To what extent do staff experiences of racial equality in promotion align with organizational policies in the context of Industry/HR 4.0 technologies?

Mrs Camille Heslop-Martin, Dr. Jessey Pswarayi, Dr. Fotios Mitsakis
Critical, Social and Diversity Perspectives in HRD – Working Paper

Abstract

There are concerns that staff of colour in UK universities are likely to be underrepresented in higher contract levels (Equality Challenge Unit, 2017; Bhopal, 2020). Equality measures have been implemented, such as introducing the Race Equality Charter (REC) and Athena Swan to combat racial inequalities (Campion and Clark, 2021). While adopting, implementing, or meeting some of these standards, little is known about the direct effectiveness of equality policies and the practices to challenge racial inequalities in the sector (Bhopal and Henderson, 2019). According to Kamasak and Yalcinkaya (2023), there is an emerging trend toward HR-based industry 4.0 technologies to solve Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) challenges. However, the impact of this advancement on existing EDI policies and its effect on the promotion of racialised staff is unknown. This paper examines the impact of EDI policies on racial equality from the lens of Critical Race Theory (CRT). It explores the intersection of racial equality, organizational EDI policies, and promotion in the context of emerging Industry/HR 4.0 technologies, and whether innovations mitigate or perpetuate inequality. The findings reveal that HR 4.0 and EDI policies may inadvertently reinforce structural barriers for racialised staff when not grounded in their lived academic experiences.

Keywords: Racial equality, promotion, equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) policies, critical race theory, Industry/HR 4.0.

1. Introduction

Several authors have engaged in the discourse around systematic barriers among staff of colour in higher education (Tate and Bagguley, 2017; Arday, 2022; Bhopal, 2020). HESA (2024) statistics show that at the end of December 2022, out of a total of 240,420 (100%) academic staff, 7,295 (3%) were black and only 210 (2.9 %) were black professors. In comparison, white academic staff stood at 167,190 (69.5%), with 19,480 (11.6%) white professors. White staff are more than four times likely to become professors. Black academics are seen as a smaller group of the population with their roles largely situated below that of the professorial role (HESA, 2024). There are indications of barriers to promotion and progression which could impact the disproportion in promotion among university racial staff. Efforts have been made to deal with the issue of racial inequality, however, progress is slow, and there remains the challenge of limited diversity among racialised groups in senior leadership roles.

Mechanisms have been implemented to tackle racial inequality in UK Higher Education (HE) institutions. The Race Equality Charter (REC) is one such framework developed by Advance HE to help improve representation, progression,

and success among Black and minority ethnic (BME) staff and students (Campion and Clark, 2022). Little is known of the effectiveness of the REC, raising questions about its ability to create meaningful structural changes. Champion and Clark (2022) did not deny that such a framework brought awareness and more visibility to institutional race issues but noted that there have not been real changes since its implementation. Another framework developed by Advance HE to help improve gender equality in HE is the Athena Swan (Advance HE, 2024). It aims to acknowledge and award HE institutions across all disciplines for initiatives towards the advancement of women in their career development. Bhopal and Henderson (2021) highlighted that despite the existence of the Athena Swan, white, middle-class women in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine are mainly the beneficiaries.

The rapid integration of Industry 4.0 technologies into Human Resource Development (HRD) practices has generated renewed interest in their potential to address long-standing structural inequalities within organisations. As Kamasak and Yalcinkaya (2023) note, there is a growing belief that digital HR tools like AI-driven recruitment and performance systems can boost fairness and objectivity in decision-making, including the realm of EDI. But despite this optimism, there is a lack of empirical understanding of how these technologies interact with existing EDI policies, particularly in the higher education sector, where racialised staff continue to face disproportionate barriers to promotion and leadership. EDI Policies and Industry/HR 4.0 will be explored in the context of racialised staff in UK HE. The composition of the paper include the conceptual/theoretical background, the research purpose and questions, literature review on the impact of EDI policies on racialised staff ability to advance into senior leadership roles in the context of Industry HR 4.0., the methods, the key findings and discussions, the implications for HRD, the limitations and future directions for research, and then at the end, the conclusion.

2. Conceptual/Theoretical Background

Institutional racism could be argued as an organisation's failure to meet the needs of people due to their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. The term can be used interchangeably with systematic racism and structural racism is 'seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people' (UK Parliament, 2021, pg. 1). Research has pointed to institutional racism as a potential barrier to racial equality (Tate and Bagguley, 2017; Arday, 2022; Bhopal, 2020). Institutions are noted for perpetuating racialised norms through good intentions, but generally with flawed equality policies (Phoenix, 2013). Critical race theory (CRT) offers a strong critical lens through which systematic inequalities can be examined. CRT stipulates that racism is not just bias but is systematic and institutional (Delgado and Stefancic, 2017).

EDI initiatives such as the Race Equality Charter and the Athena Swan do not appear to solve the deep-rooted power structure when it comes to inequality in UK higher education. Instead, they have become symbolic (Bhopal and Henderson, 2022). Scholars acknowledge the strengths and weaknesses of equality policies and incremental changes implemented, but these are inadequate (Armstrong and

Sullivan, 2025). CRT demands transformative change; the theory will be drawn on to assess EDI initiatives on ethnic minorities' promotion into senior leadership roles in UK higher education. CRT in addition to focusing on law and racism, contributes towards improving equality in the long term. It will examine how race and racism intersect with institutional policies and practices. The paper also draws on perspectives of HR 4.0 technologies, with an emphasis on EDI within digitized organizational systems.

3. Research Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to explore the impact of EDI policies on racial equality and to interrogate the role of HR 4.0 technology in aiding or reproducing inequality. The following question guides the research: *How do staff experiences of racial equality* in promotion align with organizational policies in the context of HR 4.0 technologies? This question is explored through two sub-questions:

1) To what extent does staff experience of equality and promotion align with organizational policies?

2) What implications does HR 4.0 technology have on the issue of racial inequality?

4. Literature Review

4.1 Ethnic Minority Staff Experiences and organisational EDI Policies

Ethnic minority refers to all ethnicities except for those who identify as white British. According to the Office for National Statistics (2024), the population by ethnicity in England and Wales stood at 59.6 million people, of whom 81.7% were white. Of the 19 ethnic categories, the white population accounted for the largest (74.4%), followed by Asian (9.3%), then black (4.0%), then mixed (2.9%), and other (2.1%) (Office for National Statistics, 2024). The term racial or racialised is used interchangeably with ethnic minority to refer to non-whites throughout the research. There are promotion disparities among racialised groups despite the implementation of equality and diversity policies in HE (Tate and Bagguley, 2016). Scholars point to systematic racism, highlighting white privilege, whereby the white group possesses certain privileges because they are white (Bhopal, 2023; Bhopal, 2022; Arday and Mirza, 2018; Rollock, 2019).

All UK universities must have equality policies under the Equality Act 2010 (UK Government, 2010). The policies are there to protect against discrimination and address equality of opportunity and good relations (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2014). HE institutions have developed their policies, which may differ in detail and in how they are implemented. They can voluntarily participate in other equality schemes such as the Athena Swan and the REC. Athena Swan Charter may have benefits such as raising gender equality profile issues (Tzanakou & Pearce, 2019), but the problem of inequality outweighs the benefits (Bhopal and Henderson, 2021; Ishaq and Hussain, 2022).

Studies have revealed that racialised staff see initiatives largely as symbolic and ineffective in tackling embedded institutional racism (Ahmed, 2012; Campion and Clark, 2022; Rollock, 2019). Some ethnic minorities describe equality policies as a tick-box exercise that doesn't bring about meaningful change (Koutsouris et. al., 2022; Bhopal and Henderson, 2021; Tzanakou & Pearce, 2019; Athena Swan Charter Review Independent Steering Group, 2020). Instead, HE institutions are seen to be protecting their images with less emphasis on dealing with the challenges of systematic inequalities (Bhopal, 2018). Other racialised staff indicated that they experience informal barriers that Equality policies do not address. This includes not having access to mentors or inauthentic mentors (Harris, 2023), being excluded from key networks, and in some cases, racialised stereotypes. Some find that they are being neglected, working harder than their white peers, and may sometimes find themselves forming their own racialised group (Athena Swan Charter Review Independent Steering Group, 2020; Bhopal & Henderson, 2021).

Similar to Athena Swan, the REC has its benefits as well as its limitations. It brings about awareness of racial equality issues. Likewise, racialised staff see it as superficial given the lack of transparency and changes in ethnic minority representation in HE. There is a need for more systematic change, and the success of the REC can only be evidenced when systematic racism is addressed. Findings revealed that although there are minor improvements of racialised groups since the implementation of the REC, evidence is lacking to demonstrate that the changes are a result of the charter (Bhopal, 2016).

4.2 What implications does HR 4.0 technology have on the issue of racial inequality?

The Industrial Revolution refers to huge changes throughout history in businesses and technology (King and Lawley, 2022). The fourth industrial revolution is currently in existence, where there is a shift from different eras, such as the factory with a mechanised approach, through to computers and automation. Similarly, Industry 4.0 is the name attributed to the current and fourth phase of the industrial revolution, driven by technologies. This era welcomes technology transformation, impacting all sectors, including that of Human Resource Development (HRD) with talent management, recruitment, and learning systems (Naim and Lenka, 2018). The fourth industrial revolution welcomes emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), automation, big data, gig economy (King and Lawley, 2022).

Stuss (2023) noted that Industry 4.0 is a broader concept with multiple subsets, including HR 4.0. This refers to the digital transformation of human resource management practices, focusing on the people side of Industry 4.0. That is, how people are managed, supported, and developed in the high-tech work environment. According to Stuss (2023), HR 4.0 includes: e-HRM systems, AI in recruitment, digital learning platforms, performance tracking tools, and managing human–technology collaboration. While HR 4.0 theoretically includes tools that could reduce inequality, equity is rarely centered in the design of HR 4.0 systems (Stuss, 2023). It therefore means that unless inclusion is designed as a priority,

tools that are meant to modernize HR may deepen existing inequalities, particularly in structurally unequal fields like academia. Digital HR systems remove power from employees, embedding organisational values and historical biases into algorithmic decision-making without sufficient transparency (Meijerink et al., 2020)

Dhanpat et al. (2020) caution that the implementation of HR 4.0 in emerging economies often overlooks socio-cultural inequalities, reinforcing exclusion under the guise of modernization. Research on AI in human resources further reveals that algorithms trained on historical data can codify past discriminatory practices, including those affecting ethnic minority staff in higher education institutions (Noble, 2018; Binns, 2018). This is particularly alarming in promotion systems, where success metrics may reflect dominant norms of productivity and merit that marginalize non-majoritarian academics (Arday, 2018).

HR.0 is identified as a distinct yet underdeveloped research cluster. It underscores a prevailing emphasis on technological tools over comprehensive conceptual development within the field (Raghavan et al., 2020; Stuss, 2023). There is a gap in understanding the human-centric aspects of HR 4.0. and that it could benefit from a deeper exploration of theoretical frameworks that underpin HR 4.0. Similarly, other scholars have called for a more holistic integration of human factors in Industry 4.0 (Dhanpat et al., 2020; da Silva et al., 2022).

5. Methods

Interviews are useful to explore and understand how individuals or groups attribute meaning to human or social issues. It involves focusing on the views of those being interviewed (Creswell, 2017). The research focus is on the impact of EDI policies on racial equality and to interrogate the role of HR 4.0 technology in aiding or reproducing inequality. With the use of interviews, racial groups had an opportunity to share their unique experiences, and therefore providing rich, detailed, and nuanced insights (Creswell, 2017).

Notably, this type of research cannot be conducted without 'the conscious or unconscious use of underlying theoretical perspectives which inform methodology, guiding theory, questions pursued, and conclusions drawn' (Broido & Manning, 2002, pg.434) during the research process. Adopting a qualitative approach, this study used semi-structured interviews due to their adaptability to explore participants' feelings and thoughts through various cues such as facial expressions, tone, and body language (Bell, 2022). Through interviews, the interviewer can develop a relationship with the respondents, allowing for rich data (Tindall et. Al., 2009). The interviews give voice to racialised groups who are often excluded from subpopulations (Pistrang and Barker, 2012).

Data was collected from racialised academic staff holding positions at the level of Lecturer/Senior Lecturer and in UK universities using Semi-structured interviews. A purposive and snowballing approach (Bryman, 2016) with the researcher's network (Manning and Kunkel, 2013) was adopted. The researcher acknowledges the bias in relying on other participants to refer people who may be similar to

themselves. There may be persons who may not be willing to provide the names of peers due to ethical reasons. Despite the drawbacks, the method allowed for the recruitment of the hidden population, and the method is inexpensive. It also allowed for a shorter time to complete (Creswell, 2014). Interviews were done online via MS Teams.

Data were analysed using Braun and Clarke (2006) six-phase approach to thematic analysis, involving: familiarisation with the data, assigning data preliminary codes, searching for themes and patterns in codes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report. There are ethical implications for research despite any given methodology (Anderson et. al. 2015). As such, all ethical and legal practices were observed for this research. An important aspect of the research is integrity, all participants were made knowledgeable of the process (Anderson et. al. 2015) before agreeing and participating.

6. Key Findings and Discussions

Through thematic analysis guided by Braun and Clarke (2006). Transcripts were read multiple times to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the content. Coding was done manually using margin notes and highlighting techniques to extract the initial codes. The codes were then organised into potential themes, with key themes emerging as follows: little awareness and involvement in EDI policies, the necessity for clear communication and active inclusion, conditional optimism and human limitations of HR 4.0 in bias reduction, and the complex interplay between technology, culture, and human agency.

6.1 Racialised Staff Engagement and Awareness of EDI Policies

The thematic analysis of participant interviews reveals critical insights into the perceived effectiveness and visibility of EDI initiatives in UK universities. Two key themes emerged: The lack of awareness and engagement with EDI policies and the need for clearer communication and active inclusion. In the first instance, participants did not demonstrate much knowledge and personal engagement with current EDI policies, such as the Race Equality Charter (REC). Although they know they exist, it is unclear about their actual impact on racialised staff, particularly in the context of promotion and leadership opportunities. One participant reflected, 'The policies are there, but do I know what the policies are for and how much they are contributing to ethnic minority people, no idea,' highlighting a disconnect between institutional EDI efforts and staff awareness. These findings align with prior research documenting the gap between policy presence and meaningful organisational change (Ahmed, 2012; Campion and Clark, 2022; Rollock, 2019).

Other participants emphasised the crucial role of communication and leadership in fostering inclusion. The lack of visible champions or clear points of contact for EDI initiatives, such as the REC, was seen as a barrier to active participation and community building. As one interviewee noted, 'Who is actually managing and moving all this forward for people to actually be part of that community, no one knows,' indicating a need for transparency and accountability. This supports extant literature underscoring that effective EDI implementation requires not only

formal policies but also ongoing engagement, leadership commitment, and accessible platforms for marginalised groups (Bhopal, 2018). These findings suggest that while institutional EDI policies exist, their effectiveness is constrained by the lack of visibility and active inclusion of racialised academics. To advance equity, universities must prioritise strategic communication, leadership involvement, and mechanisms that foster genuine community engagement beyond policy documentation.

6.2 Perceptions of Industry/HR 4.0 technology

The analysis of participant narratives reveals nuanced perspectives on the potential and limitations of HR 4.0 within Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) frameworks in academia. Two overarching themes emerged that frame these discussions: the conditional optimism and human limitations of HRM 4.0 in bias reduction, and the complex interplay between technology, culture, and human agency. Participants acknowledged that AI holds promise in reducing explicit discrimination, particularly through objective processes such as candidate screening. One participant noted, 'it can reduce the discrimination in terms of…screening for candidates for a particular position,' suggesting a recognition of AI's potential to enhance procedural fairness. This aligns with contemporary literature highlighting AI's capacity to mitigate some forms of unconscious bias in hiring practices (Noble, 2018; Raghavan et al., 2020). However, this optimism was tempered by an acute awareness of AI's inherent subjectivity due to human design and implementation. As one participant articulated, 'really it's humans behind the development of technologies…so it has some subjectivity to it.' This underscores existing critiques regarding the reproduction of societal biases through algorithmic systems (Noble, 2018; Raghavan et al., 2020).

Further, participants emphasized that technology alone is insufficient to address the cultural and ethical complexities embedded in discrimination. One participant stated, 'it can't really…address…different cultural attitudes, 'highlighting the irreplaceable role of human judgement, empathy, and cultural literacy in equity work. This resonates strongly with intersectionality scholarship and critiques of technological determinism in social justice domains, emphasising that algorithmic tools must be integrated within broader, human-centered institutional strategies (Stuss, 2023).

The findings thus reveal a dual narrative: while AI contributes to efficiency and reduces certain biases, its deployment without critical oversight risks perpetuating existing inequalities. This suggests that academic institutions must adopt a balanced approach that leverages technological advancements alongside sustained human engagement, reflexivity, and structural reform to foster genuine equity.

7. Implications for HRD practice

This research makes a theoretical contribution to ongoing debates in Human Resource Development (HRD), Industry 4.0, and organisational equity by offering a nuanced understanding of how digital transformation, particularly HR 4.0 technologies, intersects with race and career progression in higher education. It highlights the risk that, without intentional equity-focused design, these technologies may inadvertently reproduce existing structural inequalities, especially in processes such as promotion. The findings underscore the urgent need for HRD practitioners, policymakers, and university leaders to embed racial equity into the design, implementation, and monitoring of digital HR systems. In doing so, institutions can ensure that Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policies move beyond performative commitments to become genuinely participatory, transparent, and impactful. Practically, this research has significant implications for HRD policy and practice, it provides a foundation for designing more inclusive and accountable promotion pathways that benefit racialised academic staff. More broadly, the study contributes to the development of HR 4.0 frameworks that are socially responsive and capable of addressing entrenched inequalities in the academic workplace.

8. Limitations and Future Directions for Research

The study was based on a small, qualitative dataset derived from a limited number of interviews with racialised academic staff, which may not capture the full spectrum of experiences across different institutions or disciplines (Silverman, 2013). The manual thematic analysis, while thorough, introduces a degree of subjectivity that may influence theme interpretation (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Participants' awareness and understanding of EDI policies varied, potentially limiting the depth of insight into institutional policies. Additionally, participants' familiarity with HR 4.0 technologies and related EDI policies varied, potentially limiting the depth of analysis regarding the intersection of digital HR tools and structural inequalities. Future research should expand the sample size across multiple universities for a wider participant base, incorporate comparative institutional analyses, and examine specific design and implementation of HR.4.0 systems to assess their actual impact on equity and inclusion in academic promotion and career progression.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research underscores the need for organizations to evaluate their EDI policies considering HRD 4.0 advancements, ensuring equality for all, including marginalized groups. There is a need to ensure that HR 4.0 technologies support, rather than hinder, racial equality in promotion and career advancement. The lived experience of human interaction should not be excluded from HRD 4.0 technologies discussions. The analysis highlights a critical disjuncture between the formal existence of HR 4.0 systems and EDI policies, and their perceived impact among racialised academics in UK universities. While HR 4.0 technologies are often promoted as tools to streamline HR processes and promote fairness, participants expressed scepticism about their actual capacity to address deep-

rooted structural inequities without deliberate inclusion-oriented design and implementation. Similarly, EDI policies were frequently described as passive, performative, or disconnected from lived experience, known more for their presence on institutional websites than for tangible outcomes. These findings underscore the need for a more engaged, transparent, and community-informed approach to HRD practice, where both digital innovation and diversity frameworks are grounded in the everyday realities of racialised groups. The small sample size was acknowledged as a limitation for this research, and it is recommended that future research could build on this research, drawing on a larger and diverse sample across universities and disciplines.

References

Advance HE. (2024). Race Equality Charter: Aims and Principles. [Online] Available at: https://advance-he.ac.uk/equality-charters/race-equality-charter [Accessed 19 May 2025]

Advance HE. (2024). Athena Swan Charter: Aims and Principles. [Online] Available at: https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan-charter#whatis [Accessed 19 May 2025]

Ahmed, S., 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Arday, J., 2022. The black professoriate: Assessing the landscape within British higher education. *On Education*, *5*(13).

Arday, J. and Mirza, H.S. eds., 2018. *Dismantling race in higher education: Racism, whiteness and decolonising the academy* (Vol. 8). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arday, J., 2018. Dismantling power and privilege through reflexivity: Negotiating normative Whiteness, the Eurocentric curriculum and racial micro-aggressions within the Academy. *Whiteness and Education*, *3*(2), pp.141-161.

Armstrong, J. and Sullivan, A., 2025. A critical analysis of Athena Swan as a policy-scoring scheme. *British Educational Research Journal*, *51*(1), pp.225-243.

Athena SWAN Charter Review Independent Steering Group. (2020). *The future of Athena Swan*. Retrieved from **https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/advance-he/Future-of-Athena-SWAN_Report-1_1600340258.pdf**

Bell, E., Bryman, A. and Harley, B., 2022. *Business research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Bhopal, K., 2023. Critical race theory: Confronting, challenging, and rethinking white privilege. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *49*(1), pp.111-128.

Bhopal, K., 2022. Academics of colour in elite universities in the UK and the USA: The 'unspoken system of exclusion'. *Studies in Higher Education*, *47*(11), pp.2127-2137.

Bhopal, K., 2020. For whose benefit? Black and Minority Ethnic training programmes in higher education institutions in England, UK. *British educational research journal*, *46*(3), pp.500-515.

Bhopal, K. and Henderson, H., 2019. Advancing equality in higher education: An exploratory study of the Athena SWAN and Race equality charters. *British Academy/Leverhulme Research Report*

Bhopal, K. and Henderson, H., 2021. Competing inequalities: Gender versus race in higher education institutions in the UK. *Educational Review*, *73*(2), pp.153-169.

Bhopal, K., 2016. White academia: will the Race Equality Charter make a difference?. *British Politics and Policy at LSE*.
Broido, E.M. and Manning, K., 2002. Philosophical Foundations and Current Theoretical Perspectives in Qualitative Research. *Journal of college student development*, *43*(4), pp.434-45.

Binns, R., 2018, January. Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency* (pp. 149-159). PMLR.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), pp.77-101.

Campion, K. and Clark, K., 2022. Revitalising race equality policy? Assessing the impact of the Race Equality Charter Mark for British universities. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *25*(1), pp.18-37.

Creswell, J.W., 2017. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications

da Silva, L.B.P., Soltovski, R., Pontes, J., Treinta, F.T., Leitão, P., Mosconi, E., de Resende, L.M.M. and Yoshino, R.T., 2022. Human resources management 4.0: Literature review and trends. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *168*, p.108111.

Dhanpat, N., Buthelezi, Z.P., Joe, M.R., Maphela, T.V. and Shongwe, N., 2020. Industry 4.0: The role of human resource professionals. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *18*(1), pp.1-11.

Delgado, R. and Stefancic, J., 2023. Critical race theory: An introduction (Vol. 87). NyU press.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2014. *The Essential Guide to the Public Sector Equality Duty*. [online] Available at: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/essential-guide-public-sector-equality-duty [Accessed 19 May 2025].

Ellis, R., 2024. Growing numbers of black academics quitting for private sector. Times Higher Education, 28 March. Available at: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/growing-numbers-black-academics-quitting-private-sector [Accessed 19th May 2025]

ECU (Equality Challenge Unit).; 2016. Equality in Higher Education: Statistical Report Staff. London: ECU.

Harris, L.C. and Ogbonna, E., 2023. Equal opportunities but unequal mentoring? The perceptions of mentoring by Black and minority ethnic academics in the UK university sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *33*(4), pp.940-956.

Henderson, H. and Bhopal, K., 2022. Narratives of academic staff involvement in Athena SWAN and race equality charter marks in UK higher education institutions. *Journal of Education Policy*, *37*(5), pp.781-797.

HESA 2024. Higher Education Statistics: UK, 2022/23. [online] Higher Education Statistics Agency. Available at: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/16-01-2024/sb267-higher-education-staff-statistics [Accessed 19 May 2025]

Ishaq, M. and Hussain, A.M., 2022. BAME employees' work experience in the UK public sector: an empirical study of academic and research libraries. International Journal of Public Sector Management.

Kamasak, R., Alkan, D.P. and Yalcinkaya, B., 2023. Emerging Trends of Industry 4.0 in Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Implementations. *Contemporary approaches in equality, diversity and inclusion: Strategic and technological perspectives*, pp.129-148.

King, D. and Lawley, S., 2022. *Organizational behaviour*. Oxford University Press.

Koutsouris, G., Stentiford, L. and Norwich, B., 2022. A critical exploration of inclusion policies of elite UK universities. British Educational Research Journal.

Meijerink, J., Boons, M., Keegan, A. and Marler, J., 2021. Algorithmic human resource management: Synthesizing developments and cross-disciplinary insights on digital HRM. *The InTernaTIonal Journal of human resource managemenT*, *32*(12), pp.2545-2562.

Naim, M.F. and Lenka, U., 2017. Linking knowledge sharing, competency development, and affective commitment: evidence from Indian Gen Y employees. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *21*(4), pp.885-906.

Noble, S.U., 2018. Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. In *Algorithms of oppression*. New York university press.

Office for National Statistics (ONS), 2024. Population of England and Wales. [online] Ethnicity facts and figures. Available at https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/national-and-regional-populations/population-of-england-and-wales/latest/ [Accessed 19 May 2025]

Phoenix, A., 2013. De-colonising practices: Negotiating narratives from racialised and gendered experiences of education. In *Black and Postcolonial Feminisms in New Times* (pp. 101-114). Routledge.

Pistrang, N. and Barker, C., 2012. Varieties of qualitative research: A pragmatic approach to selecting methods.

Raghavan, M., Barocas, S., Kleinberg, J. and Levy, K., 2020, January. Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 469-481).

Rollock, N., 2019. Staying power: The career experiences and strategies of UK Black female professors.

Silverman, D., 2013. Doing qualitative research 4th ed.

Tate, S.A. and Bagguley, P., 2017. Building the anti-racist university: Next steps. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *20*(3), pp.289-299.

Tzanakou, C., & Pearce, R. (2019). Moderate feminism within or against the neoliberal university? The example of Athena SWAN. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 26(8), 1191–1211.

UK Government, 2010. *Equality Act 2010*. [online] Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/149 [Accessed 19 May 2025].

UK Parliament, 2021. The Macpherson Report: twenty-two years on: Eleventh Report of Session 2021-22. [online] House of Commons Home Affairs Committee. Available at: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5802/cmselect/cmhaff/139/13911.htm [Accessed 19 May 2025]