

The Paradox of Diversity: How Critical Race Theory Challenges Conventional Approaches to Equity and Inclusion

¹ Dadang Irawan, ² Seger Santoso, ³ Mia Christy Patricia

^{1, 2, 3} Management STIE Kasih Bangsa, Jakarta Indonesia

Email : ¹ dadang@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id, ² seger@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id, ³ miachristypatricia04@gmail.com

Abstract. *This literature review investigates the paradox of diversity by examining how Critical Race Theory (CRT) challenges conventional approaches to equity and inclusion in organizational settings. The study explores the limitations of traditional diversity management frameworks, which often focus on representation or meritocracy without addressing deeper systemic issues of racism and discrimination. By applying CRT's principles of intersectionality and social justice, this review highlights how diversity programs that neglect to confront historical and structural power imbalances may fail to achieve true equity. The findings suggest that CRT offers a more comprehensive approach to understanding diversity, enabling organizations to create strategies that address inequities at their core. However, the review also acknowledges the limitations of applying CRT in diverse global contexts and the challenges organizations may face in implementing these strategies. The study concludes by recommending further empirical research on the outcomes of CRT-based diversity initiatives and suggests expanding the focus beyond race to include other dimensions of diversity such as gender and disability.*

Keywords: *Critical Race Theory, diversity management, equity and inclusion, systemic racism, intersectionality*

1. INTRODUCTION

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DE&I) are central to organizational development in today's globalized world. The increasing emphasis on these principles is driven by a desire to create workplaces where people of all backgrounds feel welcomed and valued. However, achieving these goals remains complex due to the persistent influence of systemic inequalities, cultural misunderstandings, and institutional biases. As organizations increasingly adopt diversity strategies, questions arise about how best to manage and foster true inclusivity. Critical Race Theory (CRT) has emerged as a valuable framework that addresses the complexities of race, power, and justice in organizational contexts. This literature review explores the paradoxes inherent in conventional diversity strategies and evaluates how CRT challenges traditional approaches to equity and inclusion.

At the heart of diversity strategies are assumptions about the benefits of inclusivity and unity. Waldman and Sparr (2023) critique Critical Race Theory, suggesting that it conflicts with the goal of promoting diversity and unity in organizations. Their argument echoes the broader "anti-woke" discourse, which casts CRT as divisive and counterproductive in promoting harmony in diverse environments (Thomason et al., 2023). However, their critique largely draws from opinion-based sources rather than engaging deeply with CRT scholarship (Opoku-Dakwa & Rice, 2024). This review extends existing rebuttals by showing how CRT contributes to diversity strategies and demonstrates its relevance for future research in organizational management.

Critical Race Theory, originating in legal studies, has become a crucial lens through which scholars and practitioners analyze systemic inequalities (Bell, 1980). CRT argues that racism is not merely an individual or isolated phenomenon but a structural feature embedded in laws, institutions, and everyday interactions. As noted by Kolivoski, Weaver, and Constance-Huggins (2014), CRT emphasizes that race and racism are deeply intertwined with power dynamics and that these issues must be addressed if organizations aim to create truly equitable environments.

One of the core tenets of CRT is "interest convergence," which suggests that advances in racial equity only occur when they align with the interests of the dominant group (Bell, 1980). This theory challenges conventional meritocratic beliefs that diversity can be achieved through colorblind policies and good intentions alone (Castilla & Benard, 2010). Instead, CRT encourages an examination of how power structures maintain inequalities, even in environments that espouse values of diversity and inclusion (Ray, 2019).

The paradox inherent in diversity management is the tension between celebrating differences and fostering unity (Ferdman, 2017). While traditional diversity strategies often aim to create a harmonious work environment, they can inadvertently suppress discussions about inequality and marginalization. This tendency to avoid uncomfortable conversations about race, gender, and power reinforces existing hierarchies and stifles the potential for meaningful change (Konrad, Richard, & Yang, 2021).

Positive Organizational Behavior (POB), which Waldman and Sparr (2023) champion as an alternative to CRT, focuses on promoting positive emotions, well-being, and organizational success (Luthans, 2002). While POB has merits in fostering a positive work culture, it tends to sidestep the critical examination of negative organizational behaviors such as discrimination and racism (Opoku-Dakwa & Rice, 2024). By focusing solely on positive traits, POB risks minimizing or ignoring the systemic barriers that prevent marginalized groups from fully participating in organizational life.

The paradox of diversity management becomes evident when organizations prioritize unity over equity. As noted by Thomason et al. (2023), efforts to "soften" diversity initiatives to avoid conflict can dilute their effectiveness. W&S's recommendation to reject CRT and focus on unity-oriented strategies overlooks the importance of addressing systemic racism and inequality, which CRT highlights as central to achieving true diversity and inclusion.

CRT's critique of power and privilege is essential for understanding the limitations of current diversity practices. Traditional approaches often view diversity as a business case, highlighting the benefits of a diverse workforce, such as innovation, better decision-making,

and improved financial performance (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). However, this instrumental approach can reduce diversity to a mere checkbox, ignoring the deeper issues of structural inequality (Bernstein et al., 2020).

A focus on equity—ensuring fair treatment, access, and opportunities for all—demands that organizations go beyond surface-level diversity to tackle underlying causes of exclusion (Mor Barak et al., 2016). CRT offers a framework for analyzing how organizational policies and practices may inadvertently perpetuate inequality, even when designed with the best intentions. For instance, Castilla (2015) demonstrated that transparency and accountability in pay decisions can reduce biases in salary distribution, which disproportionately affect racial minorities.

Moreover, CRT provides a critical lens for examining how race intersects with other aspects of identity, such as gender, sexuality, and class (Greene, 2012). This intersectional approach is crucial for creating diversity strategies that recognize the complexity of individual experiences and identities (Crenshaw, 1989). By embracing CRT, organizations can develop more nuanced and effective strategies for promoting inclusion and equity, rather than relying on one-size-fits-all solutions that fail to address the needs of marginalized groups.

The misrepresentation of CRT as divisive and incompatible with unity in diversity strategies reflects a broader misunderstanding of its goals. As Opoku-Dakwa and Rice (2024) argue, CRT does not promote division; rather, it calls attention to the need for honest conversations about race, power, and privilege. Organizations that aim to create inclusive environments must engage with these uncomfortable but necessary discussions if they are to move beyond superficial diversity initiatives.

Evidence-based management, which integrates empirical research with organizational practice, offers a path forward for DE&I strategies informed by CRT. Research shows that diversity initiatives that explicitly address issues of power and inequality are more likely to succeed in creating inclusive workplaces (Nishii, 2013). By grounding diversity strategies in the realities of structural inequality, organizations can avoid the pitfalls of unity-oriented approaches that ignore the complexities of identity and power.

The debate surrounding CRT and diversity strategies highlights the challenges of creating truly inclusive workplaces. While Waldman and Sparr (2023) advocate for a focus on unity and positive organizational behavior, their critique of CRT overlooks the importance of addressing systemic racism and inequality in diversity management. CRT provides a critical framework for understanding how power and privilege shape organizational dynamics, and its insights are essential for developing effective DE&I strategies.

Organizations that wish to promote equity and inclusion must embrace the paradoxes inherent in diversity management, acknowledging that unity cannot be achieved without confronting the uncomfortable realities of inequality. As future research continues to explore the intersection of diversity, race, and organizational behavior, CRT will remain a valuable tool for guiding evidence-based DE&I strategies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical Race Theory (CRT) has emerged as a significant framework for analyzing the complexities of race, diversity, and inclusion in organizational settings. Over the years, it has provided critical insights into how systems of power and privilege operate, particularly in the context of race, and how conventional diversity strategies often fail to address these deeper structural issues. The focus of this literature review is to explore how CRT offers a unique challenge to conventional approaches to equity and inclusion, highlighting the tensions that arise in diversity management and the potential for CRT to enhance organizational strategies aimed at fostering inclusion.

CRT's foundations rest on the idea that racism is ingrained in the fabric of societal systems, including law, politics, and economics, making it a pervasive force that shapes outcomes for racial minorities (Bell, 1980). This perspective is particularly useful in examining diversity strategies, as it brings attention to the limitations of colorblind or surface-level approaches that do not confront institutional and structural racism (Lynn & Dixon, 2013). Traditional diversity management often focuses on promoting diversity for the sake of representation, without engaging critically with how existing power dynamics undermine true equity (Kolivoski, Weaver, & Constance-Huggins, 2014).

Waldman and Sparr's (2023) critique of CRT, asserting that it is incompatible with the goals of diversity and unity, has sparked significant debate. A growing body of scholarship refutes this critique by emphasizing CRT's contributions to understanding how organizations can go beyond superficial diversity initiatives to address systemic inequalities (Opoku-Dakwa & Rice, 2024). For example, CRT scholars argue that initiatives centered solely on increasing representation or fostering a sense of unity without addressing the root causes of discrimination often perpetuate the very inequities they seek to resolve (Ray, 2019). CRT encourages organizations to confront these issues head-on, challenging the status quo and offering a more substantive path toward inclusion.

One of the central critiques that CRT offers is its challenge to the notion of meritocracy. Traditional approaches to diversity in organizations often operate under the assumption that

workplaces are meritocratic, where individuals are rewarded based on ability and effort alone. However, CRT exposes how meritocratic ideals can obscure racial biases and other forms of discrimination (Castilla & Benard, 2010). Research by Dobbin and Kalev (2016) underscores how merit-based systems can inadvertently reinforce inequalities, as they fail to account for the systemic barriers that racial minorities face in career advancement. Similarly, Castilla's (2015) work demonstrates how organizational processes around pay decisions and promotions, even when designed to be objective, often reflect and perpetuate existing biases.

This paradox is particularly relevant when considering how positive organizational behavior (POB) frameworks are often used to promote diversity. POB focuses on fostering positive workplace environments by emphasizing behaviors like trust, resilience, and collaboration (Luthans & Avolio, 2009). While valuable, these frameworks often overlook the negative experiences, such as racism and exclusion, that marginalized employees encounter in the workplace. As Waldman and Sparr (2023) suggest, POB's focus on positivity can limit critical engagement with the structural factors that create and sustain inequalities. In contrast, CRT insists on a more confrontational approach, advocating for the dismantling of systemic racism rather than simply focusing on superficial solutions (Kolivoski, Weaver, & Constance-Huggins, 2014).

The paradox of diversity management lies in the tension between inclusion and exclusion. Traditional diversity strategies often emphasize inclusion as a way to improve organizational cohesion and unity. However, inclusion efforts that do not directly address exclusionary practices may unintentionally reinforce existing inequalities (Ferdman, 2017). CRT scholars argue that to achieve true inclusion, organizations must confront exclusion head-on, addressing how systems of privilege operate to marginalize certain groups (Bernstein et al., 2020).

A study by Nishii (2013) illustrates how diversity initiatives that emphasize inclusion without addressing power imbalances often result in superficial forms of inclusion that fail to benefit marginalized groups. Nishii found that organizational climates that focus on inclusion without addressing the underlying causes of exclusion, such as racial bias and discrimination, often leave minority employees feeling marginalized despite diversity initiatives. CRT challenges these approaches by highlighting the importance of addressing exclusionary practices and policies that perpetuate racial inequalities in organizations (Lynn & Dixon, 2013).

A combined application of CRT and paradox theory offers a unique approach to understanding diversity management challenges. Paradox theory emphasizes the tensions that

arise from competing organizational goals, such as the tension between fostering unity and addressing inequality (Smith & Lewis, 2011). While Waldman and Sparr (2023) argue that paradox theory undermines the utility of CRT, other scholars suggest that paradox theory, when combined with CRT, provides a valuable framework for understanding the complexities of diversity strategies (Opoku-Dakwa & Rice, 2024).

Smith and Lewis (2011) argue that paradoxes in organizations require leaders to embrace contradictions and tensions rather than seeking to resolve them. Applying this to diversity management, the tension between promoting unity and addressing racial inequality can be seen as a paradox that organizations must navigate. CRT provides critical insights into how organizations can manage these tensions by emphasizing the importance of addressing systemic inequalities rather than ignoring them in favor of superficial unity (Ray, 2019). Opoku-Dakwa and Rice (2024) suggest that paradox theory, when combined with CRT, offers a powerful lens through which organizations can develop more robust and effective diversity strategies.

The literature on CRT and diversity strategies reveals significant tensions between traditional approaches to diversity management and the critical insights offered by CRT. As this review has shown, conventional diversity strategies often fall short of addressing the structural inequalities that perpetuate exclusion and marginalization in organizations. CRT provides a valuable framework for confronting these limitations, emphasizing the need to address systemic racism and challenge meritocratic ideals that often reinforce existing inequalities (Ray, 2019; Castilla & Benard, 2010).

Furthermore, the combination of CRT with paradox theory offers a nuanced approach to diversity management that embraces the complexities and tensions inherent in efforts to promote both unity and equity (Smith & Lewis, 2011). Future research should continue to explore how these frameworks can inform evidence-based management of diversity, equity, and inclusion strategies, with a focus on addressing the structural and systemic factors that perpetuate inequality in the workplace (Opoku-Dakwa & Rice, 2024).

3. METHOD

The chosen methodology for this study is a qualitative literature review. Qualitative literature reviews are increasingly used in social sciences to provide an in-depth, conceptual understanding of complex issues (Snyder, 2019). For this research, the aim is to critically examine how Critical Race Theory (CRT) challenges conventional approaches to equity and inclusion within the framework of diversity strategies. This approach was selected because it

allows for an in-depth exploration of existing theories, debates, and empirical studies that examine how CRT reshapes thinking around diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizational contexts.

In contrast to quantitative literature reviews or systematic reviews, which focus on measuring and comparing data, qualitative literature reviews are more interpretive in nature (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). They provide a critical synthesis of the existing body of knowledge, identify gaps in the literature, and explore how different theories interact. This methodology allows for a more nuanced understanding of how CRT challenges dominant paradigms of diversity and inclusion, particularly through an analysis of paradoxes and tensions within conventional approaches (Bearman, Smith, & Carbone, 2021).

The data for this study comes from a comprehensive review of academic literature published between 2010 and 2024. Relevant sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and reports from scholarly databases. According to Snyder (2019), the quality and credibility of sources are essential to the reliability of a literature review. Therefore, only studies that meet the criteria of peer review and high academic standards were included. In total, the review encompasses approximately 50 scholarly sources that explore CRT, diversity management, organizational behavior, and equity and inclusion frameworks.

A thematic analysis of these sources was conducted, with particular attention paid to how CRT critiques conventional diversity strategies, exposes systemic racism, and offers alternative pathways to equity. Thematic analysis is a widely used method in qualitative literature reviews because it allows researchers to identify recurring patterns, themes, and ideas within a body of work (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Key themes, such as meritocracy, inclusion/exclusion paradoxes, and power dynamics in diversity strategies, were identified and mapped in relation to CRT principles.

To ensure that the review captures relevant research, strict inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Only studies that explicitly focus on diversity management, CRT, or organizational equity were included. For example, studies that focus solely on diversity without engaging with critical race theory or organizational settings were excluded. This criterion aligns with the guidance provided by Hart (2018), who emphasizes the importance of maintaining focus on a well-defined research question in literature reviews. Inclusion criteria were as follows: Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and academic reports published between 2010 and 2024. Studies addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion strategies within organizations. Research that integrates CRT or critiques of conventional diversity frameworks. Articles written in English. Publications after 2010, unless they are seminal works on CRT

(such as Bell, 1980). This structured approach ensured that the data collected was both relevant and comprehensive, allowing for a robust and critical synthesis of the available research.

Data analysis followed a thematic coding process, as described by Braun and Clarke (2006). Each article or book chapter was reviewed for its key arguments, findings, and contributions to the discussion of CRT and diversity management. The analysis aimed to identify three primary themes: The paradox of inclusion and exclusion in diversity strategies (Ferdman, 2017). CRT's critique of meritocracy and neutrality in organizational systems (Castilla & Benard, 2010). The impact of structural racism on equity and inclusion efforts (Ray, 2019). Thematic coding allowed for the identification of patterns across different studies, revealing common critiques of conventional approaches to diversity and inclusion and highlighting where CRT provides new insights (Saldana, 2021). The synthesis of findings from multiple sources also helped in mapping how these concepts evolve in the literature over time.

By coding and categorizing these findings, the review not only consolidates existing knowledge but also surfaces new perspectives on how CRT's challenge to conventional diversity strategies can reshape approaches to organizational equity. To ensure the rigor of the literature review process, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist was employed. CASP is a tool used to evaluate the quality of research articles, ensuring that they are methodologically sound and contribute to the academic debate (CASP, 2018). Each article selected for inclusion was reviewed using CASP criteria, which include assessment of the study's aims, design, methodology, and relevance to the research question.

Moreover, peer debriefing was used as a strategy to maintain credibility. According to Creswell and Poth (2018), peer debriefing helps enhance the validity of qualitative research by allowing other experts to review the coding and thematic analysis. Several scholars familiar with CRT and diversity research reviewed the initial findings and thematic structures to ensure that the interpretations were accurate and aligned with current academic debates.

While this qualitative literature review provides an in-depth exploration of the subject, it is not without limitations. One potential limitation is the subjectivity inherent in thematic analysis, as the coding process relies on the researcher's interpretation of the data (Bearman et al., 2021). Additionally, the review focuses primarily on literature published in English, which may exclude valuable perspectives from non-English academic sources.

Finally, the rapid evolution of the CRT discourse, particularly in response to political and social shifts in recent years, means that new insights may emerge after the completion of this review. Thus, ongoing updates and revisions to the literature will be necessary to keep the analysis current.

This qualitative literature review methodology offers a structured and systematic approach to analyzing the intersection of CRT and diversity strategies in organizational contexts. By utilizing thematic analysis and rigorous inclusion/exclusion criteria, this study provides a comprehensive exploration of how CRT critiques conventional approaches to equity and inclusion, while also offering a pathway for future research. Through the application of qualitative research methods, this review illuminates the potential for CRT to reshape organizational strategies in meaningful and transformative ways.

4. RESULTS

The qualitative literature review on "The Paradox of Diversity: How Critical Race Theory Challenges Conventional Approaches to Equity and Inclusion" yields several key findings that highlight both the strengths and limitations of mainstream diversity initiatives. Through a thematic analysis of the academic literature, three major themes emerged: the paradox of inclusion and exclusion, the critique of meritocracy, and the exposure of systemic racism in conventional diversity strategies. These themes collectively demonstrate how Critical Race Theory (CRT) provides a critical lens through which to understand and challenge dominant frameworks of equity and inclusion in organizations.

The Paradox of Inclusion and Exclusion. A significant finding in this literature review is the inclusion-exclusion paradox present in many diversity and inclusion (D&I) initiatives. Several studies argue that while conventional diversity strategies aim to promote inclusivity, they often inadvertently reinforce exclusionary practices by focusing on superficial measures of representation rather than addressing deeper structural inequalities (Ferdman, 2017; Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). This paradox is a central critique from a CRT perspective, which emphasizes that inclusion without equity fails to dismantle the systems of privilege and power that marginalize people of color.

Ferdman (2017) highlights that many organizations approach diversity as a numerical goal, focusing on hiring more individuals from underrepresented groups but failing to create environments where these individuals feel fully included or valued. CRT scholars argue that such approaches to diversity allow organizations to appear progressive while maintaining existing power dynamics that exclude marginalized groups from decision-making processes and leadership roles (Bell, 1980). This paradox reveals that simply increasing diversity does not inherently lead to more equitable or inclusive environments, a critical insight that CRT scholars use to challenge conventional diversity frameworks.

The Critique of Meritocracy and Neutrality. Another significant finding in the literature is the critique of meritocracy and claims of organizational neutrality. Many organizations frame diversity efforts within the rhetoric of meritocracy, suggesting that all individuals have equal access to success based on their skills and abilities. However, CRT scholars challenge this notion, arguing that meritocratic ideals often obscure the ways in which systemic racism and structural inequalities shape opportunities and outcomes for marginalized groups (Castilla & Benard, 2010; Bonilla-Silva, 2018).

Several studies reviewed emphasize that conventional diversity programs often fail to address the underlying racial biases and systemic barriers that disadvantage people of color in hiring, promotions, and access to resources (Castilla & Benard, 2010). This critique aligns with CRT's central assertion that racism is not an anomaly within organizations but rather an ingrained feature of the systems that define how merit and success are distributed. For example, Bonilla-Silva (2018) argues that "color-blind racism" allows organizations to claim neutrality while continuing to perpetuate racial inequalities. CRT thus provides a framework for understanding how organizational claims of fairness and neutrality are often used to maintain the status quo, rather than dismantle systems of racial inequality.

Systemic Racism and Structural Power. A third key finding is the exposure of systemic racism and the central role of structural power in shaping organizational practices. CRT emphasizes that racism is not just an individual problem but is embedded within the very structures of society, including its organizations and institutions (Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). This structural understanding of racism is crucial in critiquing conventional approaches to diversity, which often focus on individual behaviors and biases rather than addressing the systemic nature of racial inequality.

The literature reveals that many diversity initiatives are designed to address interpersonal discrimination or unconscious bias, but they do not engage with the broader systems of privilege and oppression that shape the experiences of people of color in the workplace (Ray, 2019; Berrey, Nelson, & Nielsen, 2017). For instance, Ray (2019) argues that organizations are "racialized" in ways that privilege whiteness and disadvantage non-white individuals, even when overt discrimination is absent. CRT scholars advocate for an approach to diversity that focuses not only on representation but also on transforming the underlying power structures that perpetuate racial hierarchies.

This structural critique challenges conventional diversity initiatives, which are often rooted in liberal ideals of equality that fail to address the systemic nature of oppression. CRT scholars argue that true equity requires a fundamental restructuring of organizations and

society, not merely reforms that leave underlying power dynamics intact (Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). This insight is vital for understanding how CRT challenges not only the methods but also the goals of conventional diversity programs.

The findings from this literature review underscore that Critical Race Theory provides a powerful critique of conventional approaches to diversity, equity, and inclusion. CRT scholars argue that many diversity initiatives are limited by their focus on representation and numerical diversity, which often fail to address the deeper structural inequalities that sustain racial hierarchies. The paradox of inclusion and exclusion, the critique of meritocracy and neutrality, and the exposure of systemic racism all demonstrate how CRT challenges the assumptions underlying mainstream diversity strategies.

Conventional approaches to equity and inclusion tend to focus on individual-level interventions, such as anti-bias training or affirmative action programs, which are insufficient for dismantling the structural power imbalances that define organizational life (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). CRT, by contrast, calls for a more radical reimagining of diversity that centers the experiences and voices of marginalized communities, while addressing the systemic and structural dimensions of inequality (Bell, 1995; Crenshaw, 1991).

The findings from this literature review suggest that organizations seeking to achieve true equity and inclusion must move beyond superficial diversity initiatives and engage with the structural critiques offered by Critical Race Theory. By focusing on the deeper systems of power and privilege that shape organizational life, CRT provides a roadmap for developing more transformative and sustainable approaches to equity and inclusion. This shift from representation-focused diversity to a structural understanding of racial justice represents a significant departure from conventional D&I strategies, but it is necessary for addressing the paradoxes and limitations identified in this review.

5. DISCUSSION

The literature review conducted on “The Paradox of Diversity: How Critical Race Theory Challenges Conventional Approaches to Equity and Inclusion” highlights critical insights from Critical Race Theory (CRT) that challenge conventional diversity frameworks. This discussion synthesizes key findings from the review and draws on comparative analysis from eight prior studies that further illuminate the limitations and potential of current diversity practices in organizations. The paradoxes of diversity, the critique of meritocracy, and the recognition of systemic racism emerge as pivotal points in the conversation, showing how CRT offers a necessary corrective to mainstream approaches to equity and inclusion.

The Paradox of Diversity and Inclusion. One of the central paradoxes identified in the literature is the tension between diversity as representation and diversity as inclusion. CRT critiques the conventional emphasis on increasing diversity in the workplace, which tends to focus on numerical representation rather than substantive inclusion (Ferdman, 2017; Bell, 1995). As Ferdman (2017) points out, organizations often boast about their diversity figures—hiring individuals from historically marginalized groups—yet fail to create environments where these individuals are fully integrated or have equal access to power and decision-making.

This finding aligns with Dobbin and Kalev’s (2016) work, which argues that many diversity programs are designed with the goal of avoiding legal liability or improving public image, rather than fostering meaningful change. They found that companies implementing diversity training or establishing diversity committees often see little improvement in actual racial and gender diversity at higher organizational levels. Both Dobbin and Kalev (2016) and Ferdman (2017) highlight that surface-level diversity measures allow organizations to maintain appearances without addressing the deeper structural issues that keep marginalized groups in subordinate roles.

In comparison, Bell’s (1995) analysis of the “interest convergence” theory further reinforces this paradox by showing that dominant groups will only support diversity initiatives when it serves their own interests. This idea is echoed in Crenshaw’s (1991) critique of intersectionality, where she demonstrates that diversity policies tend to overlook the compounded disadvantages experienced by individuals who occupy multiple marginalized identities. These critiques reveal that without a structural change in how power operates within organizations, diversity initiatives may perpetuate exclusion under the guise of inclusion.

Critique of Meritocracy and Organizational Neutrality. The second major theme from the review is the critique of meritocracy, a concept frequently invoked in defense of conventional diversity initiatives. CRT scholars argue that the rhetoric of meritocracy obscures the ways in which systemic inequalities shape access to opportunities, often privileging white employees while disadvantaging people of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2018; Castilla & Benard, 2010). The illusion of meritocracy serves to maintain existing power structures by suggesting that everyone has an equal chance to succeed based solely on their abilities and effort.

Bonilla-Silva (2018) coined the term “color-blind racism” to describe how organizations profess neutrality and fairness while systematically perpetuating racial inequality. This aligns with Castilla and Benard’s (2010) study on the paradox of meritocracy in organizations, where they found that companies that claim to be meritocratic often show higher levels of discrimination against women and minorities. Their findings suggest that the more an

organization believes it is fair, the less likely it is to examine its own biases or the systemic barriers affecting marginalized employees.

Similarly, Ray's (2019) theory of racialized organizations critiques the belief in organizational neutrality, arguing that all organizations are shaped by racial dynamics. His work complements Bonilla-Silva's (2018) findings by showing that racial hierarchies are embedded in organizational structures, from hiring practices to promotion decisions, even in the absence of overt discrimination. This structural critique is central to CRT, which insists that addressing individual bias or behavior is insufficient for dismantling the systemic nature of racism in organizations (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).

In comparison, a study by Berrey, Nelson, and Nielsen (2017) on workplace discrimination law highlights that legal frameworks designed to prevent discrimination often reinforce meritocratic ideals, focusing on individual cases of bias rather than addressing broader systemic issues. Their research shows that many organizations comply with diversity laws superficially, adopting policies that shield them from lawsuits without significantly altering the racial and gender dynamics at play. This reinforces CRT's argument that current diversity efforts are primarily designed to maintain the status quo, rather than fundamentally challenging the structures of racial inequality (Crenshaw, 1991).

Systemic Racism and Power Dynamics in Organizations. A third critical finding from the literature review is the emphasis on systemic racism and the need to address structural power in diversity and inclusion efforts. CRT scholars argue that racism is not merely an individual phenomenon but is embedded within the very structures of society and organizations (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Crenshaw, 1991). This structural critique is often missing from conventional diversity frameworks, which tend to focus on changing individual behaviors through anti-bias training or mentorship programs.

Ray's (2019) theory of racialized organizations offers a useful framework for understanding how systemic racism operates in the workplace. He argues that organizations are not neutral actors but are shaped by racial hierarchies that privilege whiteness. This view challenges the notion that simply hiring more people of color or implementing diversity programs will lead to meaningful change. Instead, Ray (2019) advocates for a deeper restructuring of organizational practices, from recruitment to promotion, to dismantle the racial hierarchies that exist within institutions.

This finding is consistent with Berrey, Nelson, and Nielsen's (2017) research, which shows that organizations often implement diversity policies to protect themselves from legal liability rather than to address systemic inequality. They argue that such policies are primarily

symbolic, providing the appearance of fairness without actually challenging the power dynamics that maintain racial inequality. This aligns with Delgado and Stefancic's (2017) assertion that true racial equity requires not only legal reform but also a fundamental transformation of the social and economic systems that perpetuate white supremacy.

A study by Wingfield and Alston (2014) on racial disparities in leadership positions further supports this argument. They found that even when people of color are hired into leadership roles, they often face additional scrutiny and are held to higher standards than their white counterparts, reinforcing existing power dynamics. This finding reflects CRT's critique that simply increasing diversity without addressing systemic racism does not lead to true inclusion or equity.

Similarly, Bonilla-Silva's (2018) research on color-blind racism demonstrates that organizations often resist acknowledging the role of systemic racism in shaping outcomes for people of color. By promoting a narrative of individual responsibility and fairness, organizations deflect attention away from the broader structures of power that continue to disadvantage marginalized groups. This aligns with CRT's assertion that systemic racism must be addressed at a structural level, rather than relying on individual-level interventions (Crenshaw, 1991).

When comparing the results of this literature review to previous research, it is clear that CRT offers a more robust framework for understanding the limitations of conventional diversity approaches. For example, Dobbin and Kalev's (2016) study on diversity programs found that many initiatives, such as diversity training and hiring quotas, fail to produce lasting change in organizational culture. Their findings align with CRT's critique that such programs are superficial and do not address the deeper power structures that sustain racial inequality.

Similarly, Ferdman's (2017) analysis of the paradoxes of inclusion highlights that organizations often approach diversity as a numbers game, focusing on representation without fostering true inclusion. This critique is consistent with CRT's argument that diversity efforts must go beyond representation and address the structural barriers that prevent marginalized groups from accessing power and decision-making authority (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).

Castilla and Benard's (2010) research on meritocracy further supports CRT's critique of organizational fairness. Their study found that organizations that pride themselves on being meritocratic often exhibit more discrimination against women and minorities, reinforcing CRT's argument that meritocratic ideals often serve to mask systemic inequalities. This finding is also consistent with Ray's (2019) theory of racialized organizations, which argues that meritocracy is a tool used to maintain existing power dynamics.

Berrey, Nelson, and Nielsen's (2017) study on workplace discrimination law also aligns with CRT's critique of legal frameworks designed to address inequality. They argue that such frameworks are primarily symbolic, providing organizations with legal protection while failing to address the systemic nature of racial and gender inequality. This finding reinforces CRT's assertion that legal reform alone is insufficient for achieving true equity; instead, broader structural change is necessary (Crenshaw, 1991).

Finally, Wingfield and Alston's (2014) research on racial disparities in leadership positions provides further evidence of the limitations of conventional diversity efforts. They found that even when people of color are hired into leadership roles, they face additional scrutiny and are often held to higher standards than their white peers. This finding supports CRT's critique that simply increasing diversity in leadership does not address the underlying power dynamics that perpetuate racial inequality.

The literature review on "The Paradox of Diversity: How Critical Race Theory Challenges Conventional Approaches to Equity and Inclusion" reveals that CRT offers a critical lens through which to understand and challenge the limitations of current diversity efforts. By focusing on the structural nature of racism and power, CRT provides a more comprehensive framework for addressing the paradoxes of inclusion and exclusion, the flaws of meritocratic ideals, and the systemic barriers that prevent true equity and inclusion in organizations. These insights suggest that for diversity initiatives to be truly effective, they must go beyond representation and address the deeper structures of power that sustain racial inequality.

6. CONCLUSION

This literature review explored the paradox of diversity through the lens of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and how it challenges conventional approaches to equity and inclusion. Critical Race Theory serves as an essential tool for understanding the complexities of diversity management, particularly in how it uncovers systemic inequities embedded in organizational structures. The findings of this review underscore that traditional diversity programs often fall short because they operate under frameworks that prioritize superficial representation or unity without addressing the deeper, systemic issues of racism and discrimination (Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).

Unlike conventional approaches that focus on unity or meritocracy (Castilla & Benard, 2010), CRT emphasizes the need to confront historical and structural power imbalances that marginalize minority groups (Bell, 1995). This review found that CRT's focus on

intersectionality and social justice offers organizations a more nuanced understanding of diversity, allowing for strategies that target inequity at its root (Ray, 2019). Furthermore, CRT is critical for examining the ways in which organizations maintain racial hierarchies and how these hierarchies undermine the goals of diversity and inclusion (Wingfield & Alston, 2014).

By acknowledging the limitations of meritocratic frameworks and color-blind policies, this review suggests that diversity management needs to be reshaped to incorporate CRT principles. Such reshaping could address deep-seated discrimination and better align diversity strategies with the goals of equity and inclusion (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016). CRT can guide organizations toward creating not only inclusive workplaces but also equitable structures that reflect the diverse experiences of all employees (Ferdman, 2017).

LIMITATIONS

While this literature review provides a comprehensive exploration of how Critical Race Theory can enhance diversity and inclusion strategies, there are several limitations worth noting. First, much of the research and analysis presented here is drawn from U.S.-based studies, where the racial and social dynamics may differ significantly from those in other countries (Bonilla-Silva, 2018). Thus, the applicability of CRT to diversity management outside the U.S. context may be limited. Future research should explore how CRT could be adapted or expanded to address global diversity challenges.

Second, while CRT is instrumental in exposing systemic inequalities, its application in organizational settings is still relatively underdeveloped. Many organizations may face difficulties in implementing CRT-informed diversity strategies due to resistance or a lack of understanding of the theory's principles (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Additionally, the review relies heavily on theoretical frameworks and qualitative studies, which may not provide the empirical data needed to measure the long-term effectiveness of CRT in diversity management. More empirical research is needed to evaluate the outcomes of CRT-based strategies in real-world organizational contexts.

Finally, the literature review focused predominantly on racial issues, potentially overlooking other critical aspects of diversity, such as gender, sexuality, and disability, which could benefit from the intersectional insights CRT offers (Crenshaw, 1991). A more comprehensive examination of how CRT intersects with these dimensions of diversity would be a fruitful area for future research.

In conclusion, while CRT offers valuable insights for rethinking diversity and inclusion strategies, its implementation requires a nuanced approach that considers both its strengths and

limitations. Organizations seeking to adopt CRT in their diversity frameworks must do so with a deep commitment to addressing systemic inequities at their core.

REFERENCES

- Bearman, M., Smith, C. D., & Carbone, A. (2021). *Quality and rigour in qualitative research*. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 26(5), 1419–1430.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma*. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–533.
- Bell, D. A. (1995). *Racial realism*. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 302–312). The New Press.
- Bell, D. A. (1995). *Who's afraid of critical race theory?* *University of Illinois Law Review*, 1995(4), 893–910. <https://illinoislawreview.org>
- Berrey, E., Nelson, R. L., & Nielsen, L. B. (2017). *Rights on trial: How workplace discrimination law perpetuates inequality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bernstein, R. S., Bulger, M., Salipante, P., & Weisinger, J. Y. (2020). *From diversity to inclusion to equity: A theory of generative interactions*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(3), 395–410.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Castilla, E. J. (2015). *Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions*. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 311–333.
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). *The paradox of meritocracy in organizations*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543–576.
- <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). *Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color*. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP). (2018). *CASP qualitative checklist*. Retrieved from <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). NYU Press.

- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). *Why diversity programs fail and what works better*. Harvard Business Review, 94(7), 52–60. <https://hbr.org>
- Ferdman, B. M. (2017). *Paradoxes of inclusion: Understanding and managing the tensions of diversity and multiculturalism in the workplace*. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 53(2), 191–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886317707609>
- Ferdman, B. M., & Deane, B. (2017). *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 1–36). Jossey-Bass.
- Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Kolivoski, K. M., Weaver, A., & Constance-Huggins, M. (2014). *Critical race theory: Opportunities for application in social work practice and policy*. Families in Society, 95(4), 269–276.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2009). *The “point” of positive organizational behavior*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(2), 291–307.
- Lynn, M., & Dixon, A. D. (2013). *Handbook of critical race theory in education*. Routledge.
- Nishii, L. H. (2013). *The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups*. Academy of Management Journal, 56(6), 1754–1774.
- Opoku-Dakwa, A., & Rice, D. B. (2024). *A place for critical race theory and wokeness in diversity strategies*. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(2), Online First.
- Ray, V. (2019). *A theory of racialized organizations*. American Sociological Review, 84(1), 26–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335>
- Saldana, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). *Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing*. Academy of Management Review, 36(2), 381–403.
- Snyder, H. (2019). *Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines*. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). *Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review*. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222.
- Waldman, D. A., & Sparr, J. L. (2023). *Rethinking diversity strategies: An application of paradox and positive organizational behavior theories*. Academy of Management Perspectives, 37(2), 174–192.
- Wingfield, A. H., & Alston, R. (2014). *Maintaining hierarchies in predominantly white organizations: A theory of racial tasks*. American Behavioral Scientist, 58(2), 274–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213503336>