

GENDER PAY EQUITY IN PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FIRMS

Dr. Anjali Deshmukh

Assistant Professor

Department of Human Resource Management

School of Management Studies

Institute of Business and Professional Studies

Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

Gender pay equity is a central governance, talent, and professional-legitimacy issue for professional service firms. Law firms, consulting practices, accounting and audit partnerships, architecture and engineering consultancies, financial advisory businesses, and technology service providers rely heavily on specialised knowledge and client relationships. Their compensation systems commonly combine fixed salary, variable incentive, client-originated revenue, utilisation targets, promotion-linked pay, partnership distributions, and discretionary recognition. These features can reward contribution, but they can also obscure unequal outcomes where access to high-value work, client networks, sponsorship, flexible-work acceptance, and leadership opportunities is uneven. A firm may have formally identical salary bands while still producing gendered differences in total reward and career income over time.

This qualitative, literature-based study examines how pay-equity gaps can arise and persist in professional service settings. It reviews research on gender pay gaps, occupational segregation, performance evaluation, work allocation, client development, partnership promotion, pay transparency, and organisational accountability. The analysis uses a professional-service-firm lens that links compensation to the allocation of revenue-generating opportunities and career-making assignments. It follows an equity-management sequence: defining comparable work, mapping compensation components, analysing representation and advancement, testing pay decisions for unexplained differences, correcting structural drivers, monitoring outcomes, and reporting progress through credible governance.

The study finds that equal-pay compliance alone is insufficient when inequalities are generated earlier in the career system. Disparities may be reinforced by opaque discretionary awards, unequal access to client-facing work, biased assumptions about availability, uneven distribution of sponsorship, and promotion criteria that reward inherited networks rather than demonstrable contribution. Effective action requires transparent job architecture, disciplined pay reviews, documented decision rules, inclusive assignment practices, manager accountability, safe challenge channels, and senior-level oversight. The paper concludes that pay equity should be treated as an ongoing organisational capability that strengthens retention, trust, client confidence, and the long-term quality of professional services.

Keywords: Gender Pay Equity, Professional Service Firms, Compensation Transparency, Equal Pay, Career Progression, Pay Audit, Partnership Promotion, Organisational Justice, Talent Retention, Inclusive Leadership

1. INTRODUCTION

Professional service firms compete through specialised expertise, judgment, reputation, and the capacity to solve complex client problems. Their people are therefore not only employees; they are also carriers of knowledge, relationship capital, and institutional credibility. Compensation plays a decisive role in this environment because it signals how contribution is recognised and who is considered ready for advancement.

When pay practices are perceived as opaque or inconsistent, the effect reaches beyond payroll. It can shape morale, mobility, client service, organisational commitment, and the willingness of talented professionals to remain in the firm.

Gender pay equity concerns whether people performing equal, similar, or comparably valued work receive fair compensation after legitimate role-related factors are considered. It is broader than a single comparison of base

salary. In professional service firms, total reward can include annual salary, performance bonuses, business-development incentives, commission or origination credit, retention awards, partnership draws, profit distributions, deferred compensation, equity participation, and access to career-building work. A narrow salary-only review may therefore miss the places where inequality accumulates. For this reason, robust analysis must consider both immediate pay and the opportunity structures that influence future earning capacity [1, 3, 6]. The persistence of pay gaps cannot be understood solely as an individual negotiation issue. Research has shown that pay outcomes are affected by occupational sorting, organisational structures, evaluation systems, expectations about availability, access to networks, and the distribution of high-visibility work [2, 4, 7]. In professional settings, these mechanisms are often embedded in ordinary business routines: who is invited to pitch for a client, who receives a complex assignment, whose relationship is recognised as firm revenue, who is sponsored for partnership, and whose flexible-working arrangement is treated as evidence of reduced commitment. Even when these decisions are not explicitly gendered, their cumulative effects may be gendered.

This paper examines pay equity as a management and governance issue within professional service firms. It reviews relevant literature, identifies the principal pathways through which pay disparities emerge, compares the requirements of several professional-service contexts, and develops an integrated framework for diagnosis and improvement. The central argument is that sustainable equity requires attention to compensation, career progression, work allocation, and decision accountability at the same time. A firm that corrects an individual pay gap but leaves unequal opportunity patterns unchanged is likely to reproduce the problem in later cycles.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on gender pay gaps distinguishes between observed differences in earnings and the portion that remains after adjusting for measured factors such as occupation, experience, education, hours, and job level. Both measures matter. An adjusted analysis

can identify potentially unexplained differences among comparable employees, while an unadjusted analysis reveals the broader organisational distribution of opportunities and rewards. In professional firms, both perspectives are necessary because formal job comparability may coexist with gendered concentration in lower-paying specialisms, smaller client portfolios, or slower promotion tracks [1, 2, 5].

Studies of organisational inequality emphasise that pay disparities frequently arise through linked decisions rather than a single discriminatory event. Hiring, role assignment, performance appraisal, bonus allocation, sponsorship, promotion, and retention decisions each create small advantages or disadvantages that compound over time [7, 8, 10]. Professional service firms are especially exposed to this pattern because commercial success can depend on informal reputation, client access, and relational networks that are difficult to measure consistently. Where criteria for high-value work or revenue recognition are unclear, managers may rely on familiar assumptions about confidence, fit, availability, or client preference.

Research also indicates that transparency can improve scrutiny and accountability, but transparency by itself does not guarantee equity. A firm must define comparable groups carefully, protect confidentiality, explain legitimate pay factors, and establish a credible process for correction. Public reporting may reveal patterns, whereas internal governance determines whether managers investigate causes and change systems. The most effective approach is therefore not a single disclosure exercise but a recurring cycle of data analysis, evidence-based intervention, communication, and review [11, 14, 16].

2.1 CONCEPT AND SCOPE OF PAY EQUITY

- Pay equity means that compensation decisions are based on legitimate, consistently applied factors such as role scope, competence, sustained performance, market position, and documented business contribution rather than gender or gender-linked assumptions.
- A complete assessment includes base salary, bonus, commission, client-origination credit, retention payments,

promotion-linked increases, partnership distributions, equity awards, and other benefits that influence lifetime earnings.

- Comparable-work analysis should examine work of equal or similar value while recognising that professional roles may differ in specialism, client mix, risk responsibility, and seniority. These differences must be evidenced, not assumed.
- An inclusive analysis considers intersecting factors such as race, disability, age, parenthood, caregiving responsibilities, contract type, location, and working pattern, because gendered pay outcomes are not experienced uniformly across all groups.

2.2 GENDERED PAY STRUCTURES IN PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FIRMS

- Partnership and senior-leadership systems may concentrate reward in profit share, client originations, and discretionary allocations that are less visible than salary bands and may be influenced by legacy relationships.
- High-value assignments, client introductions, cross-selling opportunities, and international mobility can create future income advantages. Unequal access to these assignments can widen pay differences before formal compensation decisions occur.
- Performance measures may rely on billable hours, utilisation, availability, sales generation, or visibility. Without contextual review, these measures may penalise professionals who carry disproportionate caregiving responsibilities or lack access to premium client work.
- Hybrid and flexible working can improve inclusion, but it can also create proximity bias when managers equate physical visibility with commitment, leadership readiness, or client credibility.

2.3 THEORETICAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS

- Human-capital explanations focus on experience, training, and labour-market choices, but organisational research shows that these factors operate within structures that distribute opportunity unequally [3, 5].

- Organisational-justice theory highlights the importance of distributive fairness in rewards, procedural fairness in decision-making, and interactional fairness in how decisions are communicated and challenged [12].
- Pay-transparency and equal-pay frameworks encourage employers to document pay systems, identify unjustified disparities, consult affected groups, and provide corrective action rather than treating reporting as an end in itself [11, 15].
- Professional ethics require firms to align internal reward practices with their public commitments to merit, client trust, diversity, and responsible leadership. A clear governance structure converts these commitments into operational standards.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines gender pay equity in professional service firms as an organisational system rather than as an isolated payroll outcome. The object of study is the set of practices through which professional expertise is valued, work is allocated, performance is measured, clients are developed, and compensation is distributed. The analysis is not limited to one firm, profession, or country. Instead, it considers recurring features of professional environments in which people advance through a combination of technical competence, commercial contribution, professional reputation, and leadership recognition.

The theoretical basis of the study is grounded in the proposition that pay equity and career equity are interdependent. A professional may receive equal pay at a particular point in time while remaining disadvantaged in future earnings if access to sponsorship, premium assignments, client networks, and promotion is unequal. Conversely, a firm may improve representation in entry-level roles without achieving equity if senior reward systems remain concentrated in opaque pathways. The study therefore treats compensation, opportunity, organisational legitimacy, and talent sustainability as linked dimensions of equitable professional practice.

3.1 PROFESSIONAL-SERVICE CONTEXTS AND EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

The study considers five representative professional-service contexts. These contexts show that the compensation mix, source of

career advantage, and appropriate equity safeguards vary across firms. The shared requirement is that organisations must examine not only what people are paid, but also how they gain access to the work and relationships that determine future reward.

TABLE 1. PROFESSIONAL-SERVICE CONTEXTS, PAY-EQUITY RISKS, AND GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

S.No.	Professional Service Context	Compensation and Career Driver	Primary Equity Risk	Governance Value
1	Law firms and legal practices	Salary scale, billable work, client origination, partnership draw, and matter leadership	Unequal access to premium matters, informal client credit, and partnership sponsorship	Makes revenue attribution and promotion standards reviewable and evidence based
2	Management consulting	Project staffing, utilisation, bonus, client impact, sales contribution, and promotion pace	Assignment to lower-visibility projects, travel assumptions, and proximity bias	Links staffing decisions, evaluation evidence, and reward outcomes
3	Accounting and audit firms	Professional grade, engagement leadership, chargeable hours, quality ratings, and partner pathway	Uneven access to client leadership, business development, and high-growth portfolios	Creates comparable review across service lines and career stages
4	Architecture and engineering consultancies	Technical grade, project responsibility, client exposure, site opportunity, and incentive pay	Gendered specialisation, uneven field exposure, and subjective leadership assessments	Tests whether role scope and capability are valued consistently
5	Financial advisory and technology services	Base salary, variable pay, deal credit, sales incentives, retention awards, and equity participation	Opaque bonus pools, network-dependent revenue credit, and unequal access to sponsors	Improves auditability of discretionary reward and high-value opportunity allocation

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the meaning and scope of gender pay equity within professional service firms, including salary, variable pay, client-revenue credit, and partnership-related rewards.
- To identify the organisational mechanisms through which gendered pay differences may arise, including work allocation, performance evaluation, sponsorship, promotion, flexibility norms, and discretionary compensation.
- To compare pay-equity risks across law, consulting, accounting and audit, architecture and engineering, financial advisory, and technology service contexts.
- To evaluate the role of pay transparency, job architecture, formal decision records, inclusive talent processes, and senior accountability in creating fairer reward systems.
- To develop a practical framework for diagnosing, correcting, monitoring, and governing pay equity over time.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative and literature-based research methodology. It synthesises scholarship on gender pay gaps, organisational inequality, professional careers, performance evaluation, compensation governance, and pay transparency. The approach is appropriate because the research question concerns the interaction between formal reward systems and the informal practices through which professional opportunity is distributed. The study does not present primary payroll data from a named firm; its findings are interpretive and designed to support policy design, internal diagnostics, and future empirical investigation. The methodological framework follows a pay-equity management lifecycle. It considers the definition of comparable work, collection of compensation and career data, analysis of pay and opportunity patterns, identification of structural drivers, design of corrective measures, implementation through accountable management, monitoring of outcomes, and periodic reassessment. This lifecycle recognises that a pay audit is not complete when a gap is calculated. It becomes meaningful only when the firm can explain the drivers, correct unjustified differences, and prevent recurrence in later hiring, review, and promotion cycles.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN (QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH)

- The study follows a qualitative and comparative design based on peer-reviewed scholarship, international labour guidance, organisational research, and professional-practice principles.
- The analysis compares professional-service contexts according to compensation architecture, client-development models, promotion structures, assignment systems, flexibility norms, and governance maturity.
- The study uses an organisational-systems perspective that links reward outcomes to recruitment, staffing, performance management, sponsorship, business development, and succession planning.
- The findings are interpreted through management and governance principles rather than through a statistically representative survey or a controlled experimental dataset.

4.2 PAY-EQUITY AND CAREER-EQUITY FRAMEWORK

- Comparable-work assessment is structured around role family, job level, responsibility, technical expertise, client impact, geographic market, experience, and other legitimate factors that should be consistently documented.
- Compensation assessment includes fixed pay, variable pay, incentive eligibility, bonus outcomes, client-originated revenue credit, equity or profit participation, promotion-linked increments, and retention awards.
- Career-opportunity assessment considers access to high-value assignments, client exposure, sponsorship, training, leadership roles, flexible-work support, internal mobility, and succession opportunities.
- Governance is assessed through executive oversight, clear decision rights, manager guidance, audit methods, confidentiality safeguards, remediation protocols, employee voice, and regular reporting.

4.3 FIRM AND WORKFORCE CONTEXT

- The study considers large and mid-sized professional firms, partnership-based practices, corporate professional-service units, and specialist advisory businesses with differentiated reward models.
- Professional roles are considered across early career, experienced practitioner, manager, director, partner, and senior leadership levels, where the form of reward and the source of discretion may change significantly.
- The analysis recognises that gendered outcomes may differ by specialism, service line, location, client sector, employment contract, working pattern, and time spent in the organisation.
- The organisational context includes formal policies as well as informal norms concerning availability, client entertainment, travel, networking, caregiving, visibility, and leadership presence.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

The following compensation, opportunity, and governance parameters are evaluated:

- Distribution of women and men across job levels, service lines, revenue-generating roles, client-facing assignments,

partnership tracks, and senior leadership positions.

- Median and mean differences in base salary, bonus, incentive eligibility, discretionary awards, promotion increases, profit participation, and total remuneration.
- Availability and quality of records supporting performance ratings, bonus decisions, client-originated revenue, project staffing, promotion recommendations, and retention awards.
- Access to sponsorship, business-development opportunities, premium client accounts, travel, leadership development, high-visibility presentations, and succession-planning pools.
- Employee experience of fairness, confidence in reporting concerns, clarity of pay criteria, quality of feedback, manager consistency, and perceived consequences of flexible working.
- Capacity for corrective action through budget allocation, role regrading, process redesign, manager accountability, independent review, and recurring measurement.

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review literature on gender pay gaps, professional careers, organisational inequality, compensation governance, transparency, and evidence-based inclusion practices.
- Identify recurring features of professional firms that can influence pay, including billable work, client relationship ownership, sales contribution, partner sponsorship, and discretionary bonus processes.
- Compare firm contexts according to reward architecture, career pathway, work-allocation practices, flexibility norms, and governance controls.
- Map observed risks to diagnostic, corrective, preventive, and reporting measures that can be adapted to organisational size and professional context.
- Interpret the combined evidence to formulate an integrated pay-equity and career-equity framework for professional service firms.

- Develop practical recommendations for internal review, leadership accountability, employee communication, and future empirical research.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative comparison of compensation systems, opportunity structures, and governance arrangements across representative professional-service contexts.
- Interpretation of how salary, incentive, promotion, and client-development practices interact to produce or reduce gendered earnings outcomes.
- Assessment of the relationship between decision transparency, procedural consistency, employee trust, talent retention, and the effectiveness of remedial action.
- Identification of interventions that can be adapted for partnership firms, consulting practices, knowledge-intensive corporate units, and specialist advisory businesses.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis indicates that payroll data are necessary but not sufficient for understanding gender pay equity in professional service firms. A pay analysis can identify a difference in average reward, but the explanation may sit upstream in role assignment, sales opportunity, promotion timing, or access to client revenue. A useful diagnostic therefore begins by separating major compensation components and then tracing how people become eligible for each component. For example, a bonus gap may be associated with different performance ratings, but those ratings may in turn reflect unequal allocation of high-margin projects or client-facing leadership responsibilities. The analytical task is to follow the decision chain rather than treat the final pay figure as self-explanatory.

A second finding is that discretionary systems require especially strong governance. Professional firms often value judgment because client work is complex and outcomes cannot always be reduced to a formula. However, discretion without standards can make bias difficult to detect and challenge. Decisions about bonus pools, origination credit, retention awards, or partnership allocation may be influenced by informal

sponsorship, legacy client relationships, visibility with senior decision-makers, or perceptions of commercial style. Documentation does not eliminate judgment, but it makes the basis of judgment reviewable. Decision-makers should be able to show what evidence was used, how comparable cases were treated, and why a reward outcome was proportionate to contribution.

The analysis also shows that career pathways can create a delayed pay gap. Early-career professionals may enter at broadly similar salaries, yet divergence can emerge through the distribution of mentoring, staffing, client contact, international exposure, and leadership opportunities. When a firm repeatedly assigns a narrow group to high-profile matters or to clients considered strategically important, that group accumulates experience that later appears to justify higher pay and faster promotion. This process can be self-reinforcing because past opportunity becomes evidence of future readiness. Equity review must therefore include a forward-looking question: who is receiving the assignments that are likely to generate the next cycle of advantage?

Flexible-working arrangements are another important point of analysis. Flexibility can retain expertise and expand participation, but its benefits depend on how it is implemented. Where flexibility is informally treated as a sign of lower ambition, professionals who use it may be excluded from urgent projects, client events, travel, or leadership conversations. The resulting pay effect may not appear as a direct penalty; instead, it may emerge through reduced visibility and slower accumulation of commercial credentials. Firms should measure whether flexible workers receive comparable performance ratings, promotion rates, client exposure, and incentive opportunities after legitimate role-related factors are considered.

The final analytical finding concerns organisational accountability. Pay-equity work is more reliable when senior leadership owns the issue, managers receive practical guidance, and progress is reviewed through defined metrics. A central human-resources or reward team can provide analytical capability, but business leaders must also account for assignment patterns, sponsorship decisions, and reward outcomes within their units.

Independent review, protected reporting channels, and regular employee communication strengthen credibility because they demonstrate that the process is not merely symbolic. The aim is not uniform pay regardless of contribution. It is a system in which differences in reward can be explained by transparent, relevant, and consistently applied factors.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that gender pay equity in professional service firms is inseparable from the wider architecture of professional careers. Traditional pay reviews can be valuable, especially when they identify unjustified salary or bonus differences among comparable employees. Yet an exclusive focus on the final pay number can leave the source of inequality untouched. In knowledge-intensive firms, rewards often follow from access to revenue, client trust, and leadership visibility. These are shaped by staffing, sponsorship, business-development opportunities, and informal signals about who is expected to succeed. A sustainable strategy must therefore join compensation review with opportunity review.

A career-equity approach changes the management question. Instead of asking only whether two individuals are paid the same today, the firm asks whether equally capable professionals are given a fair chance to build the experience, reputation, and commercial contribution that drive future reward. This does not require firms to ignore performance differences. It requires them to distinguish performance from unequal access to performance opportunities. For example, a senior consultant who has never been staffed on a major client transformation may have fewer measurable sales outcomes than a colleague who repeatedly receives such exposure. Treating those outcomes as purely individual achievement can conceal the role of managerial allocation.

The strongest interventions are layered. At the structural level, firms need clear job architecture, salary ranges, documented criteria for variable pay, and consistent processes for promotion and partnership selection. At the managerial level, they need disciplined staffing, calibrated performance reviews, inclusive sponsorship, and evidence-

based allocation of client credit. At the individual level, they need transparent feedback, accessible challenge routes, development support, and protection from retaliation. At the governance level, they need senior oversight, independent analytical capability, clear remediation procedures, and regular reporting that focuses on both outcomes and causes.

Transparency should be designed carefully. A transparent organisation does not necessarily disclose every individual salary. It makes the principles, ranges, criteria, and process understandable while safeguarding personal privacy. Employees should know what progression requires, how bonus outcomes are determined, what information supports a promotion case, and how they can raise concerns. Leaders should have access to sufficiently detailed data to detect patterns by level, service line, geography, working pattern, and compensation component. External reporting can strengthen accountability, but it is most credible when supported by internal evidence and a documented action plan.

Equity is also a business-quality issue. Professional clients increasingly assess whether their advisers reflect values of fairness, inclusion, and responsible governance. Firms that lose experienced women because reward systems are perceived as arbitrary may also lose continuity, institutional knowledge, and diverse perspective. Conversely, firms that build trusted, transparent career systems can strengthen retention, collaboration, succession, and reputational resilience. The goal is not only legal or reputational risk reduction; it is the development of a professional environment in which merit can be demonstrated and recognised without requiring conformity to a narrow model of availability, networking style, or leadership presence.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined gender pay equity in professional service firms as a linked question

8. REFERENCES

1. Blau, F. D., and Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(3), 789-865.
2. Goldin, C. (2014). A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter. *American Economic Review*, 104(4), 1091-1119.
3. Goldin, C. (2021). *Career and family: Women's century-long journey toward equity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

of compensation, opportunity, governance, and organisational legitimacy. It showed that professional reward systems are often complex because they combine salary, variable pay, client-revenue credit, career progression, and partnership-related distributions. These systems can support merit when their criteria are clear and consistently applied. They can also reproduce inequality when high-value opportunities, informal sponsorship, discretionary awards, and promotion pathways are not subject to evidence-based review.

The analysis found that law, consulting, accounting and audit, architecture and engineering, financial advisory, and technology service environments each require a tailored approach. However, common principles apply across contexts: define comparable work carefully; examine total reward; analyse role allocation and career progression; document discretionary decisions; correct unexplained differences promptly; protect employee voice; and monitor outcomes over time. No single pay audit, transparency statement, or training programme is sufficient in isolation. Effectiveness depends on coordinated action across reward, staffing, performance management, leadership development, and senior governance.

Professional service firms can create more equitable and resilient workplaces when they treat pay equity as an ongoing management capability. The long-term objective is a system in which compensation differences are transparent, relevant, and defensible; career-building opportunities are distributed fairly; and professionals can progress without being disadvantaged by gendered assumptions about commitment, visibility, caregiving, or commercial potential. Such a system supports not only fairness for employees but also stronger professional standards, more sustainable talent pipelines, and greater trust from clients and society.

4. Bertrand, M., Goldin, C., and Katz, L. F. (2010). Dynamics of the gender gap for young professionals in the financial and corporate sectors. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2(3), 228-255.
5. Blau, F. D., Ferber, M. A., and Winkler, A. E. (2014). *The economics of women, men, and work* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
6. International Labour Organization. (2019). *A quantum leap for gender equality: For a better future of work for all*. Geneva: ILO.
7. 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.
8. Castilla, E. J., and Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543-576.
9. Correll, S. J., Benard, S., and Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(5), 1297-1338.
10. Ridgeway, C. L., and Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender and Society*, 18(4), 510-531.
11. OECD. (2021). *Pay transparency tools to close the gender wage gap*. OECD Policy Brief on Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. Paris: OECD Publishing.
12. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
13. Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 56-87.
14. Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., and Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(9), 80-85.
15. European Commission. (2023). Directive (EU) 2023/970 to strengthen the application of the principle of equal pay for equal work or work of equal value through pay transparency and enforcement mechanisms. *Official Journal of the European Union*.
16. World Economic Forum. (2024). *Global gender gap report 2024*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
17. Kay, F. M., and Gorman, E. H. (2008). Women in the legal profession. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 4, 299-332.
18. Tomaskovic-Devey, D., and Avent-Holt, D. (2019). *Relational inequalities: An organizational approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
19. Joshi, A., Son, J., and Roh, H. (2015). When can women close the gap? A meta-analytic test of sex differences in performance and rewards. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5), 1516-1545.
20. Babcock, L., and Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
21. Eagly, A. H., and Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
22. Petersen, T., and Morgan, L. A. (1995). Separate and unequal: Occupation-establishment sex segregation and the gender wage gap. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(2), 329-365.
23. Levanon, A., England, P., and Allison, P. (2009). Occupational feminization and pay: Assessing causal dynamics using 1950-2000 U.S. Census data. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 865-891.
24. Stainback, K., Kleiner, S., and Skaggs, S. (2016). Women in power: Undoing or redoing the gendered organization? *Gender and Society*, 30(1), 109-135.
25. Kahn, J. R., and Garcia-Mangano, J. (2017). The inequality of motherhood: The gender wage gap in contemporary America. In S. McLanahan and C. E. Rouse (Eds.), *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 674(1), 113-132.
26. Hewlett, S. A., Peraino, K., Sherbin, L., and Sumberg, K. (2010). *The sponsor effect: Breaking through the last glass ceiling*. Harvard Business Review Research Report.
27. Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., and Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 10(3), 474-493.

28. Catalyst. (2020). Women in management consulting: Advancing equality in a changing profession. New York: Catalyst.
29. International Bar Association. (2022). 50:50 by 2030: Gender equality in the legal profession. London: International Bar Association.
30. United Nations Women. (2023). Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The gender snapshot 2023. New York: UN Women.