

BEHAVIORAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF SOME EMPLOYEES AND THEIR IMPACT ON JOB PERFORMANCE (CASE STUDY)

Nasser Khamis Nasser Al-Ghadani

International Islamic University, Malaysia, asool_926@hotmail.com

Abstract

With globalization at its peak, organizations are expanding, acquiring, and merging businesses worldwide to maintain and increase their competitive advantage. As such, we have witnessed an increase in the diversity of the workforce resulting from immigration and opportunity. With diversity not only come a variety of opinions, but also an array of beliefs, customs, practices and traditions which might seem 'standard or normal' to some, but 'abnormal or strange' to others. When these become a source of prejudices and biased dispositions, as well as more alarmingly discrimination and harassment, these issues must be immediately dealt with under the jurisdiction of the HR as per applicable laws and corporate policies.

This report shall analyse the 'case – Maalick vs. Rington Communications' in the context of law as it relates to the U.K.; the equality act of 2010, as well as previous anti discrimination legislation that have been introduced along with HR best practices. The case revolves around an employee of Rington Communications, Inc., Maalick, a.k.a. MarShawn Demur and the formal complaint he filed revolving around his religious beliefs alleging racial harassment and religious discrimination. Rington Communications is a large telecommunications corporation (30,000 employees worldwide ; 2013 Gross Revenue of GBP 20 Billion) with several branches in the U.S.A. and U.K., and pride itself in its diversity, considering it to be one of the driving factors of its success. It considers itself an equal opportunities employer and even has a comprehensive 'Equal Opportunities / Anti – discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy' that clearly defines code of conduct and expectations of each employee.

This report will identify and describe specific issues encountered by Maalick in the workplace. It will analyse his co-workers' actions and consider them with respect to applicable discrimination and harassment corporate policies, their violations, and U.K. labour laws. It will evaluate the actions of the organization (scrutinizing the behavior of both his direct manager – Clive Jenkins, as well as the country's HR Director – Marta Ford) in response to his situation, as well as explore potential actions that could have been taken to mitigate the damage and prevent future reoccurrences of the same. It will also deliberate the case from the perspective of the corporate vice president for equal opportunity and diversity – Judith Dixon, while considering formal and informal avenues and the part played by 'power' considering the sources of 'power'. The report will finally make suggestions and recommendations, concluding by evaluating the options of the top management from a broader corporate perspective.

Keywords: harassment , discrimination, victimization.

1 INTRODUCTION

In today's age of globalization and free trade, several nations have reduced or discarded barriers to entry to help their own economies. This has brought about expansion, mergers, acquisitions, and mutually beneficial cooperation and collaboration of corporations worldwide. This has directly led to immigration with workforce moving to places with increased activity and as per the requirements of the organizations they serve. Corporate offices often send key personnel to oversee and report operations and opportunities in recently

established / acquired markets to help better forecast future activities and strategies to be deployed. As such, we have witnessed an increase in the diversity of the workforce resulting from this immigration and opportunity. But with diversity not only come a variety of opinions, but also an array of beliefs, religions, customs, practices and traditions which might seem 'standard or normal' to some, but 'abnormal or strange' to others. Most organizations have a clearly defined 'code of conduct' included in their HR corporate policy that define appropriate behavior and expectations of each employee to respect and adhere to. These policies usually include sections regarding diversity, equal opportunity, anti – discrimination as well as harassment. However, when these differences <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/170893> amongst personnel become a source of prejudice and biased dispositions, as well as more alarmingly discrimination and harassment, the resulting issues must be immediately dealt with under the jurisdiction of the HR as per applicable country laws and corporate policies.

2 THE CASE: MAALICK VS. RINGTON COMMUNICATIONS

- The case revolves around an employee of Rington Communications, Inc., Maalick, a.k.a. MarShawn Demur; the formal complaint he filed regarding his religious beliefs, alleging racial harassment and religious discrimination.
- Firstly, discussing the facts and occurrences regarding Maalick:
 - Maalick or MarShawn Demur is of African Decent and attended the University of SouthWales as an international student.
 - MarShawn Demur initially started his career with Rington Communications as a management trainee while still a student, and had later been offered a full time position with the organization as a customer service supervisor.
 - He had been employed by Rington Communications for over six years.
 - A newly opened branch of Rington Communications at Canary Wharf – London, was looking to increase their operations and as such team size, and had a vacancy for the position of operations manager.
 - MarShawn Demur was qualified and skilled for this position, and based on a managers recommendation, applied for the position.
 - He interviewed with Mr. Clive Jenkins, a parent country national (PCN), the facility director of the London branch, whom he would be reporting to. The interview seemed positive with Jenkins reassuring him that his ethnically diverse background would be an asset, and its usage would be maximized. Additionally, he was reassured that the management team would help assist him with this transition.
 - Jenkins invited Demur to his Church meeting the day following his interview where he met with other members of Jenkins community. The meeting was pleasant.
 - He was offered the position, which he duly took up, and relocated to London. Jenkins was pleased with Demur's performance, and often complemented him on his ideas and work ethic, and even provided him with a superior performance review at the end of his first annual performance appraisal.
 - Just prior to relocating, Demur had decided to become a member of the Church of International Spirituality, which was run through the internationalist congregation in Hammersmith comprising about 80 people. They held regular worship services and offered spiritual education classes. As per the membership, he would be required to comply with their restrictions on diet, appearance, methods of worship as well as other areas of conduct. He began becoming more influenced by this ideology, and was often found reading related materials during breaks and lunch. However, to be fully inducted as a member, he would be required to enroll in a five day intensive spiritual preparation and confirmation process.
 - He requested a week's vacation from Jenkins to complete his enrolment process.
 - Jenkins raised concerns; and said quote unquote " You know I am a religious person, but what you describe sounds quite strange. I need some information on this so-called religion before I can make a decision to give you a week off. We are quite busy, you know! "
 - Demur provided Jenkins with the additional information requested, and was granted the week off.
 - A few days prior to his departure, Demur was approached by several employees enquiring about his religion. They seemed hostile about the idea stating that members of the internationalist congregation were considered 'strange' and were referred to as 'voodooists' and partakers in witchcraft and sorcery. Demur in turn provided them with accurate information about the internationalist religion attempting to correct their misconceived perceptions.

- Demur went and attended the ceremony and officially became an internationalist. As part of this process, he was provided with a newly enlightened identity based on the spiritual doctrine – Maalick – which he was required to use at all times.
- Upon his return, he visited the HR department, and spoke to the HR Director, Marta Ford, informing her of the change in name, and also spoke about the conversation he had with his co-workers prior to departure. She reassured him there was nothing to be worried about and that his new name would be formally recognized in all office records and correspondence. He would sign official correspondence under this new identity – Maalick.
- Upon entering his office one day, he found his office decorated with dolls with pins sticking out of various body parts, witch hats and containers of incense. On the wall behind his desk was a picture of Africa decorated with strange letterings and symbols. Maalick was astonished and immediately called Jenkins to his office. Jenkins was amused by this act and mockingly stated: “Well Demur – or should I say Maalick- I must say you have some admirers. As an employee with African roots, you should have expected some lighthearted ribbing about your conversion to that strange religion of yours. Even you must admit that they do some weird things.” To which Maalick replied “No, I must say that I did not expect this!”. Jenkins in turn promised to handle the situation.
- Over the next few months, Maalick continued to receive a series of notes left on his desk and car referencing black cats, black magic, requests for palm readings, and notices about the disappearance of MarShawn Demur. He discarded these messages as juvenile pranks that his fellow co-workers would tire off. At the Christmas party, Jenkins even joked about Maalick’s conversion to the internationalist faith.
- One fine day he received a copy of what seemed to be chants titled ‘prayers for black folk’, and a book titled ‘Mystical Practices from the Negro Experience’. Upon receipt of this, Maalick took the materials to the HR and met with the Director, Marta Ford. She asked him if he knew who was responsible for these actions, but he had no clue. She reassured him that such behavior was unacceptable at Rington, and that she would handle the situation immediately.
- Marta Ford called a meeting with all department heads and informed them about the situation. She even sent out an internal memo reiterating Rington Communications’ discrimination and harassment policies and the penalties associated with non compliance, and even held meetings with the heads of each of the departments expressing the gravity of the situation. The head of departments in turn held meetings with their subordinates explaining the situation, which caused the issues to stop immediately.
- Maalick was visited by Ford several times to ensure that there was no harassment taking place, to which he reported that ‘all was well’. During one of these visits, he enquired about two vacancies, to which he was provided with information from her and was encouraged to apply since he met the requirements and held relevant experience.
- He applied and duly interviewed with Jenkins, however, was informed that his application was unsuccessful and the position was going to be offered to an outside candidate – Charles Bartlett – who happened to be a member of Jenkin’s Church.
- Maalick filed a formal complaint with Ford, alleging religious discrimination and racial harassment.
- As per corporate policy, Ford filed in the official paperwork and forwarded the complaint to Judith Dixon, the vice president for Equal Opportunities and diversity at the corporate head office in Kansas. The following day, Dixon called a conference with Ford and Jenkins to discuss the case.

3 PERTAINING LAWS

The directly applicable laws pertaining to this case include the Protection from Harassment Act 1997, Employment Equality Regulations of 2003, which was replaced by the Equality Act of 2010 – on 1st October 2010, as well as the U.K. Employment Laws, and corporate policies of Rington Communications. As per the 2003 regulations, ‘Discrimination in the workplace on grounds of race, religion or belief is unlawful and fully prosecutable under the extent of law. Race refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, nationality (including citizenship), ethnic or national origins. Rights related to religion or belief includes any religious or philosophical belief, and even includes the lack of a belief. As per these regulations, discrimination can further be declassified as ‘Direct, Associative, Perceptive, Indirect, or even simply as harassment, third party harassment, and victimization’ (U.K. Equality Act, 2010) which are further explained as per below:

Direct discrimination is a form of discrimination which transpires due to any of the secured personal characteristics as listed in the act, while indirect discriminations transpires when there is an indirect

correlation to one of the protected characteristics as per the policy or requirements not justifiable in terms of works. Associative and perceptive discrimination occur when discrimination is a direct result of association with others being discriminated and preconceived perceptions that may ensue. Harassment can be classified in a variety of forms such as lewd or evocative remarks and verbal abuse or unwarranted physical contact with respect to one of the characteristics listed in the Equality Act of 2010. Victimization can be classified when an individual is purposefully discriminated against primarily due to previous actions and complaints made regarding discrimination, causing groups of people to hold the victims responsible.

The primary appropriate and legal action that must be taken by the offended individual is to raise a formal complaint or grievance to try to find a solution to the problem at hand with their HR department. Offended parties if dissatisfied by the actions taken by HR or the management may even choose to raise the issues with an 'Employment Tribunal'. According to the U.K. Employment advice guide, 'employment tribunals are official licit entities that handle discrepancies related to employment rights. It is presided by a qualified judge and two other members that represent the employer and the employee who has raised the complaint. In most occurrences, a formal written notification / complaint must first be registered with the employer prior to making a claim to the tribunal. The timeframe to register an official complaint is less than three months (3 months minus one day) from the date of the incident. It is advisable to get an expert opinion from a legal advisor prior to filing an official claim to avoid potential issues. www.adviceguide.org.uk, last accessed 15th April 2015). Employment Tribunals, as per the law, have the ability to make unlimited compensation awards to the offended while accounting for compensation for injury to feelings which is difficult to quantify.

If an individual is not certain whether an instance falls under the Equality Act of 2010, they should review relevant laws, policies, and past cases, to ensure their circumstances require immediate and strict action. They may also choose to seek advice from an expert in the field – perhaps the Citizens Advice Bureau, their HR department, or other legal solicitors.

Additionally, employers may also be liable to compensation related to discrimination if they are unable to prove that satisfactory measures were taken by themselves to prevent harassment / discrimination from taking place.' (Martin Phillips, 2015)

Furthermore, bullying is another form of discrimination / harassment that an employer is required to provide protection from to all its employees. A comprehensive description of the rules and regulations pertaining to bullying and harassment is included in the ACAS (Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service – www.acas.org.uk.

It is even stated in the Rington Communications' Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy under the subsection 'violation of policy' that a formal investigation will be launched for each complaint registered, and appropriate disciplinary action will be taken, which could result in termination of employment, regardless of violation of any laws.

4 ANALYSIS OF JENKINS ACTIONS

When Demur first asked Jenkins for a week's vacation time explaining the requirement of the internationalist faith to complete his enrolment process, Jenkins response was quote unquote " You know I am a religious person, but what you describe sounds quite strange. I need some information on this so-called religion before I can make a decision to give you a week off. We are quite busy, you know!". Jenkins reaction and statements could be perceived as hostile and derogatory towards Demur's beliefs, and as per law could be perceived as verbal harassment, however, could also be interpreted as naïve as he had little information regarding the same. When Demur provided Jenkins with the additional information requested, he was granted the week off, which was acceptable.

Nextly, upon entering his office one day, Maalick found his office decorated with dolls with pins sticking out of various body parts, witch hats and containers of incense. On the wall behind his desk was a picture of Africa decorated with strange letterings and symbols. Maalick was astonished and immediately called Jenkins to his office. Jenkins was amused by this act and mockingly stated: "Well Demur - or should I say Maalick- I must say you have some admirers. As an employee with African roots, you should have expected some lighthearted ribbing about your conversion to that strange religion of yours. Even you must admit that they do some weird things." To which Maalick replied "No, I must say that I did not expect this!". Jenkins in turn promised to handle the situation, however, there is no mention of any measures taken by Jenkins. At least a formal memo should have been drafted and forwarded to all employees reminding them of the corporate policies and Equality Act of 2010 mentioning strict action would be taken against offenders. As per Rington Communications' Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy, it was Maalick's and Jenkin's legal and moral obligation to report this incident to their direct line managers – Jenkins and Ford, but keeping in mind that Jenkins was his manager which might cause further issues, he decided to

remain silent – which is an error on his part. Also, this becomes an even bigger and more serious offence as employers may also be liable to compensation related to discrimination if they are unable to prove that satisfactory measures were taken by themselves to prevent harassment / discrimination from taking place, and no measures were taken to resolve the situation at this point.

It is also mentioned that at the Christmas party, Jenkins even joked about Maalick's conversion to the internationalist faith. While this may be written off as friendly behavior and might have been said in jest, remarks related to one's beliefs and religion are an extremely sensitive subject which cannot be dismissed as witticism. As per Rington Communications' Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy, it was Maalick's legal and moral obligation to report this incident to their direct line manager, however since Jenkins would be reviewing the situation, he decided it best not to. Had Maalick taken this to Ford at the time, serious action would have been taken against Jenkins, regardless of his position and seniority as per applicable corporate and U.K. Employment Laws as per the Equality Act of 2010.

5 CO-WORKERS' ACTIONS

A few days prior to his departure spiritual preparation and confirmation induction process, Demur was approached by several employees enquiring about his religion. They seemed hostile about the idea stating that members of the internationalist congregation were considered 'strange' and were referred to as 'voodooists' and partakers in witchcraft and sorcery. Demur in turn provided them with accurate information about the internationalist religion, attempting to correct their misconceived perceptions. This can be perceived as harassment as using demeaning or using derogatory remarks regarding another's beliefs is a serious offence and is punishable under the Harassment Act 1997, as well as the Employment Equality Regulations of 2003, subsections – Discrimination, Religion or beliefs, under the Equality Act of 2010. At the time, Demur dismissed his co-workers' statements and actions as innocent due to the lack of information regarding his new faith and decided to not take any action. As per the 2003 regulations, 'Discrimination in the workplace on grounds of race, religion or belief is unlawful and fully prosecutable under the extent of law' (Martin Phillips, U.K. Employment Laws, 2015). Offended parties may even choose to raise the issues with an 'Employment Tribunal', which as per the law, have the ability to make unlimited compensation awards to the offended while accounting for compensation for injury to feelings which is difficult to quantify.

The co-workers' remarks were unwarranted for, and while it may be perceived as 'innocent and inquisitive', further action could have / should have been taken. As per Rington Communications' Equal Opportunities / Anti-Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy, it was Maalick's legal and moral obligation to report the incidents of discrimination to his direct line manager who would decide the best course of action. He could have taken up the case with HR; Ford, to avoid a confrontation, but to reasons known best to himself, decided against it. As such, Ford cannot be blamed for the situation escalating as she was completely unaware of the situation.

Furthermore, upon entering his office one day, he found his office decorated with dolls with pins sticking out of various body parts, witch hats and containers of incense. On the wall behind his desk was a picture of Africa decorated with strange letterings and symbols. This would have definitely raised some concerns with Maalick, and these actions can be classified as racial harassment. As per the employment law guide (2015), it is a seriously punishable offence under the United Kingdom Labour Law as well as the Harassment Act 1997, and the Employment Equality Regulations of 2003 which guarantees freedom of choice of worship and beliefs, and equal opportunity regardless of age, disability, race, sex, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief (Employment Law Guide, Apr 2015). Again, the co-workers actions were unwarranted for, and serious further action should have been taken.

Over the next few months, Maalick continued to receive a series of notes left on his desk and car referencing black cats, black magic, requests for palm readings, and notices about the disappearance of MarShawn Demur. He discarded these messages as juvenile pranks that his fellow co-workers would tire off. He should have been more assertive at the time, and brought this to the attention of Marta Ford. This is discrimination and harassment that the victim – Maalick – had to suffer on a regular basis. Maalick should have brought this to the attention of both Jenkins and Ford and resolved the situation in the initial stages. No individual should have to 'put up / live' with a fear of harassment in whichever form. As per the pertaining laws of the United Kingdom, all individuals are considered equal, and this guarantees basic human rights to dignity, opportunity, choice of worship, amongst others. His choosing to conceal this information is considered solely his fault, and had he divulged this information, actions could have been taken to mitigate the damage.

Furthermore, one day he received a copy of what seemed to be chants titled 'prayers for black folk', and a

book titled 'Mystical Practices from the Negro Experience'. This was the final straw for Maalick who decided serious action was required to be taken and took up the case with Marta Ford, the HR Director.

6 MARTA FORD'S ACTIONS

When Maalick received a copy of what seemed to be chants titled 'prayers for black folk', and a book titled 'Mystical Practices from the Negro Experience', he took the materials to the HR and met with the Director, Marta Ford. He reiterated all the past occurrences as well, and she asked him if he knew who was responsible for these actions, but he had no clue. She reassured him that such behavior was unacceptable at Rington, and that she would handle the situation immediately. Finally, Maalick standing up for himself, and his beliefs, action was taken. The management, and henceforth, his co-workers were summoned for meetings, with racial discrimination as the main topic of discussion. They were reminded of the expected corporate values each employee was required to adhere to in addition to the pertaining U.K. labour laws. This much needed formal warning to employees indulging in harassment, discrimination, or vandalism would draw serious consequences for any negative behavior. This stern warning caused the 'juvenile' actions to immediately halt. It was understood that such discriminatory actions would not be tolerated.

She even followed up with him to ensure this discriminatory behavior was not continuing.

When Maalick filed a formal complaint with Ford alleging religious discrimination and racial harassment, she reported the issue to the vice president for Equal Opportunities and diversity at the corporate head office, Judith Dixon.

It is understood that Marta Ford was proactive in handling the situations that arose and did her best to pacify the situation while ensuring such actions were not repeated as per HR best practices. She kept the best interests of the company in mind and tried to amicably resolve the situation avoiding / preventing escalation and potentially lengthy court cases and hearings. She could possibly be more proactive and hold monthly awareness meetings reminding employees of their rights and responsibilities pertaining to discrimination, harassment, and corporate policies. She can even schedule an hour every week to discuss potential cases and provide guidance to employees that feel their rights have been violated. This in turn will assist in ensuring similar situations do not arise in the future.

7 FROM DIXON'S PERSPECTIVE

Dixon was completely oblivious to the situation until Ford sent her a formal complaint that had been registered by Maalick. There is little information provided about her, however, since she is the corporate vice president of equal opportunities and diversity, it comes directly under her jurisdiction. She has summoned a meeting (conference) with Ford and Jenkins to further discuss the situation at hand. She must tactfully handle the situation, amicably resolving it, while accounting for the corporate policies as well as the pertaining laws as mentioned in the previous sections.

Some potential courses of actions have been suggested in the recommendations / conclusions section in this report.

8 IMPORTANT ELEMENTS FOR RINGTON TO CONSIDER

Rington Communications considers itself an equal opportunities employer and even has a comprehensive 'Equal Opportunities / Anti – discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy' that clearly defines code of conduct and expectations of each employee.

As per the information provided and the author's understanding of Rington Communications' provided corporate policies (pertaining to Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment) as well as U.K. laws, the behavior of other employees clearly represents discrimination and harassment based on religion and is considered illegal as per the Harassment Act 1997, as well as the Equality Act of 2010.

Rington will have to consider each above mentioned event individually with respect to its (Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment) corporate policies, the Harassment Act 1997, Employment Equality Regulations of 2003, as well as the Equality Act of 2010. It seems clear that inadequate action was taken by themselves to the abovementioned situations, until Marta Ford got involved. It is still however their responsibility to ensure none of its employees are being discriminated against, however, may prevail in a court of law as none of the employees had reported any of the incidents. They can claim they were unaware of the situations, and as such didn't take any action. Marta Ford's actions will definitely strengthen their case and her well documented acts in the best interest of the company works positively in their favour.

Maalick's case of racial harassment may prove to be challenging for Rington, however, religious

discrimination might not be applicable as this is directly related to a job he didn't receive. Rington might argue that the external candidate was better suited for the position based on his qualifications and experience which might be ambiguous.

As per their Equal Opportunities / Anti Discrimination / Diversity / Harassment policy, any violations of this policy will not be tolerated, whether any pertaining laws have been violated. As such, it will be Judith Dixon's task to ensure the same and mitigate the damage that has resulted from these incidents.

9 CONCLUSION

Globalization has led to the increase in diversity of the workforce resulting from immigration and opportunity. This diversity has brought about a variety of opinions, array of beliefs, customs, practices and traditions which might seem 'normal' to some, but 'strange' to others. When these become a source of prejudice and biased disposition, as well as more alarmingly discrimination and harassment, these issues must be immediately dealt with under the jurisdiction of the HR as per applicable laws and corporate policies.

This report has analysed the case – 'Maalick vs. Rington Communications' and the formal complaint he filed revolving around his religious beliefs alleging racial harassment and religious discrimination in the context of law as it relates to the U.K.; the equality act of 2010 along with the Harassment act of 1997 and the 2003 regulations, as well as previous anti discrimination legislation that have been introduced along with HR best practices. Rington Communications is in a precarious position with respect to this case. This report identified and described the specific issues encountered by Maalick in the workplace, and analysed his co-workers' actions while considering them with respect to applicable discrimination and harassment corporate policies, their violations, and U.K. labour laws. It evaluated the actions of the management in the organization as follows:-

The response of Marta Ford; the HR Director of Rington U.K., is considered adequate based on her knowledge of the situation. She could have / should have sent out periodic reminders / memos reminding personnel of their roles and responsibilities pertaining to discrimination and harassment, but her actions have all been well documented and in the best interest of the organization, and are considered satisfactory.

The response of Clive Jenkins, London facilities Director and Maalick's direct manager, is considered unprofessional, unacceptable, and may be classified as derogatory and fall under harassment and discrimination as per the Harassment Act of 1997, 2003 Regulations, and Equality Act of 2010 legislations. He must be tried as per the corporation's policies, and may even be taken to court (tribunal) if Maalick is not satisfied with their decision.

The report also explored potential actions that could have been taken to mitigate the damage and prevent future reoccurrences of the same. It also deliberated the case from the perspective of the corporate vice president for equal opportunity and diversity – Judith Dixon. Judith Dixon; the corporate vice president of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, was completely oblivious to the situation until it was brought to her attention, and as such cannot be held responsible for any occurrence.

In fact, Rington can be held responsible for the issues caused, and may be subject to heavy penalties if found guilty or negligent. They must proactively attempt to resolve this situation at earliest opportunity avoiding any further damage to its employees, operations, or reputation. Their exit clause could be considering Maalick, Jenkins, and other employees who were aware of the situations, but failed to report it, thereby being in violation of corporate policy themselves.

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Rington resolve the situation internally and avoid the Tribunal.

Judith Dixon, the corporate vice president of Equal Opportunities and Diversity should preside over the investigation that is recommended to be led by Marta Ford. Ford would be the best person as she is acquainted with the personnel in Canary Wharf and somewhat familiar with the situation. She should conduct an in depth analysis of the situation, solely presenting facts with proof where possible and applicable. She should also organize this information gathered in terms of the violations of corporate policy, and applicable laws, as discussed in previous sections.

This information gathered should then be forwarded to Dixon. Dixon should assess the situation unbiasedly, first with respect to the violation of corporate policy, and furthermore with respect to applicable and pertaining laws. It is recommended that she take strict action against the perpetrators; including Jenkins for the lack of action taken, to avoid repeat occurrences. She may also amend the corporate policy to include a mandatory monthly or quarterly awareness meeting reminding employees of their rights and responsibilities

pertaining to discrimination, harassment, and corporate policies. She can even require an HR unit in each country to schedule an hour every week to discuss potential cases and provide guidance to employees that feel their rights have been violated – via phone or in person and keep the information pertaining to each case strictly confidential. Additionally, a mass e-mail could be sent out to every employee, again on a bi-weekly, monthly, or quarterly basis as deemed appropriate to raise awareness regarding rights, responsibilities, as well as corporate policies. Similarly, such measures should be implemented at all facilities worldwide.

This in turn is expected to assist in ensuring similar situations do not arise organization wide in the future.

REFERENCE LIST

- Act, E. (2010). Equality Act 2010. *The Equality Act*. Online Available at: <http://www.calderstones.nhs.uk/media/files/Equality%20and%20Diversity/Equality%20Act%202010.pdf>
- Harris, J., Great Britain Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate, Information and Publications Group, & United Ki. (2000). *The Protection from Harassment Act 1997: An evaluation of its use and effectiveness*. Great Britain, Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. Online Available at: <http://www.harassmentlaw.co.uk/pdf/rds.pdf>
- Sargeant, M. (2003). The Employment Equality Regulations 2003: a legitimisation of age discrimination in employment. *Industrial law journal*, 35(3), 209-227. Online Available at: <http://ilj.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/3/209.short>
- Martin Phillips, U.K. Employment Laws – Rights At Work, 2015. Online Available at: http://www.adviceguide.org.uk/england/work_e/work_rights_at_work_e/basic_rights_at_work.htm#h_discrimination (last accessed 15th April 2015)
- Lester, T. P. (1994). Yankee Woman in King Arthur's Court--What the United States and the United Kingdom Can Learn from Each Other about Sexual Harrassment Law, *The. BC Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.*, 17, 233. Online Available at: <http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/bcic17&div=20&id=&page=>
- Rasnic, C. D. (1981). Evolvement of an Action for Sexual Harassment under Title VII, *The. Louis ULJ*, 26, 875. Online Available at: <http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/stluj26&div=46&id=&page=>
- Cavanaugh, B. P. (2004). September 11 backlash employment discrimination. *JOURNAL OF MISSOURI BAR*, 60, 186-193. Online Available at: <http://www.cavanaugh-law.net/sites/default/files/MoBar-article.pdf>
- Thomas, D. A. (2004). Diversity as strategy. *Harvard business review*, 82(9), 98-98. Online Available at: <http://www.foundationforeuropeanleadership.org/assets/downloads/infoItems/177.pdf>
- Dass, P., & Parker, B. (1999). Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(2), 68-80. Online Available at: <http://amp.aom.org/content/13/2/68.short>
- Arnold, M. D. (2013). *Saudade, Duende, and Feedback: The Hybrid Voices of Twenty-First-Century Neoflamenco and Neofado* (Doctoral dissertation, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA). Online Available at: <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/170893>