

Interventions on Gender Equity in the Workplace: A Scoping Review

Summary

We conducted a scoping review to examine evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on interventions examining gender equity (GE) in workplace or volunteer settings. We aimed to determine if the interventions considered intersections of gender and PROGRESS-Plus equity variables (e.g., race/ethnicity). We identified 24 GE-promoting interventions in the workplace and categorized them into six themes. Many studies had a positive statement for their primary outcomes. The majority of studies were primarily conducted in the USA. Most studies reported at least 1 element of the PROGRESS-Plus criteria (e.g., gender/sex, occupation). No RCTs reported on all elements of the PROGRESS-Plus criteria

Implications

The results of this review can be used by researchers, academic, healthcare and policy professionals to inform future research and organizational priorities. There is a need to consider non-binary gender identities and issues related to intersectionality. This scoping review highlights a need for future standardized outcome measures considering specific contexts and cultures.

Reference: Tricco AC, Parker A, Khan PA, et al. Interventions on gender equity in the workplace: a scoping review. *BMC Med.* 2024;22(1):149.

PMID: [38581003](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38581003/)

For more information, please contact Dr. Andrea Tricco:
andrea.tricco@unityhealth.to

What is the current situation?

- The importance of gender and sex identity is widely known in health research. However, the complexities of sex and gender on a global scale that widen the observed gender gap require more attention.
- Further examination of GE disparities within workplace or volunteer settings is required to deliver scientific excellence, quality, integrity and patient care.

What is the objective?

- To conduct a scoping review to determine whether interventions considered the intersection of gender and other variables, including PROGRESS-Plus equity variables (e.g., race/ethnicity).

How was the review conducted?

- The review was conducted using the JBI guide and results were reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR).
- We searched MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, Cumulated Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Web of Science, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Index to Legal Periodicals and Books, Public Affairs Information Service (PAIS) Index, Policy Index File, and the Canadian Business & Current Affairs Database from inception to May 2022.
- Included studies reporting (P) participants of any gender aged 18 years or older, (I) any intervention promoting GE targeting people, organizations, or systems, (C) any comparator, (O) any outcomes related to GE (S) RCTs or quasi-randomized control trials.
- Prevalence of each PROGRESS-PLUS variable was summarized; Place of residence, Race/Ethnicity/Culture/Language, Occupation, Gender/Sex, Religion, Education, Socioeconomic Status, and Social Capital.

What did the review find?

- We screened 8,855 citations, 803 grey literature sources, and 663 full-text articles.
- 24 RCT studies and one companion report were included that identified GE-promoting interventions in the workplace and categorized into 6 themes. 20 interventions had positive conclusion statements for their primary outcomes.
- 23 studies reported at least one PROGRESS-Plus variable (e.g., sex, gender or occupation).
- Most studies did not report the process of determining gender/sex; 2 studies identified non-binary gender identity.
- The review found a lack of literature that promotes workplace GE, highlighting the requirement for standardized outcome measures considering specific contexts and cultures.

Funded by Canadian Institutes of Health
Research (CIHR)



CIHR IRSC
Canadian Institutes of Health Research
Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada