI, *Presente*) conduct their own surveys of employers.

While indices are not expected to take on the same psychometric standards as survey instruments, nonetheless, they should be valid and reliable. A good index should be sufficiently comprehensive, meaningful, and appropriate for its use. Indices should also be reliable, both on equivalence and stability (i.e., measuring consistently and are stable over time). None of the indices we reviewed report on their construct validities. Given that some indices change the compositions of what is included or measured (e.g., SOGI indices), it makes comparison of rankings for a particular entity (e.g., national or firm) over time to be problematic. Furthermore, indices that rely on expert opinions such as the Migration Integration Policy Index and the Multiculturalism Policy Index should also have inter-rater reliabilities. However, we do observe that most of the indices draw from objective data sources such as UN entities, national and supranational census and statistics bureaus, reputable publishers, and non-partisan think tanks. This provides a fair degree of assurance that the indices were constructed with reliable data, although not always consistently over time.

Exclusion

Some important indices have not been included in this compendium since they do not meet our criteria – objective rather than perceptual and not measured at the national or firm level – for inclusion in this first volume. We also acknowledge that disability is absent in this compendium given our difficulty in locating an appropriate index that would allow for a country or firm level comparison. We anticipate including disability in future volumes (e.g., the Disability Equality Index that addresses disability friendliness of US employers). We were similarly challenged in locating a religious index that is focused on a country or firm policy on religion, although there is extant research on quantitatively measuring religious identification, religious practices or religious beliefs. Research on religion at the workplace has mostly been qualitative in nature and focused on the individual level (Miller & Ewest, 2010, 2015; Miller, Ewest & Neubert, 2018). At the moment, we have not been able to locate a country or firm level religious diversity friendliness index. We endeavor to explore these two dimensions further in future volumes.

OVERVIEW OF INDICES

We reviewed a total of 23 indices in this compendium. Four of the indices are general in nature, not focusing on any single dimension of diversity or equity: the UN Human Development Index, the Global Diversity Readiness Index, the Global Tolerance Index, and the Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Instrument. These four indices are concerned with outcomes (Human Development Index), perceived policies/outcomes (Global Tolerance Index), policies (Global Diversity Readiness Index and Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Instrument), and to a lesser extent demographic diversity (Global Tolerance Index) and attitudes towards diversity (Global Diversity Readiness Index). Three of the indices are measured at country/region level, only one at the firm-level (the Diversity and Inclusion Global Best Practices Instrument).

The other indices in our compendium have a single focal dimension which are gender, SOGI, migration and multiculturalism, as well as religion. We have an overwhelming number of indices devoted to gender (national-level indices) due to its popularity: Gender Inequality Index, Gender Equity Index, Gender Equality Index, Women's Economic Opportunity Index, Global Gender Gap Index, Gender Parity Score, Gender Diversity Index, and the Equilar Gender Diversity Index. Most are country or region (multi-country) level indices, with only two focused on the corporate level (the Gender Diversity Index and the Equilar Gender Diversity Index measure the proportion of women on board in firms). These indices are concerned with policies and/or outcomes.

We also present indices that address migration, citizenship, and multiculturalism. They include the Migration Integration Policy Index, Indicators of Citizenship Rights for Immigrants, and Multiculturalism Policy Index. All three indices are also national-level indices and all three are concerned with policies and/or outcomes.

We have three chapters on SOGI which review six indices. Two chapters focus on the HRC Corporate Equality Index (US) and the LGBT Diversity Index, while a third chapter reviews five SOGI indices: (1) HRC's Corporate Equality Index (CEI – U.S.), (2) Stonewall's Workplace Equality Index (WEI – U.K.), (3) Fulcrum's Ukrainian Corporate Equality Index

(CEI – Ukraine), (4) the Forum’s South African Workplace Equality Index (SAWEI – South Africa), and (5) Presente’s Diversity and Equality Diagnostic (Empresas Presente: Diagnóstico de Diversidad y Equidad – Peru). All are focused at the firm level and investigate policies and/or outcomes.

Finally, we only included a single index (at the national level) on religion: the Religious Diversity Index. Similar to the gender and SOGI indices, the Religious Diversity Index (how religiously diverse a given country’s population is) is focused on demographics rather than on policies or outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The task of constructing an index is like building a bridge – it requires careful planning, forethought, consistency, meticulousness, and an understanding of how it can be linked to improve diversity and equity outcomes. We hope you will find the individual reviews (chapters) of the indices to be useful and insightful whether you are a scholar or researcher, public policy maker, or organizational decision maker.

NOTE

1. The UN Gender Inequality Index replaces the Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) due to their shortcomings.

REFERENCES

- Bardhan, K., & Klasen, S. (1999). UNDP’s gender-related indices: a critical review. *World Development*, 27(6), 985–1010.
- Bowen, H. P., & Moesen, W. (2007). Benchmarking the performance of nations: non-uniform weighting and non-economic dimensions. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 7(1), 6–16.
- Cherchye, L., Moesen, W., & Puyenbroeck, T. (2004). Legitimately diverse, yet comparable: on synthesizing social inclusion performance in the EU. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(5), 919–955.
- Heung, V. (2006). Can the introduction of an inclusion index move a system forward? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(4–5), 309–322.
- Hirway, I., & Mahadevia, D. (1996). Critique of gender development index: towards an alternative. *Economic and Political Weekly*, WS87–WS96.
- Klarsfeld, A., Ng, E. S., Booysen, L., Castro Christiansen, L., & Kuvaas, B. (2016). Comparative equality and diversity: main findings and research gaps. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 23(3), 394–412.
- Klasen, S. (2006). UNDP’s gender-related measures: some conceptual problems and possible solutions. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2), 243–274.
- Klugman, J., Rodríguez, F., & Choi, H. J. (2011). The HDI 2010: new controversies, old critiques. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 9(2), 249–288.
- Lyness, K. S., & Kropf, M. B. (2005). The relationships of national gender equality and organizational support with work–family balance: a study of European managers. *Human Relations*, 58(1), 33–60.
- Mayer, A. L. (2008). Strengths and weaknesses of common sustainability indices for multidimensional systems. *Environment International*, 34(2), 277–291.

- Metz, I., Ng, E. S., Cornelius, N., Hoobler, J. M., & Nkomo, S. (2016). A comparative review of multiculturalism in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States and South Africa. In A. Klarsfeld, E. S. Ng, L. A. E. Booysen, L. C. Christiansen, & B. Kuvaas (Eds.), *Research Handbook of International and Comparative Perspectives on Diversity Management* (pp. 131–170). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Miller, D. W., & Ewest, T. (2010). Rethinking the impact of religion on business values: understanding its reemergence and measuring its manifestations. *Journal of International Business Ethics*, 3(2), 49–57.
- Miller, D. W., & Ewest, T. (2015). A new framework for analyzing organizational workplace religion and spirituality. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 12(4), 305–328.
- Miller, D. W., Ewest, T., & Neubert, M. J. (2018). Development of The Integration Profile (TIP) Faith and Work Integration Scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(2), 455–471.
- Ng, E. S., & Bloemraad, I. (2015). A SWOT analysis of multiculturalism in Canada, Europe, Mauritius, and South Korea. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 59(6), 619–636.
- Ng, E.S., & Klarsfeld, A. (2018). Comparative and multi-country research in equality, diversity, and inclusion. In R. Bendl, L. Booysen, & J. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods on Diversity Management, Equality and Inclusion at Work* (pp. 122–146). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Plantenga, J., Remery, C., Figueiredo, H., & Smith, M. (2009). Towards a European Union gender equality index. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 19(1), 19–33.
- Schüler, D. (2006). The uses and misuses of the Gender-related Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure: a review of the literature. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2), 161–181.
- Tayar, M. (2017). Ranking LGBT inclusion: diversity ranking systems as institutional archetypes. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 34(2), 198–210.
- van der Vleuten, A., & Verloo, M. (2012). Ranking and benchmarking: the political logic of new regulatory instruments in the fields of gender equality and anti-corruption. *Policy & Politics*, 40(1), 71–86.