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Summary

Some jobseeker groups experience difficulty in securing employment due to perceived gaps in their employable skills, qualifications or experience. Others are effectively ‘screened out’ during recruitment processes on the basis of their gender, race, ethnicity, language, age or disability. Labour market participation for these groups is affected by the human resource practices of employers, as well as the nature of support they may receive to address perceived ‘employability’ gaps.

In contrast, ‘inclusive employment’ can be defined as all efforts that promote fair and equitable access to decent employment, ensuring satisfactory pay and conditions, career prospects and opportunities for social integration.¹

In this study we investigate the advantages and limitations of ‘toolkits’ for influencing more inclusive employment practices.

Using employer toolkits to advance inclusive employment

Employer toolkits are designed to assist in removing employment barriers for particular groups in the labour market. They are compendia of resources such as guidelines, step-by-step instructions, recommendations, tips, checklists, templates and other practical materials. They may be used by employers or by labour market intermediaries (LMIs) that seek to address barriers such as restrictive recruitment practices, or negative stereotypes of some jobseekers.

There is limited literature available on the uptake of toolkits by employers, or evidence of their impact on employment outcomes for disadvantaged groups. Nevertheless, toolkits continue to be published by a variety of organisations and institutions,

¹For concepts that contributed to our definition of ‘inclusive employment’, see ILO (2015), Majid (2001), Scarpetta (2014) and Smyth & Buchanan (2013).
Employer toolkits

including employer and professional associations, government departments; peak bodies or lobby groups, research organisations, statutory bodies and community organisations.

This paper presents a review of 20 toolkits from Australian and international sources.\(^2\) We identify what the toolkits offer to employers and how they address employment issues for three jobseeker groups:

- young people
- culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) groups
- mature-age jobseekers.

We also examine general ‘diversity’ toolkits that cover multiple groups.

We report on the toolkits’ engagement strategies and messages about specific jobseeker groups, and the key themes in general guidance offered to employers. Finally, we assess the advantages and limitations of the toolkit approach for advancing ‘inclusive employment’ in Australia.

**Key findings**

**Employer action is justified in social or economic terms**

The toolkits in our study explained the need for employer action in either economic or social terms:

- a **business case rationale**: Labour demand and economic conditions (such as skills shortages or recruitment/retention challenges) which mean that employers need to consider alternative sources of labour.

- a **corporate social responsibility (CSR) or social challenges rationale**: Labour market exclusion and marginalisation has negative social implications, and employers need to play their part in improving these conditions.

Unsurprisingly, toolkits authored by business associations, government departments and employer lobby groups were more likely to be rationalised in terms of labour demand or economic arguments. Not-for-profit and community groups were more likely to emphasise social rationales.

\(^2\) For details on how the toolkits were selected, please see ‘This study’ below.
Figure S2 plots the 20 toolkits reviewed in this study according to their relative emphasis on social or economic justifications, and direct or indirect benefits. Several observations can be made:

- The majority of toolkits (16 of the 20) present a proposition to employers that emphasises direct business benefits of employing from the target groups.
- All of the toolkits focusing on mature-age jobseekers are justified in terms of labour demand arguments (such as skills shortages), while those focusing on young people mostly have social rationales.
- Toolkits that focus on CALD groups are the most varied in terms of their underlying justifications and value propositions.

Figure S2 Employer toolkits’ rationale and emphasis on benefits

Note: Toolkit numbers match the list in Appendix B
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Toolkits inform changes to practice while appealing to business interests
Toolkits attempt to influence employers using a combination of engagement strategies. These strategies constitute what we have termed in this report the ‘toolkit approach’:

- contributing to better employer understandings of labour market disadvantage and employment barriers for specific groups
- appealing to employers’ interests in terms of direct business benefits and opportunities
- prompting employers to assess barriers that may exist in their workplace operations, strategies or culture
- providing practical tools and guidance to assist employers in adapting human resource policies and practices.

Toolkits offer a range of practical resources to employers
We classified the tools and supporting content in our sample toolkits using the ILO’s Knowledge Strategy framework (2007). This distinguishes between three types of tools:

- ‘how-to’ tools, such as manuals, guidelines and training materials
- knowledge-based tools, such as policy briefs, research, evaluation, knowledge networks and data
- good practices (ILO 2007).

The toolkits we looked at offer a broad range of practical tools for use by employers, such as self-assessment tools, checklists, HR guidance, policy templates, and case studies and examples. Most toolkit guidance is about informing process changes (rather than strategic choices) within employing organisations, with supporting content to assess and plan for these changes.

Different messages for specific jobseeker groups
Employment barriers for the three target groups are represented differently in the toolkits. The issue of young people without access to work is presented as primarily a social (rather than an economic) problem, requiring targeted programs and interventions: many of these—such as work experience—may not involve actual employment opportunities. In contrast, the ageing workforce and underemployed CALD groups are more often framed as underutilised workers that can produce direct business benefits if employers can make necessary adaptations.
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Table S1 summarises the key toolkit messages to employers about the three specific jobseeker groups that are the focus of this study.

**Table S1 Toolkit messages to employers about specific cohorts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Young people</th>
<th>CALD groups</th>
<th>Mature-age adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers</strong></td>
<td>Lack of quality career pathways, leading to disengagement</td>
<td>CALD workers are under-leveraged and undervalued</td>
<td>Age discrimination in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Take advantage of new skills and fresh ideas</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, motivated and hardworking</td>
<td>Skilled and experienced workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term investment</td>
<td>Value of increased cultural diversity</td>
<td>High productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grow your own talent</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff professional development opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td>Provide non-employment options: emphasis on work experience, mentoring, work tasters</td>
<td>Provide support in the workplace, e.g. buddies/mentors</td>
<td>Review organisational culture for ageist barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer apprenticeships &amp; training</td>
<td>Ensure use of plain English</td>
<td>Consider alternative job design and flexible conditions (incl. job rotation or redeployment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build cultural competence into HR processes</td>
<td>Volunteering option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Break down racial stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General guidance emphasises human resource adaptations and ‘champions’

While providing specific messages for different jobseeker groups, toolkit guidance tends not to distinguish between different employer types—in terms of size or sector. General guidance emphasises changes to human resource policies and practices to remove employment barriers, particularly during recruitment.

Some toolkits recommend special intake programs, while others recommend more root and branch review of human resource practices. Sometimes targeted programs for particular groups may be appropriate (this is usually a recommendation in youth-focused toolkits, for example); but overall the guidance suggests that employers consider the human resource process from a ‘systemic’ or ‘holistic’ perspective.

The role of ‘champions’ is also emphasised in several toolkits as an implementation strategy. Demonstrating the personal commitment of leaders or managers to ‘inclusion’ can lead to more inclusive practices being adopted throughout organisations.
Advantages and limitations of toolkits

Our analysis reveals some advantages but several limitations of the toolkit approach.

Toolkits can assist employers to understand disadvantage and diversity

Toolkits have the potential to enhance employers’ understanding of barriers within their own workplaces, and add to the currency of terms such as workforce ‘diversity’ or ‘inclusion’. The diversity of author types suggests there is interest in multiple sectors to build this type of understanding. The contributions of business groups such as the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI), the Australian Industry Group (AIG) and the Diversity Council of Australia (DCA), and public institutions such as the Australian Human Rights Commission and the Fair Work Ombudsman increase the potential influence of toolkits among employers.

However, an associated risk of toolkits is that they can also have the effect of reinforcing stereotypes about unemployment or labour market disadvantage, rather than challenging conventional assumptions. Toolkits that reproduce stereotypes or assumptions are less likely to influence the ‘inclusiveness’ of mainstream recruitment practices.

Impact is limited by requiring ‘willing’ employers and ‘job-ready’ candidates

For toolkits to be used successfully, employers already have to be notionally committed to concepts like diversity recruitment or inclusive employment. An assumption underpinning toolkits is therefore that businesses are either inspired by CSR motivations or are in fact experiencing labour or skills shortages, and are willing to consider recruiting from underrepresented groups. The argument that ‘jobs are available if only employers can be persuaded to offer them to unemployed people’ (Ingold & Stuart 2014) does not hold for all employer types or sectors of the economy. In addition, the toolkit approach depends on employers being willing to make significant changes to their practices.

A related assumption behind the toolkit approach is that jobseekers are fully prepared to take up jobs when they become available, and have developed the ‘human capital’ expected by employers—work history, local experience, skills and qualifications. However, disadvantaged jobseekers are likely to have different levels of employment ‘readiness’, and therefore will require different degrees of support to make the transition to mainstream workplaces.

Role of LMIs and supply-side interventions is unclear

Few of the reviewed toolkits refer to the role of LMIs, employment agencies or other organisations in supporting disadvantaged jobseekers. Instead, toolkits are almost exclusively focused on ‘demand-side’ barriers and the actions of employers. A combination of demand and supply-side interventions may be required in any given situation to create sustainable workforce engagement for disadvantaged groups.
Voices and needs of different jobseeker groups are not prominent
Few toolkits present the ‘voices’ of people who face employment barriers, or discuss employment issues from their perspective. This means that the toolkits do not offer much insight into how and why people experience labour market disadvantage. The lack of jobseeker voices is also a missed opportunity to address employer bias.

Toolkits may not effect change at a scale to advance ‘inclusive employment’
We conclude that toolkits can play a role in promoting more equitable employment opportunities, by using different strategies and value propositions to engage employers. However, broader tasks of changing the design of jobs and the functioning of the labour market, while promoting social integration, need to be driven by larger-scale efforts involving more than just willing employers.

Few of the reviewed employer toolkits include discussion of the social or economic implications of unemployment, underemployment or labour market inequity. The majority are resources designed for use by individual employers. Australian toolkits, in particular, also lack reference to possible industry and multi-sector employment initiatives.

Any change at the micro level as a result of toolkits is incremental and entirely voluntary on the part of employers. This means that toolkits and other ‘off-the-shelf’ resources play only a small part in responding to labour market disadvantage. Toolkits are not a substitute for job creation, or for macroeconomic policy reform that fosters more inclusion in Australia’s workplaces.
1 Why study employer toolkits?

Inclusive employment

The concept of inclusive employment is useful in critically evaluating the social, economic and political challenges of the contemporary Australian labour market. For the purposes of this paper, we define ‘inclusive employment’ as all efforts that promote fair and equitable access to decent employment, ensuring satisfactory pay and conditions, career prospects and opportunities for social integration.3

The Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) provides labour market programs such as Work and Learning Centres and Given the Chance for Asylum Seekers, which deliver services and support to different jobseekers, aided by tools to build partnerships with employers. This study will assist the BSL, other labour market intermediaries and employers to understand the benefits and limitations of employer toolkits, as well as identifying gaps where additional tools could be useful.

Labour market disadvantage and employer recruitment practices

The changing Australian labour market has left some workers excluded or marginalised from employment opportunities that offer stability and career prospects. Jobs in Australia, like many other Western economies, are shifting from manufacturing and industrial sectors towards service-based ‘knowledge work’ (requiring higher skills and qualifications) (McQuaid & Lindsay 2005, p. 203). A reduced supply of low-skilled or entry-level jobs that provide ‘family supporting wages’ has been observed (Pinto-Duschinsky 2001), while job conditions have become increasingly precarious (Wilkins & Wooden 2014).

There is extensive research regarding employers’ ‘statistical discrimination’ or screening of candidates based on perceived risks (Hasluck 2011). Experimenting by sending résumés with different dates of birth (but equal qualifications) to large US firms and employment agencies, Bendick and colleagues (1997) found that older workers were discriminated against during recruitment. In their research with refugees looking for work in Australia, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2007) found that some only had success after disguising their ethnicity in written applications, and some were rejected by employers on ‘sighting’ the applicant. Referrals from employment service providers catering for disadvantaged jobseekers have influenced negative employer perceptions (Bonoli & Hinrichs 2010). Individual histories of long-term unemployment have also resulted in employers making assumptions about candidates’ motivation and effectiveness (Lindsay, McCracken & McQuaid 2003).

Employer human resources practices create barriers for disadvantaged workers, particularly those applying for low skill or entry-level positions. These include screening techniques, informal recruitment methods and non-standard employment conditions. Employers use application forms, assessment processes and interview techniques to ‘sift’ candidates who are unable to demonstrate that they are already in work and/or have past experience of the job or sector (Devins & Hogarth 2005, p. 251). They may also source candidates through ‘word of mouth’, disadvantaging applicants who lack relevant social networks (Devins & Hogarth 2005; Shury et al. 2012). Further, Spoonley (2008) argues that non-standard employment (part-time, temporary, casual, fixed-term contract, agency employment) is also increasingly used to manage low-skilled labour. He suggests that non-standard work makes it possible for employers to screen candidates without incurring significant employment liabilities. Temporary employment through agencies enables recruitment costs and risks to be externalised, while contract and casual positions can be used to expand and contract the workforce according to fluctuations in demand (Spoonley 2008).

Public employment assistance for disadvantaged jobseekers has been dominated by direct support to jobseekers only. However, there is a need for increased focus on employers’ responsibilities in creating more inclusive workforces.

**Labour market intermediaries and ‘employer engagement’**

A focus on employers recognises that adaptation is required at the source of jobs and vacancies to reduce barriers for particular jobseekers.

**Labour market intermediaries** (LMIs) broker the relationship between employers and jobseekers (Benner 2003). LMIs, particularly not-for-profit and community-based organisations, are important in helping jobseekers who are disadvantaged by their race, education or experience (Hilton & Lambert 2015). Employers may also seek out the support of LMIs as a strategy to reduce recruitment costs or increase employee retention (Hilton & Lambert 2015).

**Employer engagement** describes the efforts of LMIs to engage with employers to facilitate job outcomes for excluded or disadvantaged groups. Employer engagement approaches are often based on an underlying assumption that ‘jobs are available if only employers can be persuaded to offer them to unemployed people’ (Ingold & Stuart 2014).

Green and Hasluck (2009) suggest that key benefits for jobseekers of employer engagement programs include improved access to vacancies, job-relevant training; the brokering of recruitment, post-employment support for successful applicants and the ability to influence recruitment and retention policies. Some employer-oriented programs may also address demand-side ‘problems’ such as restrictive recruitment practices and negative perceptions of jobseekers (Spoonley 2008).
This study

One strategy commonly used for influencing more inclusive employment practices is to provide employers with guidance and information for adapting human resource practices. ‘Toolkits’ for employers are developed to directly influence the demand side of the labour market.

The toolkits are often designed to assist employers to consider the practical and business implications of recruiting from non-mainstream groups. Toolkits can provide ‘off-the-shelf’ assistance that can be implemented directly by employers. LMIs may also use the toolkits to inform their interactions with employers.

Employer toolkits vary in their content type, theoretical or empirical basis, and the method taken to develop the resource itself. Toolkits are developed by a range of organisations, including employer and professional associations, government departments, not-for-profit and community organisations, research institutes, statutory bodies, peak advocacy bodies and lobby groups.

Aims

This study aims to:

• identify and critically evaluate what toolkits offer to employers and how they frame barriers for specific disadvantaged jobseeker groups
• synthesise key themes from the guidance being offered to employers
• assess the extent to which employer toolkits can be used to advance inclusive employment in Australia.

Sample

We focus on employer toolkits for specific jobseeker groups supported by the BSL: young people, culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) people, and mature-age jobseekers. We also examine ‘diversity’ toolkits that cover multiple groups.

To develop an initial shortlist of employer toolkits for review, we applied a search method adapted from VicHealth’s review of audit and assessment tools to prevent race-based discrimination and support diversity (VicHealth 2010).
Employer toolkits

This involved:

- an internet search to identify publicly available employer toolkits
- a scan of the employment websites of prominent Australian business groups, as well as peak bodies, social service agencies and community sector organisations.\(^4\)

Internet searches were conducted using combinations of keywords, including:

- toolkit, tool, guidance, guidelines, manual, handbook
- youth, young people, mature age, older workers, CALD, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers
- employer, employment, labour market, disadvantage, recruitment, human resources, diversity, inclusion.

Internet searches were conducted until an appropriate saturation of sources was reached (either the same results began to recur, or search terms no longer produced relevant results).

Inclusion criteria

A list of 61 resources was compiled from the initial web searches. To narrow the sample, five inclusion criteria were applied:

1. Contents publicly available from the internet, rather than requiring user payment or subscription (e.g. through journals or academic databases)
2. Aimed at employer audiences (including recruitment or hiring managers)
3. Addresses employment barriers for at least one of the following cohorts
   a. Young people
   b. CALD groups (including migrant workers, refugees, ethnic groups, multi-faith groups)
   c. Mature-age jobseekers
   d. ‘Diversity’ groups
4. Contains tools from at least one of the following categories:
   a. ‘How-to’ tools
   b. Knowledge-based tools
   c. Good practices
5. Meets at least one of the following quality measures:
   a. Appears to be grounded in theoretical or empirical research, or there is evidence of stakeholder consultation
   b. Contains appropriate references and citations.

A balanced sample to compare Australian and international toolkits was also required. Based on these criteria, the sample was narrowed to 20 (comprising 11 Australian and 9 international toolkits).

\(^4\) For a full list of websites consulted please see Appendix A.
Analysis

A qualitative analysis of the selected toolkits was undertaken to identify key themes and approaches. Critical questions were used to guide the analysis, including:

- Who produces toolkits and what is their rationale?
- What strategies are adopted for engaging and convincing employers to act?
- What guidance and practical resources do toolkits offer to employers?
- What are the advantages and limitations of the toolkit approach for advancing an inclusive employment agenda?

We also considered employer toolkits for their general applicability to the Australian labour market, and compared Australian toolkits with similar products developed overseas. However, we excluded international toolkits that were designed for specific national labour market conditions, and those designed only for certain organisational contexts (e.g. public sector only).

Limitations

The study is not a comprehensive review of all employer toolkits. Only toolkits in printed form, freely available on the web (as opposed to those available for a price or through membership-based organisations) and published in English were included. Video or other forms of multimedia resources were also not included (although web-based tools were). Nevertheless the study provides insights into the value of the toolkit approach in working with employers to increase workplace diversity.

A further key limitation of this study is that it focused only on the content of toolkit publications, and did not include employers’ views on how they are actually used. Further research with employers is needed to understand the strategies and tools employers use to engage with jobseekers that face disadvantages in the labour market.
2 Findings: What do the toolkits offer?

Here we summarise what employers and LMIs can expect from toolkits, including engagement strategies, rationales, benefits associated with employing diverse jobseekers, and different types of supporting content (tools). See Appendix B for detailed information about the toolkits and a brief appraisal of the strengths and limitations of each toolkit.

Who produces toolkits?

The reviewed toolkits were produced primarily by employer and professional associations, government departments, and peak bodies and lobby groups. Table 2.1 below summarises the producers of toolkits in our sample by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Producer type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government department or agency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer and professional associations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak advocacy bodies and lobby groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory bodies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research organisations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies for engaging employers

Each toolkit adopts approaches to engaging employers and communicating key messages, which may include:

- raising employers’ awareness about specific forms of labour market disadvantage by providing information, stories, case studies and statistics about the cohort
- making a ‘business case’ or compelling argument for increased workforce diversity and inclusion, by describing the potential benefits to employers
- highlighting common barriers for jobseeker groups that may exist in workplace culture, management styles, or human resource policies and practice
- suggesting specific adaptations to business and human resource practices, with accompanying tools such as tips, guidance, templates, and checklists
- proposing ‘special’ and separate (i.e. non-mainstream) recruitment intakes or targeted employment programs for specific jobseekers.

Most employer toolkits combine several of these approaches.
Rationales for employer action

The toolkits typically begin with a discussion of labour market disadvantage for target groups and the possible business concerns of employers. How the rationale is presented provides insights into the authors’ interests.

A previous study on employer engagement programs for disadvantaged jobseekers (van Kooy, Bowman & Bodsworth 2014) developed a continuum to highlight the varying drivers and motivations of employers (see Figure 2.1). At one end of the continuum, employers are driven by corporate social responsibility (CSR) objectives or social agendas. At the other end of the continuum, an interest in alternative sources of labour to satisfy recruitment and skills demands is a business driver.

Figure 2.1  Continuum of individual employer-oriented programs

In this study we find that the authors of employer toolkits appeal to a similar range of employer interests. We identify two key rationales in our sample of employer toolkits:

- **A business case rationale**: Labour demand and economic conditions (such as skills shortages or recruitment/retention challenges) necessitate consideration by employers of alternative sources of labour.

- **A corporate social responsibility (CSR) or social challenges rationale**: Labour market exclusion and marginalisation has negative social implications – employers need to play their part in improving these conditions.

More than half (12 of the 20) of the toolkits in our sample focus on the first rationale, with an emphasis on market conditions for employers. These conditions are generally expressed in terms of skills, talent and labour shortages.

The *Investing in experience* toolkit argues that Australian businesses face increasing ‘skills shortages’ and the demographic challenges of an ageing population. Mature-age workers, it is suggested, are a ‘source of new skills’ (DEEWR 2012, p. 4). Similarly, the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission argues:
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Businesses that don’t utilise the experience and talents of mature-age workers will start to experience labour shortages (VEOHRC 2010b, p. 1).

Situating Australian employers in the economic context of the ‘Asian century’, Diversity Council Australia’s *Cracking the cultural ceiling* toolkit suggests that cultural inclusion is ‘now a strategic business and talent management issue’ (Diversity Council Australia 2014). In Canada, the Government of Alberta’s *Making it work* toolkit describes a ‘booming’ business environment, but with a serious shortage of qualified labour. The authors argue that ‘inclusive strategies to recruit and retain employees from every demographic can help businesses respond to labour shortages’ (Government of Alberta 2008, p. 4).

The second rationale aligns closely with the CSR agendas described in the employer engagement study. Fewer than half of the employer toolkits in our sample (8 of the 20) made arguments about the broader social imperatives of more inclusive employment practices, and only three strongly emphasised these points.

The Federation of Ethnic Communities’ Councils of Australia (FECCA) *Harmony* fact sheets, for example, argue that cultural diversity in Australian workplaces is ‘everyone’s business and impacts us all’, and that ‘being culturally aware and adaptable is everyone’s responsibility’ (FECCA 2013, pp. 2,5). Gap Inc. (2012) also highlight the costs of youth unemployment in the United States in terms of lost tax revenue and the direct costs of supporting ‘disconnected youth’.

**Business benefits of inclusive employment practices**

All of the toolkits in our sample present a set of propositions to employers about the direct and indirect benefits associated with recruiting from diverse jobseeker groups (summarised in Table 2.2). These propositions are framed as incentives to use the guidance in the toolkits. In most of the toolkits (16 of the 20) there is a strong emphasis on the direct business benefits of recruiting from the target jobseeker groups.

**Table 2.2  Summary of direct and indirect business benefits of toolkits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct benefits</th>
<th>Indirect benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity dividends</td>
<td>Improved staff morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff loyalty and better retention</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better customer service</td>
<td>Staff benefit from cross-cultural interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced potential for innovation</td>
<td>Staff health and wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New networks and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage and new markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/policy compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Australian Centre for International Business (ACIB 2001, p. 8) advocates a ‘productive diversity’ approach, which involves adapting human resource strategies to maximise creativity and innovation from ‘diverse’ teams. Cultural diversity is presented by the Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship as a driver of increased productivity due to improved staff morale (DIAC 2013). The Invest in experience toolkit also urges Australian employers to consider the productivity dividends of mature-age jobseekers, arguing that they perform at their best for more of the day and are less likely to take days off or experience work-related injuries (DEEWR 2012).

Some toolkits present loyalty to the employer or brand as another positive outcome of engaging disadvantaged jobseeker groups—particularly young people and migrants. In one toolkit, an Australian employer is quoted as describing migrant workers as ‘overwhelmingly engaged’ with their company (DIAC 2013, p. 8). In the United States, Gap Inc. (2012, p. 10) argue that taking on ‘opportunity youth’ (defined as young people who grew up facing different forms of social disadvantage) can increase employee loyalty and engagement.

Other toolkits argue that the attributes of workers can support innovative product development or business processes. Migrant workers are highlighted by FECCA as ‘beneficial in training Australian workers in skill sets where we have deficits’ (FECCA 2013, p. 27), while young people in the United Kingdom are emphasised as contributing ‘new skills and fresh ideas’ (CIPD 2013, p. 1). One toolkit refers to research that suggests ethnically diverse groups can provide ‘higher quality (more effective and feasible) ideas’ than those produced by ‘homogeneous groups’ (VicHealth 2013, p. 1).

Another potential benefit presented in the toolkits is opening up access to new markets and customers. This is best exemplified by the Connections toolkit, which argues that migrants and refugees can help businesses ‘enhance customer service, strengthen existing market share or expand into new markets, both in Australia and overseas’ (DIAC 2013, p. 4).

Legal and policy compliance
Some of the reviewed toolkits emphasise the need for compliance with legal or normative frameworks for diversity and inclusion.

The Right smart employers toolkits are designed specifically to assist employers to comply with Victoria’s Equal Opportunity Act (VEOHRC 2010c). The Workplace diversity toolkit also emphasises legislative compliance, by plainly stating:

A key reason for embracing diversity in the workplace is that state and federal laws make it illegal not to (TasCOSS 2012, p. 1).

The FECCA fact sheets (FECCA 2013) also include a section on workplace discrimination and legal frameworks relating to CALD groups, while the Diversity management toolkit
includes a briefing note on compliance requirements in Australia about equal employment opportunity (ACIB 2001).

**Indirect benefits in the workplace**
A smaller group of toolkits refer to the indirect benefits of ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusion’ for the existing workforce.

According to ACIB (2001, p. 89), ‘unmanaged’ diversity in the workplace can create social ‘out’ and ‘in’ groups in the workplace, resulting in low job satisfaction, low organisational commitment and high ‘withdrawal’ (absenteeism and turnover). VicHealth (2013, p. 2) cites their own evidence review, which argues that race-based discrimination can lead to ‘higher rates of ill health, especially mental health and problems such as anxiety, depression, stress’. A key example in the review is an epidemiological study which shows an association between self-reported racism and ill health for oppressed racial groups (Paradies 2006). VicHealth draw on this research to conclude that nurturing cultural diversity can reduce race-based discrimination and increase workforce participation (VicHealth 2013). Similarly, FECCA argues that existing staff can also benefit from ‘cross-cultural interaction’ (FECCA 2013, p. 23).
Figure 2.2 below plots the 20 toolkits reviewed in this study according to their relative emphasis on social or economic justifications, and direct or indirect benefits.

Several observations can be made:

- The majority of toolkits (16 of the 20) present a proposition to employers that emphasises direct business benefits.

- All of the toolkits focusing on mature-age jobseekers are justified in terms of labour demand arguments (such as skills shortages), while those focusing on young people mostly have social rationales.

- Toolkits that focus on CALD groups are the most varied in terms of their underlying justifications and value propositions.

Figure 2.2  Employer toolkits’ rationales and emphasis on benefits

Note: Toolkit numbers match the list in Appendix B
Tools and supporting content

The ILO’s (2007) framework for different tools distinguishes between practical tools, tools that aim to inform or educate, and examples from practice and experience.

Table 2.3 summarises the different types of tools found in the sample according to this framework, and shows how they intersect with the strategies for engaging employers described above.

### Table 2.3  Summary of strategies, tool types and supporting content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement strategy</th>
<th>‘How-to’ tools</th>
<th>Knowledge-based tools</th>
<th>Good practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to better understanding</td>
<td>Self-assessment tools and checklists</td>
<td>Educational material e.g. data and statistics, Glossary of terms, Myth-busting/FAQs, Fact sheets</td>
<td>Case studies and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results from existing programs, Web links to programs, services and resources, Testimonials</td>
<td>Case studies and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing to employers’ interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>Step-by-step instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing barriers in the workplace</td>
<td>Self-reflection questions, Audit tools</td>
<td>HR guidance, Strategy suggestions, Policy templates, Step-by-step instructions, Examples of plans</td>
<td>Best practice standards, Case studies and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing practical tools and guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘How-to’ tools

Most of the toolkits reviewed in this study include content presented in a practical format. This means the tools are designed to assist employers to take action: conduct assessments, design procedures or change operations so as to remove barriers for disadvantaged jobseekers. The main practical tools are described below.
Advantages and limitations of employer toolkits

Self-assessment tools
To help employers assess their current workplace situation and internal barriers, resources such as the Australian Government/AIG Investing in experience toolkit offer self-assessment tools (DEEWR 2012). These tools assist the employer to analyse job issues (such as absenteeism or staff turnover) by age bracket, reflect on existing policies and procedures, and prepare an ‘action plan’ with targets.

Audit tools
Other resources such as the Australian Human Rights Commission/DCA (2014) and DCA (2014) cultural diversity tools are presented as online, ‘self-audit’ processes. Completing the questionnaire leads to an assessment summary that can be used to measure progress and identify areas for further development (see Figure 2.3).

Figure 2.3  Example of self-assessment summary

Instructions
To aid the design of new processes, several toolkits offer step-by-step instructions (made as generic as possible), checklists and guidance notes. Most of these tools are ‘designed to be completed by a staff member with oversight and/or awareness of organisational planning, policies, recruitment and retention processes, such as a senior manager, human resources manager or diversity officer’ (Australian Human Rights Commission 2014).

Checklists
‘Checklists’ are presented as lists of processes against which employers can compare their existing practice. Examples include the DIVERSeCity checklists for welcoming, orienting and retaining new immigrant workers (DIVERSeCity Community Resources Society and PEERs Employment and Education Resources 2011). The VEOHRC Right
smart toolkit (2010c) includes downloadable Microsoft Word policy templates, such as the ‘Equal opportunity in practice’ template. Employers can insert their business name into the document, and adapt sections as required.

Knowledge-based tools
Tools that aim to educate employers (thus enabling them to take informed action) are also a key component of many toolkits. The ‘knowledge-based’ content of employer toolkits is often presented to justify recommendations and encourage employer action.

Research findings
Knowledge-based tools include research data and findings on employment barriers for specific groups. The DCA Cracking the cultural ceiling online toolkit presents survey data and research which focuses on the views of Asian workers, forming the basis of a case for inclusion of people with Asian cultural backgrounds into the Australian economy (Diversity Council Australia 2014).

Fact sheets
The FECCA Harmony in the workplace fact sheets offer information for employers on how to acknowledge the cultural diversity in the workplace, recognising ‘clothing and dress, religious practices, social values, customs, family obligations and non-verbal behaviour’ (FECCA 2013, p. 6). Such information is educational rather than action-oriented.

Myth-busting
Question-and-answer formats and ‘myth-busting’ information are also used in some toolkits to educate employers about what they can expect when working with specific jobseeker groups. Both the ACCI and FECCA toolkits use this method to challenge preconceptions or biases. The authors of the ACCI toolkit argue that:

[Employers] may need to reconsider beliefs and attitudes that may exclude participation by mature aged workers in [their] workplace. There are many myths and misconceptions about mature aged workers that are dispelled by real evidence from businesses already employing mature aged workers ... (ACCI & VECCI 2012, p. 6).

Glossaries
Finally, some toolkits provide glossaries of key terms that represent attempts to get stakeholders to use a common language when recruiting from disadvantaged groups. For example, the Gap Inc. youth toolkit includes definitions of terms such as ‘opportunity youth’, ‘work-ready skills’ and ‘wraparound support’ (Gap Inc. 2012, pp. 136–8).
Advantages and limitations of employer toolkits

Good practices
To illustrate how human resource policies and special recruitment programs may operate, a number of toolkits present examples of ‘good practice’ to guide employers.

Case studies
Strong examples of this approach can be found in the UK Commission for Employment and Skills (2014) work experience toolkit, which includes an entire section with short case studies, including illustrative quotes. The case studies are used to ‘convince’ employer audiences that ‘every business can do something, no matter how small, to inspire young people’ (p. 12). An example of another case study of youth work placements is provided in Figure 2.4.

Quotes from employers are also used in the DIAC toolkit to demonstrate the benefits of hiring refugee workers. For example:

Our refugee employees have shown great dedication and determination to their work and a surprising synergy with the region ... Based on our experience with Karen refugees and other migrants, we encourage any employer to embrace this opportunity and make a difference (DIAC 2013, p. 5).

As well as quotes, case studies often contain practice principles, advice from employers, links to model company policies, and descriptions of how employers made their employment practices more inclusive.

Figure 2.4  Example of a toolkit case study
However, an associated risk of toolkits is that they may also have the effect of reinforcing stereotypes about unemployment or labour market disadvantage, rather than challenging conventional assumptions. The case study in Figure 3.4 is an example of how the unemployment of young people may be represented as an individual failing (of low skills, self-confidence or motivation), while the intervention of a ‘charitable’ program creates an opportunity—‘even if it doesn’t lead to a job’. Toolkits that reproduce stereotypes or assumptions are less likely to influence the ‘inclusiveness’ of mainstream recruitment practices.

Within our sample, the international toolkits included more case studies and examples of actual implementation. The Australian toolkits appeared less empirically informed and showed less evidence of consultation and input from businesses, LMIs or jobseekers.
3 Key themes in guidance to employers

Our analysis identified three key themes of employer guidance in the reviewed toolkits:

- the importance of modifying human resources policies and practices. Restrictive recruitment processes are highlighted as creating employment barriers for disadvantaged jobseeker groups
- the need to consider the human resources process from a ‘systemic’ point of view, rather than focusing on targeted intake programs for particular groups
- the role of ‘champions’ in an implementation strategy.

Modifying recruitment practices in the open labour market

Almost all toolkits refer to the effects of standard employer recruitment practices on different jobseeker groups. This is described as a ‘screening out’ effect in the toolkit of the National Seniors Productive Ageing Centre (NSPAC 2014, p. 20): recruitment approaches lead to a ‘small talent pool from which to choose’. Recruitment practices in focus in the toolkits include:

- job advertisements
- position descriptions and selection criteria
- interviews
- candidate and job ‘matching’ processes.

The toolkits suggest that employment barriers are created by ‘inadvertent’ discrimination on the basis of age or cultural background, culturally or gender-specific recruitment ‘events’, narrow selection criteria, and risk management in human resources approaches.

Few authors suggest that employers intentionally discriminate during recruitment. However, the Workplace diversity toolkit argues that stereotypical and prejudiced views can exist about groups with ‘visible difference’, and its advice is for employers to challenge their own assumptions about cultural and organisational fit (TasCOSS 2012, p. 8). Discussing age discrimination, the VEOHRC claims that ‘ageist stereotypes and discriminatory work practices still represent a significant barrier to meaningful participation in employment for older people’ (VEOHRC 2010b, p. 1). The authors of the Workplace cultural diversity tool argue:

Some organisations are not aware that they inadvertently discriminate against employees, and potential employees, from different cultural backgrounds (Australian Human Rights Commission 2014).

The ACIB toolkit (2001) defines three core objectives of human resource management (HRM): attracting qualified job candidates, retaining desirable employees, and motivating employees. The authors then advocate an approach that uses HRM to
broaden recruitment pools and remove discriminatory practices. The intended result is that the employer develops ‘supply pipelines’ from underrepresented jobseeker groups (ACIB 2001, p. 24).

FECCA contends that although recruitment processes may be designed to be ‘fair and reasonable’ on merit, these notions are not culture or gender neutral (FECCA 2013, p. 13). Job-related key selection criteria may be unknown to people of other countries and cultures. Their advice is to make use of more ‘open’ criteria: job descriptions should ‘encourage a diverse pool of applicants and demonstrate commitment to cultural diversity and principles of access and equity’ (p. 8).

Similarly, the Australian Human Rights Commission (2014) argues that job advertisements, position descriptions and selection criteria should be written in plain language and be easy for people from different cultural backgrounds to understand.

The Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS) points out that job interviews are ‘highly culturally specific events’ that ‘reflect the normative values and styles of the mainstream culture’, and rely upon ‘subjective, culturally influenced judgments of candidates’ ways of presenting themselves’ (TasCOSS 2012, p. 9). Without some modifications, non-mainstream applicants are unable to compete in standard recruitment events.

The VEOHRC also points out that, during recruitment, employers should ‘focus solely on matching the skills and experience of the candidates against the requirements of the job’ (VEOHRC 2010a, p. 2). This implies that other factors such as culture, race, or age should not determine the candidate and job ‘matching’ decision.

Some toolkits emphasise the unfortunate influence of risk management on recruitment. ACCI, for example, argues that while businesses may think mature-age workers are ‘risky’ hires, this is an ‘incorrect perception’ because the valuable skills and knowledge that this group possesses offsets any adjustments required (ACCI & VECCI 2012, pp. 3–6). Similarly, an employer quote included in the DIAC toolkit suggests that to ‘maximise the effectiveness of the workplace,’ employers should ‘not highlight what employees don’t have, but highlight what they do have’ (DIAC 2013, p. 24).

Targeted programs or ‘holistic’ human resource strategies?

Some employer toolkits recommend designing targeted programs that respond to specific needs. Particularly for young people, special targeted programs such as apprenticeships, workplace training, and mentoring and buddy systems are recommended (e.g. Fair Work Ombudsman 2013). Young people are highlighted by the Fair Work Ombudsman as ‘a vulnerable section of the workforce and deserve particular protection’ (p. 1). A similar approach is to suggest for young people bridging or ‘pipeline’ strategies that do not necessarily include actual jobs—such as traineeships, scholarships and school-based programs (e.g. ACIB 2001). Gap Inc. (2012, p. 8) also argue that soft
skills training, ‘work-ready’ skills development programs, and ‘learn and earn’ programs such as apprenticeships are valuable for young jobseekers.

FECCA explains why targeted programs are sometimes needed:

If all workers were treated the same, most workplaces would be supporting unequal opportunities and outcomes – for example, between men and women, immigrants and Australian-born, disabled and non-disabled, older and younger workers. Effective diversity strategies see difference as both a strength and a challenge needing planned responses for an optimal outcome. This must be explained to employees so they understand why targeted programs are used for some workers. Immigrants make up one quarter of the workforce, so they are a substantial minority group (FECCA 2013, p. 21).

Elsewhere, however, ACCI and VECCI argue (referring to mature-age workers) that specific policies might ‘stigmatise the group’, and highlights the need for a ‘holistic human resource strategy’ (ACCI & VECCI 2012, p. 8). The National Seniors Productive Ageing Centre also suggests that ‘the best outcomes are achieved from an integrated, age diverse approach, rather than specific initiatives solely aimed at older workers’ (NSPAC 2014, p. 42). These comments emphasise that targeted programs may exclude some candidates from mainstream employment by over-emphasising disadvantage.

The *Investing in experience* toolkit encourages HR managers to examine the ‘whole’ process from job design and recruitment through to training, development and retention (DEEWR 2012). Similarly, the AHRC web-based toolkit (2014) takes the employer through an end-to-end review process (with policy and procedural suggestions), with categories of:

- leadership and commitment
- strategy development
- recruitment and retention approaches
- building workplace ‘culture’.

TasCOSS (2012, p. 5) also promotes a ‘systemic approach to embedding diversity into the organisation’s vision, goals, policies and strategic plans’.

The repeated emphasis on holistic HR approaches and systemic reviews throughout most of the toolkits suggests that the preference of authors of all types (including government, private and industry bodies) is for employers to restructure their mainstream work practices, rather than to design separate or ‘special’ programs to ‘accommodate’ disadvantaged jobseeker groups.
Role of ‘champions’ in implementation

The role of ‘champions’—enthusiastic and committed leaders within the employing organisation—is emphasised strongly in four toolkits as an implementation strategy. Champions, it is argued, can ‘lead, promote, and encourage’ participation in diversity and inclusion initiatives (NSPAC 2014, p. 35). ‘Committed business leaders are essential’, argue ACCI & VECCI (2012, p. 7). Such individuals also play a role in active promotion of policy and programs, helping and encouraging staff, advocating, and monitoring compliance (FECCA 2013). Finally, champions of diversity initiatives can communicate the company vision, and ‘avoid breeding cynicism by encouraging leaders to talk the talk and walk the walk’ (Diversity Council Australia 2014).
4 Discussion

Practicality and business orientation of employer tools

The sample of toolkits in this study offers a broad range of practical tools to employers. As noted above, most tools are designed to assist employers to change their human resource policies and practices. Most emphasise systemic approaches to inclusive human resource management, while some toolkits acknowledge that it is sometimes appropriate to design special programs. Most toolkit guidance is structured around process changes (rather than strategic choices) changes to enable inclusive employment, with associated tools to assess and plan for these changes.

There is a widespread emphasis on self-assessment, audit and reflection by employers in order to identify and address possible demand-side employment barriers. Information is also presented to convince employers that the apparent disadvantages associated with young people, mature-age and CALD groups can be converted into business benefits.

Contributing to a better understanding of employment barriers

Although it is unclear to what extent toolkits are used by employers, the proliferation of these materials has the potential to improve understanding of employment barriers. The diversity of toolkit producers suggests there is interest in many sectors to build this understanding. The contributions of business groups, such as the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI), the Australian Industry Group (AIG), Diversity Council of Australia (DCA), and public institutions, such as the Australian Human Rights Commission and the Fair Work Ombudsman, increase the potential influence of toolkits among employers.

Cumulatively, toolkits can add to the currency and impact of terms such as workforce ‘diversity’ or ‘inclusion’. In addition, a focus by employers on one category of disadvantaged jobseekers may open up opportunities for others. As TasCOSS argues:

A workplace culture that supports diversity ensures that all people have the opportunity to compete for careers without being disadvantaged by difference ...

... An inclusive work environment allows employees to contribute to their full potential through recognising and supporting their diverse strengths and needs (TasCOSS 2012, p. 4).

That some employers will consider adapting HR practice to embrace inclusion and diversity is a positive step towards addressing disadvantage in the labour market.

However, an emphasis on ‘difference’ in workplace culture can itself become a disadvantage for some employees. It can have the effect of reproducing stereotypes or conventional assumptions, rather than making workplaces more ‘inclusive’ overall.
‘One size fits all’ guidance?

Although toolkits are sometimes designed with specific jobseeker groups in mind, none in our sample were targeted to specific types of employers – either in terms of size or sector. Employers are discussed in generic terms, presumably to appeal to the broadest possible cross-section of readers. As a result, toolkits tend to present ‘one size fits all’ employer guidance. Understanding how well generic guidance actually applies to different employer types would require additional evidence on usage or ‘uptake’ of toolkits (which is beyond the scope of this study).

Limitations of toolkits

Toolkits require ‘willing’ employers and ‘job-ready’ candidates

Each toolkit reviewed in this study is designed to be implemented directly by employers. An implicit assumption is that employers are experiencing the effects of labour or skills shortages, and are already willing to consider recruiting from disadvantaged or underemployed groups. For example, one toolkit argues:

> We know that employers’ appetite to recruit more young people is increasing (CIPD 2013, p. 1).

However, the toolkits do not present evidence that employers are willing to consider alternative sources of labour, or have an ‘appetite’ to actively seek them out. In a tight labour market such as Australia’s, employers may need to limit the pool of candidates for available jobs, rather than increase it. Such employers may have little interest in making recruitment processes more ‘open’ or ‘inclusive’.

In advocating the inclusion of certain groups of jobseekers identified by their age or cultural background, toolkits also emphasise the need for different treatment of these groups from the ‘mainstream’. An alternative approach would be to recognise that a broad range of candidates have the skills and attributes suited to available jobs, and that filtering or screening out on the basis of age or cultural background is unwise from a business perspective, and potentially discriminatory.

Another assumption behind most toolkits is that disadvantaged jobseekers are ready to take up the jobs that are available, and have adequate human capital—work history, local experience, skills and qualifications. In fact, individual jobseekers have different levels of ‘readiness’ for the job market, and therefore require different degrees of support. In addition, the possibility that young people, CALD and mature-age jobseekers may be experiencing multiple forms of disadvantage such as housing insecurity or ill health—placing them further from mainstream employment opportunities—is not discussed in the toolkits we reviewed.

The necessary conditions of a ‘willing’ employer and ‘job-ready’ candidate therefore limit the audiences and contexts to which the toolkits are relevant.
Role of LMIs is unclear
Few of the toolkits in this study make reference to the role of LMIs, employment agencies or other third parties in supporting employment efforts for disadvantaged jobseekers. Exceptions among Australian toolkits include the one produced by DIAC (2013, p. 11), which suggests that employers partner with organisations experienced in working with migrants to advise on how to ‘introduce migrants into your business and help other employees connect with them’. ACIB (2001) also recommends that employers consider engaging specialised recruitment agencies, and recruiting from non-traditional sources such as community groups or migrant service agencies. The US-based Gap Inc. youth toolkit lists dozens of partner organisations for consideration by employers (Gap Inc. 2012).

While toolkits emphasise employers’ responsibility for removing recruitment barriers, LMIs can support jobseekers into employment by addressing job readiness. A more holistic approach to inclusive employment would consider a combination of employer and LMI interventions to create sustainable workforce engagement, as well as the enabling conditions for workforce participation—such as housing, transport or childcare.

Toolkits support micro, not macro-level change
Few of the reviewed toolkits discuss the broader social or economic implications of unemployment and underemployment, or labour market inequity. This may be because most are designed for individual employers. Any change at the micro level is therefore incremental and voluntary.

Australian toolkits, in particular, also lack reference to broader employment initiatives or any evidence of industry and multi-sector partnerships. In contrast, there is evidence in the US and UK toolkits that government agencies and the community sector are supporting partnerships with employers to boost employment outcomes for different jobseeker groups.

Author assumptions and limited evidence of implementation
A challenge in assessing the usefulness of toolkits is to understand how the guidance and tools were developed, and the motivations of authoring organisations in doing so.

In some toolkits, for example, employers are asked to compare their organisational practices against ‘best practices’ or ‘standards’ (see Figure 4.1 overleaf). This suggests that a review of existing examples has been conducted to arrive at a reasonable standard. However, few toolkits articulate a methodology that suggests this kind of evidence has been reviewed. As a result, some of the guidance in toolkits is difficult to verify as evidence-based, or having been tested.
The rationale for developing employer toolkits often reflects the producers of the document and their organisational mission. Toolkits developed by employer associations emphasise business benefits and make less reference to social issues or compliance. For example, the rationale for ‘cracking the cultural ceiling’ is presented by DCA (a member-driven organisation representing employers) in terms of leadership potential, profit and performance, innovation, market access, brand and talent (Diversity Council Australia 2014). Toolkits developed by social organisations take a different approach and emphasise a commitment to broader concepts of diversity in the workforce and the community (e.g. TasCOSS 2012).

Voices of jobseekers are not prominent
Few of the reviewed toolkits present the ‘voices’ and perspectives of workers who face difficulties finding work. This means that toolkits do not offer employers insights into how people experience labour market disadvantage.

There are some exceptions. For example, the DCA online toolkit is based on a survey of over 300 people with Asian cultural backgrounds, and provides a perspective on Asian workers in the Australian economy. They report experiencing cultural bias, Western leadership models and difficulties establishing ‘relationship capital’ (Diversity Council Australia 2014). The DIAC toolkit also includes several quotes from migrant jobseekers about their experiences engaging with Australian employers.

More often, however, the extent to which jobseeker groups have contributed to the content of toolkits is not clear, and examples of their input (direct quotes or general descriptions) are not included.

Conclusion: Advancing an inclusive employment agenda?
This study concludes that toolkits can play a role in promoting more equitable access to employment opportunities, by using different strategies and value propositions to engage employers. However, broader tasks of changing the design of jobs and the functioning of the labour market, while promoting social integration, need to be driven by larger-scale efforts that involve more than just willing employers.
Most of the reviewed employer toolkits do not include discussion of the social or economic implications of unemployment, underemployment or labour market inequity. They are resources designed for implementation by individual employers, and do not offer commentaries on macro-level challenges. Australian toolkits, in particular, also lack reference to possible industry and multi-sector employment initiatives.

The potential impact of the toolkit approach is also limited by the assumption that employer audiences are amenable to recruiting from non-mainstream jobseeker groups. The argument that ‘jobs are available if only employers can be persuaded to offer them to unemployed people’ (Ingold & Stuart 2014) does not hold for all employer types or sectors of the economy. This means that toolkits and other ‘off-the-shelf’ resources play only a small part in responding to labour market disadvantage.

While they are helpful for providing information about employment barriers and generic guidance for reducing them, toolkits still require contextualisation and ‘activation’ and by employers. Implementing the guidance requires commitment, negotiation, planning and preparation. No matter how comprehensive, toolkits alone cannot address labour market disadvantage without coordinated action between employers, policy-makers and LMIs.
## Appendices

### Appendix A. Organisational websites consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Toolkits?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix B. Summary of selected toolkits

Note: In the table below toolkits are arranged according to target group(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title (with link)</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Employ outside the box: the business case for recruiting and retaining mature age workers | Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI) & Victorian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VECCI) (Australia) | 2012 | Mature-age workers | • Guidance on HR policies and practice  
• Steps to develop recruitment/retention strategies  
• Myth-busting | **Strengths**  
• Promotes assets of mature-age workers  
• Addresses myths/misconceptions  
• Links cohort to broader diversity management issues  

**Limitations**  
• No examples or case studies  
• No evidence of consultation or references |
| 2 | Investing in experience tool kit: making age an advantage | Australian Government/Australian Industry Group (AIG) (Australia) | 2012 | Mature-age workers | • Self-assessment tools and checklists  
• Step-by-step guidance  
• Links to government programs and services | **Strengths**  
• Presents OECD and ABS data on aspects of workforce ageing  
• Addresses holistic HR cycle  

**Limitations**  
• Does not address workplace culture  
• No examples or case studies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title (with link)</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3  | Age management toolkit for employers                 | National Seniors Productive Ageing Centre (NSPAC) (Australia) | 2014 | Mature-age workers    | • Step-by-step guidance ('from start to finish')  
• Suggestions for implementation strategy | Strengths  
• Based on strong research design and evidence  
• Aimed at wide range of employment stakeholders, including unions, training providers and LMI  
Limitations  
• Breadth/detail may not be applicable for smaller employers  
• Resource demands of a highly-structured, strategic approach  
• No case studies or examples |
| 4  | Right smart employers toolkits                       | Victorian Equal Opportunity & Human Rights Commission (VEOHRC) (Australia) | 2010 | Mature-age workers (and others) | • Self-audit tool based on compliance with equal opportunity legislation  
• Checklists  
• FAQs  
• Policy templates | Strengths  
• Emphasis on designing and implementing equal opportunity policies  
Limitations  
• Simplistic yes/no questions in audit  
• No case studies or examples |
| 5  | Connections: an employer’s guide to working with migrants and refugees | Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) (Australia) | 2013 | CALD (Refugees and migrants) | • Tips and suggestions  
• Links to government programs and services | Strengths  
• Quotes and testimonials from businesses  
• Voices of migrants represented  
Limitations  
• More high-level, less specific and practical guidance  
• Few direct strategies included |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title (with link)</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6 | Harmony in the workplace: delivering the diversity dividend | Federation of Ethnic Communities’ Councils of Australia (FECCA) (Australia) | 2013 | CALD            | • Recruitment, development and retention tips  
• Legal frameworks  
• Myth-busting | **Strengths**  
• Focus on discrimination-related employment barriers  
• More detailed analysis of Australian labour market context and opportunities  
**Limitations**  
• Guidance may not be realistic or applicable for smaller employers  
• Lack of direct, practical ‘tools’ |
| 7 | Workplace cultural diversity tool                     | Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) & Diversity Council of Australia (DCA) (Australia) | 2014 | CALD            | • Web-based assessment tool  
• ‘Best practice standards’  
• Case studies  
• Description of key terms e.g. ‘barriers’, ‘pathways’ | **Strengths**  
• Based on detailed literature review and research  
• Practical and easy to navigate  
• Emphasis on recruitment/selection ‘bias’ and inclusion  
**Limitations**  
• Emphasis on formal policies and strategies – may not be appropriate for small business  
• Case studies are mostly large employers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title (with link)</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cracking the cultural ceiling: future proofing your business in the Asian century</td>
<td>Diversity Council of Australia (DCA) (Australia)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>- Web-based guidance and tips&lt;br&gt;• ‘Talent lock’ and ‘Talent key’ (problem/solution) format</td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Based on survey data and consultations with people from Asian cultural backgrounds&lt;br&gt;• Clear, easy to navigate, compelling statistics for employers <strong>Limitations</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Emphasis on existing workforce rather than access to labour market&lt;br&gt;• Narrow focus on ‘Asian talent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orientation, retention and promotion: a guide for building welcoming and inclusive workplaces for new immigrant workers</td>
<td>DIVERSEcity Community Resources Society (Canada)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>- Step-by-step guidance&lt;br&gt;- Glossary of terms&lt;br&gt;- Examples and case studies&lt;br&gt;- Checklists</td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Based on consultation and research with business and community organisations&lt;br&gt;• Part of a broader set of employer resources targeting diversity groups  <strong>Limitations</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Emphasis on ‘skilled’ immigrants only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hiring and retaining skilled immigrants: a cultural competence toolkit</td>
<td>British Columbia Human Resources Management Association (BC HRMA) (Canada)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>- HR process guidance&lt;br&gt;- Tips&lt;br&gt;- Cultural competency tools (e.g. ranking matrices)</td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Includes quotes from employers <strong>Limitations</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Focused on HR practitioners only&lt;br&gt;• Emphasis on ‘skilled’ immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title (with link)</td>
<td>Author(s) &amp; country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Target group(s)</td>
<td>Format of tools</td>
<td>Strengths/limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11 | Have you recruited staff from overseas? Is it working well?                    | Settlement Services NZ (New Zealand)| 2011 | CALD           | • Informative ‘cards’ • High-level tips • Checklists | Strengths: Perspectives of CALD employees represented • Clear and visual  
|    |                                                                                |                                     |      |                |                | Limitations: Very limited guidance and more focused on awareness-raising              |
| 12 | Best practice guide: an employer’s guide to employing young workers            | Fair Work Ombudsman (Australia)     | 2013 | Young people   | • Descriptive information • General guidance • Brief checklist | Strengths: Situated within a series of publications on ‘work & family’  
|    |                                                                                |                                     |      |                |                | Limitations: High-level guidance only • No case studies or examples • No recruitment guidance |
| 13 | Not just making tea... reinventing work experience                              | UK Commission for Employment and Skills (UKCES) (UK) | 2014 | Young people (Work experience) | • ‘Myth-busting’ • Quotes from employers • Links to forms of support/assistance and relevant organisations • Case studies | Strengths: Links to broader social challenges of youth disengagement and benefits of work experience  
<p>|    |                                                                                |                                     |      |                |                | Limitations: Limited practical guidance • No specific ‘tools’                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14 | Recruiting young people: top tips for employers | Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) (UK) | 2013 | Young people | • High-level recruitment guidance | Strengths: 
• Part of a broader research program on the role of employers in reducing youth unemployment 
• Emphasis on making recruitment more inclusive for young people 
Limitations: 
• Brief/limited detail |
| 15 | Connecting youth and business: a toolkit for employers | Gap Inc. (USA) | 2012 | Young people | • Step-by-step instructions for creating a youth-focused program | Strengths: 
• Grounded in statistical and empirical evidence 
Limitations: 
• Focused on program response, rather than core practice adaptations |
| 16 | Work experience placements that work: a guide for employers | CIPD (UK) | 2012 | Young people (work experience) | • High-level HR guidance 
• Case studies and ‘best practice examples’ | Strengths: 
• Examples and quotes 
Limitations: 
• Focused on a specific type of program (2–8 week placements) 
• No practical tools (general guidance) |
| 17 | Workplace diversity toolkit | Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS) (Australia) | 2012 | Diversity groups (general) | • Good practices and recruitment tips 
• Examples of workforce diversity plans 
• Links to programs, services and resources | Strengths: 
• Highlights multiple forms of disadvantage and barriers 
Limitations: 
• Very high-level guidance (less practical) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title (with link)</th>
<th>Author(s) &amp; country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Target group(s)</th>
<th>Format of tools</th>
<th>Strengths/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18 | **Attract, retain and motivate: a toolkit for diversity management**            | DIMIA/Australian Centre for International Business (ACIB) (Australia) | 2001 | Diversity groups | • Series of questions for employers mapped to HRM processes  
• Case studies from Australian companies  
• Best practice recruitment and selection tips | Strengths  
• Strong theoretical and empirical evidence base  
• Detailed exploration of HRM process  
Limitations  
• Language is focused on procedure and policy and may be less practical for many employers |
| 19 | **An employer’s guide to: creating an inclusive workplace**                     | Equality and Human Rights Commission (UK)    | 2010 | Diversity groups | • Step-by-step guidance  
• Self-reflection questions  
• Case studies  
• Q&A  
• Links to resources | Strengths  
• Detail and variety of case studies  
• Addresses a variety of business types/sizes  
Limitations  
• Does not contain guidance for working with specific cohorts  
• Mainly focused on voices of employers/existing staff, rather than program participants themselves |
| 20 | **Employing a diverse workforce: making it work**                              | Alberta Employment and Immigration (Canada)   | 2008 | Diversity groups | • Practical recruitment advice  
• Steps to building an ‘inclusion plan’  
• Self-assessment checklist | Strengths  
• Addresses full HR cycle and broad base of business owners and recruiters  
Limitations  
• Voices of diversity groups not represented  
• Specifically situated within Alberta labour market |
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