

Increasing the Number of Women in Senior Executive Positions

Improving Recruitment, Selection
and Retention Practices

Increasing the Number of Women in Senior Executive Positions: Improving Recruitment, Selection and Retention Practices

The role of the CEO

The role of the CEO in directly increasing the numbers of women in senior positions, as well as the pipeline to such roles, is paramount. The recommendations in this report will not secure increased numbers of women in senior roles and throughout the organisation, without the personal intervention of the CEO.

1. It is recommended the CEO consider:

- declaring the achievement of gender diversity within an inclusive culture to be a significant strategic objective of the organisation, and overseeing the development and implementation of the strategy to achieve it
- investing personal and reputational capital in reaching the objective
- actively modelling desired inclusive mindsets and behaviours in order to secure the objective
- discussing with the top team and HR leaders the adoption of each of the recommendations in this report and overseeing the implementation of those selected for adoption
- being the chief advocate and storyteller about diversity and inclusion
- leading recognition and acceptance of diversity and inclusion objectives within the organisation and among the board, including in the context of risk mitigation
- building awareness and understanding throughout the organisation of the business case for, and importance of, having gender diversity within an inclusive culture
- understanding, visibly monitoring and continuously challenging the female metrics (and corresponding explanations) throughout the organisation
- mandating clear and specific goals and targets¹³ to increase numbers of women throughout the organisation and publicising them internally and externally
- being willing to be held accountable¹⁴ for the achievement of targeted increased numbers of women
- holding others accountable for the achievement of such targets including through calling out and penalising unacceptable mindsets, behaviours and outcomes, and highlighting and rewarding achievements and successes
- recommending to the board the inclusion of specific gender diversity metrics – together with female successor identification, development and retention – in the CEO's and the top team's key performance indicators with a meaningful linkage to short-term incentives and other bonus payments
- recommending to the board that any CEO successor be required to have a demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion so that initiatives in this area are sustainable beyond current incumbents
- appointing women in equal numbers to men in the top team (if necessary by increasing, in the short term, the numbers in the top team) and staking their personal reputation on ensuring their success and the success of the required cultural transformation to inclusiveness¹⁵
- showing commitment to diversity and inclusion in all words and actions (including by bringing de-gendered norms and language to the table, by listening deeply and maintaining awareness of the personal thoughts and feelings that limit leadership effectiveness)
- undertaking and sharing with others the CEO's own results of unconscious bias testing
- tackling any issues of openness, honesty, authenticity and teamwork at the top that may detract from an inclusive culture and from women's ambitions to be part of the top team

-
- Shouldn't Matter, But Apparently It Still Does, HBR Blog. Similar results were obtained in the five-year study by Pfaff & Associates, published in 2009.
11. Prime, J., Carter, N.M. & Welbourne, T., 2009, Women Take Care, Men Take Charge: Managers' Stereotypic Perceptions of Women and Men Leaders, *The Psychologist-Manager Journal* 12(1) and *Catalyst*, 2007, The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned if You Do, Doomed if You Don't; Rime, J., Jonsten, K., Carter, N.M. & Maznevski, M., 2008, Managers' Perceptions of Women and Men Leaders: A Cross-Cultural Comparison, *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 8(2); Ibarra, H. & Obodaru, O., 2009, Women and the Vision Thing, HBR.
 12. Ibarra, H., Ely, R. & Kolb., D, Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013 explain that first generation bias encompassed the deliberate exclusion of women whereas second generation bias is now seen as the primary cause of women's persistent under-representation in leadership roles. This bias erects powerful but subtle and often invisible barriers for women that arise from cultural assumptions and organisational structures, practices, and patterns of interaction that inadvertently benefit men while putting women at a disadvantage. The Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO) defines second generation gender biases as "work cultures and practices that appear neutral and natural on their face," yet they reflect masculine values and life situations of men who have been dominant in the development of traditional work settings: Spela Trefault, Deborah Merrill-Sands, Deborah Kolb, and Suzanne Carter, "Closing the Women's Leadership Gap: Who Can Help?" April, 2011, http://www.simmons.edu/som/docs/insights_32_v6.pdf
 13. Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
 14. Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
 15. Barsh, J. & Yee, L., 2012, Unlocking the full potential of women at work, McKinsey.
 16. Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
 17. Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
 18. In a survey of Australian/New Zealand companies in 2010, 44% reported that their hires are not good performers and negatively impact business performance, profitability, productivity, customer service, teamwork, engagement and morale: Hudson, 2010, Positioning for Growth: Building a Dynamic Workforce in a new Economic Era.
 19. Benefits disclosed by S&P/ASX200 companies, in KPMG's 2013 Analysis of Disclosures for financial years ended between 31/12/11 and 30/12/12 are: broadening of skills and experience, enhanced potential to generate new ideas and improve the entity's ability to adapt to change, attraction and retention of top talent, better business outcomes by leveraging unique experiences from diverse backgrounds, access to broader pool of talent, enhanced strong corporate reputation, better opportunities to understand and engage with entity's stakeholders and communities, improved quality of life for workforce, families, communities and society at large, increased morale, reduced bias and prejudice in workplace, reduced absenteeism, responding well to change, developing employees to maximum capacity and creativity, and innovation.
 20. McKinsey shows the link between having gender diversity as a top priority and achieving representation in C-level positions: Women Matter 2010: Women at the top of corporations: Making it happen.
 21. In a survey of 605 Australian/New Zealand companies about drivers for the difference between an average and a high performer, no employers cited 'years of experience/experience', 'good references', 'where they worked before' or 'education/qualifications'. Yet these are still the most commonly used reference points in recruitment: Hudson, 2010, Positioning for Growth: Building a Dynamic Workforce in a new Economic Era. Characteristics found to distinguish high performers from low performers were openness (abstract, innovative, change-oriented and open-minded thinking), conscientiousness (organised, meticulous, rational, persevering actions) and professionalism (ambitious, critical, result-oriented, strategic, autonomous mindsets), along with several of their facets: Van Keer, E., Bogaert, J. & Trbovic, N, Could the Right Man for the Job be a Woman? How Women Differ from Men as Leaders, Hudson.
 22. Whelan, J. & Wood, R., Targets and Quotas for Women in Leadership: A Global Review of Policy, Practice and Psychological Research, The Gender Equality Project, Centre for Ethical Leadership, May, 2012; McKinsey Women Matter, 2012: Making the breakthrough; McKinsey, 2010, What Successful transformations share: McKinsey Global Survey results; McKinsey, Women Matter, 2010: Women at the top of corporations: Making it happen recommends including, at a minimum, numbers and proportions of women in each business unit and at each level, salary levels and attrition rates of men and women in comparable positions, and the ratio of women promoted to women eligible for promotion.

-
43. Research shows that stereotypes do not accurately represent reality – they misrepresent it: Hyde, J.S., 2005, *The Gender Similarity Hypothesis*, *American Psychologist*, 60(6); Aires, E., 1996, *Men and Women in Interaction: Reconsidering the Differences*, OUP.
44. Barsh, J. & Yee, L., 2012, *Unlocking the full potential of women at work*, McKinsey.
45. Warren, A.K., 2009, *Cascading Gender Biases, Compounding Effects: An Assessment of Talent Management Systems*, Catalyst.
46. Lyness, K.S & Heilman, M.E., 2006, *When Fit is Fundamental: Performance Evaluations and Promotions of Upper-Level Female and Male Managers*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4); Bauer, C.C. & Baltes, B.B., 2002, *Reducing the Effects of Gender Stereotypes on Performance Evaluations*, *Sex Roles*, 47(9/10).
47. See fn 10. Despite a large body of research supportive of the strength of women's leadership skills, attributions of success are, in practice, less likely to be applied to women than to men; in particular, compared to a male counterpart, a female leader is more likely to be judged as less competent, less influential and less likely to have played a leadership role when solving a team task and regarded as not fully responsible for company outcomes: Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32; Kulich, C., Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., 2007, *Where is the romance for women leaders? Gender effects on the romance of leadership and performance-based pay*, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 56(4); Heilman, M.S., & Haynes M.C., 2005, *No credit where credit is due: attributional rationalisation of women's success in male-female teams*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3).
- ⁴⁸ Roberts, T-A, 1991, *Gender and the influence of evaluations on self-assessments in achievement settings*, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol 109(2), 297–308; Browning, C., and Mitchell, L., 1980, *What you know can hurt you: the effects of performance criteria ambiguity on sex differences in self-confidence*, *Journal of Personality*, 48, p. 306.
49. Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, *Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work*, *Harvard Business Review*, September, 2013, McKinsey research rates such skill-building as one of the most effective measures to enhance diversity: *Women Matter*, 2010, *Women at the top of corporations: Making it happen*. After taking into account 'hot jobs', generic leadership development programs no longer significantly predict advancement – their true value is their amplifier effect, in concert with hot jobs and sponsorship, as a foundation upon which other forms of career learning can be built: *Centre for Creative Leadership*, 2011, *The 70-20-10 Rule*.
- ⁵⁰ Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, *Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work*, *Harvard Business Review*, September, 2013.
51. The BCA itself initiated a one-off mentoring program for female executives during 2010–11; Chief Executive Women have, for many years, run their Leaders' (formerly Talent Development) Program and there is a range of mentoring firms offering focused one-on-one mentoring by professional mentors; see also Wilson, P., 2012, *Make Mentoring Work*, Major Street Publishing.
52. Wilson, M.S, Van Velsor, E., Chandrasekar, A. & Criswell, C., 2011, *Grooming Top Leaders*, *Centre For Creative Leadership*; McKinsey, 2008, *Women Matter 2: Female leadership, a competitive edge for the future*.
53. McKinsey, 2008, *Women Matter 2: Female leadership, a competitive edge for the future*, highlights the role training can play in leadership development; however for women, this can tend to be a substitute for receiving experience in key 'hot jobs' – see fn40.
54. Bain & Chief Executive Women, 2013, *Creating a Positive Cycle: Critical Steps to Achieving Gender Parity in Australia*.
55. Kaplan, D.M., Wiley, J.W. & Maertz Jr, C.P., 2011, *The Role of Calculative Attachment in the Relationship Between Diversity Climate and Retention*, *Human Resource Management*, 50 (2); Cornell University, ILR School Centre for Advanced Human Resource Studies, 2010, *Paving the path to performance: Inclusive leadership reduces turnover in diverse work groups*; Patterson, N. & Mavin, S., 2009, *Women Entrepreneurs: Jumping the Corporate Ship and Gaining New Wings*, *International Small Business Journal*, 27(2).
56. Carter, N.M., Silva, C., 2010, *Women in Management: Delusions of Progress*, HBR.
57. Kulich, C., Trojanowski, G., Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., & Renneboog, L.D.R., 2011, *Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32.
58. O'Neill, O. & O'Reilly, C., 2010, *Careers as Tournaments: The impact of sex and gendered organisational culture preferences on MBA's income attainment*, *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 31. There is also a positive relationship between company performance and bonuses for male executives that is not replicated for female executives, although females appear to be punished less in bonus terms when a company is

-
- not doing well, raising the question of how their bonuses are actually assessed: Kulich, C., Trojanowski, G., Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., & Renneboog, L.D.R., 2011, Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32; Arulampalam, W., Booth, A.L., Bryan, M.L., 2005, Is there a glass ceiling over Europe? An exploration of asymmetries in the gender pay gap across the wages distribution; ISER Working Paper 2005 Weinberg, D.H., 2004, Evidence from census 2000 about earnings by detailed occupation for men and women, Census 2000 special reports, May, US Census Bureau.
59. Men are paid for potential while women are paid for proven performance, which results in men who change organisations having the greatest compensation growth and women earning more (than women who change companies) when they stay where they have already proven their worth: Carter, N.M. & Silva, C., 2011, *The Myth of the Ideal Worker: Does doing all the right things really get women ahead?* Catalyst.
 60. Milem, J.F., Chang, M.J. & Antonio, A.L., 2005, Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective, AAC&U; Jordan, T.H., 2011, Moving From Diversity to Inclusion, *Profiles in Diversity Journal*; Male Champions of Change, 2011, Our Experiences in elevating the representation of women in leadership: a letter from business leaders; McPherson, J.R. & Mendonca, L.T., 2008, The challenge of hiring and retaining women, McKinsey.
 61. See McKinsey, 2008, *Women Matter 2: Female leadership, a competitive edge for the future regarding broadening leadership behaviours*.
 62. McKinsey's *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough*.
 63. In a Catalyst study, 25% of women left their first job because of a difficult manager versus 16% of men: Carter, N.M. & Silva, C., 2010, *Women in Management: Delusions of Progress*, HBR.
 64. McKinsey research shows that a company's perceived commitment to gender parity tends to dwindle further down the organisation; the closer to the front line, the less support there appears to be for gender diverse initiatives due, at least in part, to men lower in the organisation being less persuaded of the need for gender diversity initiatives and less aligned with their objectives: 65% of men felt their company's evaluation processes treated men and women equally, whereas only 30% of women felt the same: *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough*; similar disparities between the sexes were found by Bain & Chief Executive Women, 2011, *What stops women from reaching the top? Confronting the tough issues*.
 65. Sealy, R.H.V. & Singh, V., 2010, The Importance of Role Models and Demographic Context for Senior Women's Work Identity Development, *International Journal of Management Reviews*. Bain & Chief Executive Women, 2013, *Creating a Positive Cycle: Critical Steps to Achieving Gender Parity in Australia*.
 - ⁶⁶ Groysberg, B. & Connolly, K., 2013, Great Leaders Who Make the Mix Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
 67. A large body of research has debunked the so-called Queen Bee syndrome and demonstrated that women are more likely to develop others than men (65% versus 56%), particularly those who have been developed themselves and those in senior roles, and they are more likely to be developing other women. Failure by some men to develop others is not attributed to their gender group as a whole and so is not used to negatively characterise all men's behaviour, whereas such failure in a women is used to negatively characterise women's behaviour as a group: Dinolfo, S., Silva, C. & Carter, N.M., 2012, High Potentials in the Pipeline: Leaders pay it forward, Catalyst; Rindfleisch, J., 2000, Senior Management Women in Australia: Diverse Perspectives, *Women in Management Review*, 15(4); Ragins, B.R. & Scandura, T.A., 1994, Gender Differences in Expected Outcomes of Mentoring Relationships, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4); Mavin, S., 2008, Queen Bees, Wannabees, and Afraid to Bees: No More 'Best Enemies' for Women in Management, *British Journal of Management*, 19.
 68. Foust-Cummings, H., Dinolfo, S. & Kohler, J., 2011, Sponsoring Women to Success, Catalyst; Silva, C., Carter, N.M. & Beninger, 2012, Good Intentions, Imperfect Execution? Women get fewer of the 'hot jobs' needed to advance, Catalyst; *Women Matter*, 2010, *Women at the top of corporations: Making it happen*; Ibarra, H., Carter, N.M., & Silva, C., 2010, Why Men Still Get More Promotions Than Women, HBR.
 - ⁶⁹ Catalyst, 2007, *The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned if You Do, Doomed if You Don't*
 70. McKinsey's *Women Matter 2012: Making the Breakthrough*. See also Hewlett, S.A., Peraino, K., Sherbin, L. & Sumberg, K., 2010, *The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling*, HBR Research Report; Barsh, J., Cranston, S. & Craske, R.A., 2008, *Centered leadership: How talented women thrive*, McKinsey.
 71. Barsh, J. & Yee, L., 2012, *Unlocking the full potential of women at work*, McKinsey.
 72. Ibarra, H., Carter, N.M., Silva, C., 2010, Why Men Still Get More Promotions Than Women, HBR.
 73. The behavioural styles often most valued in traditionally masculine cultures and most used as indicators of leadership potential may be both unappealing and unnatural for women and can place them in a double bind of being penalised both for their stereotypically feminine (viewed as less competent and so having to prove, repeatedly that they can lead) and masculine (too aggressive) traits and being judged according to

-
- extremes: Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L., *Through the Labyrinth*, HBR Press, 2007; *Catalyst*, 2007, *The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned if You Do, Doomed if You Don't*.
74. Bain & Chief Executive Women, 2011, What stops women from reaching the top? Confronting the tough issues. Does the fact that 64% of women aged 25–54 working full time in Australia have no children under 18, and 79% have no children under 12, indicate that many have given up full time work in favour of part-time work in frustration at not being allowed to work flexibly? It would seem so, given the high rates of part time working for women aged 30–44 (reaching a high of 49% in the 35–39 age group): Australian Bureau of Statistics Research, December 2012, commissioned by Optimiss Consulting, and the Australian Institute of Family Studies, 2008, *Work and Family Responsibilities through Life*. A recent survey of Harvard MBA graduates found that less than 10% in the ages 31–68 who were not working, had chosen this in order to care for children: <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/7138.html>.
 75. Year Book Australia, 2012, 1301.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics.
 76. McKinsey, 2008, *Women Matter 2: Female leadership, a competitive edge for the future*. See also Deloitte, 2011, *Only skin deep? Re-examining the business case for diversity, for benefits to business of flexibility for all employees*. See the report issued by the Diversity Council of Australia, 2012, with the support of Westpac, Stockland, Origin Energy and Allens, *Get Flexible: Mainstreaming flexible work in Australian business*.
 77. http://www.workplaceflexibility.com.au/expert_articles.html.
 78. Bain & Co and Chief Executive Women, 2013, *Creating a Positive Cycle: Critical Steps to Achieving Gender Parity in Australia*; Barsh, J & Yee, L., 2011, *Changing Companies' Minds about women*, *The McKinsey Quarterly*; McKinsey's *Women Matter 2007* report.
 - ⁷⁹ Secino, A, 2013, *Why Unqualified Candidates Get Hired Anyway*, HBS Working Knowledge, 25 July, 2013.
 80. Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, *Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process*, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
 81. *Personnel Selection*, *Journal of Occupation and Organisational Psychology*, 74, 2001, Hudson, 2011, *Next Generation Recruitment: Battle Strategies for the Talent War*, 20:20 Series.
 82. Burgmann, L., 2012, *Managing in a Flexible Work Environment*, AIM.
 83. Warren, A.K., 2009, *Cascading Gender Biases, Compounding Effects: An Assessment of Talent Management Systems*, *Catalyst*.
 84. s.44 of the Sex Discrimination Act, 1984 and refer to the Australian Human Rights Commission Guidelines of 2009 at http://www.humanrights.gov.au/legal/exemptions/sda_exemption/sda_exemption_guidelines.html.
 85. Valian, 1998, *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge: MIT Press, p. 280; Heilman, 1980, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26: 386-395; Sackett et al., 1991, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2): 263-267; Heilman, 1980, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26: 386–95; Hewstone et al., 2006, *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9(4): 509–532; Huffcutt & Roth, 1998, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2): 179–189; Van Ommeren et al., 2005, *Psychological Reports*, 96: 349–360. Surprisingly, in the December 2012 Quarterly Dun & Bradstreet Business Expectations Survey of Australian business 87% of respondents had not appointed nor had any intention to appoint a woman to a senior management position and only 16% were planning to mandate that female candidates be included in the short list for recruitment for senior management.
 86. Bain & chief Executive Women, 2013, *Creating a Positive Cycle: Critical Steps to Achieving Gender Parity in Australia*.
 87. Foschi, M., 1996, *Double Standards in the Evaluation of Men and Women*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(3).
 88. Steinpreis, Anders, & Ritzke, 1999, *Sex Roles*, 41, 509; see also Correll, Benard and Paik, 2007, *American Journal of Sociology*, 112 (5), which showed that evaluators rated mothers as less competent and committed to their work than non-mothers, mothers were less likely to be recommended for recruitment, promotion and management and were offered lower starting salaries than non-mothers and prospective employers called mothers back about half as often as non-mothers – by contrast fathers were not disadvantaged at all in the hiring process, but seen as more committed and offered higher starting salaries.
 89. Macan, T.H. & Dipboye, R.L., 1988, *The effects of interviewers' initial impressions on information gathering*, *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 42.
 90. Carter, N.M. & Silva, C., 2010, *Women in Management: Delusions of Progress*, HBR; Maca, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, *Actions Speak Too: Uncovering Possible Implicit and Explicit Discrimination in the Employment Interview Process*, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26 (8).
 91. Trix & Psenka, 2003, *Discourse & Society*, 14(2): 191–220.

-
92. Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8): also see additional references noted in this article.
93. McKay & Davis, 2008, cited in Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
94. Posthuma, R.A., Morgeson, F.P. & Campion, M.A., 2002, Beyond Employment Interview Validity: A Comprehensive Narrative Review of Recent Research and Trends Over Time, *Personnel Psychology*, 55(1).
- ⁹⁵ Secino, A, 2013, Why Unqualified Candidates Get Hired Anyway, HBS Working Knowledge, 25 July 2013, notes the dangers of decisions based on successful experience in a different environment.
96. Sommers, 2006, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90 (4), 597–612.
97. Paladino, P., & Castelli, L., 2008, On the immediate consequences of intergroup categorisation: Activation of approach and avoidance motor behavior toward in-group and out-group members, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34.
98. McPherson, J.R. & Mendonca, L.T., 2008, The challenge of hiring and retaining women, McKinsey.
99. Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
- ¹⁰⁰ Secino, A, 2013, Why Unqualified Candidates Get Hired Anyway, HBS Working Knowledge, 25 July 2013.
101. Uhlmann, E.L. & Cohen, G.L., 2007, 'I think therefore it's true': Effects of self-perceived objectivity on hiring decisions, *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*.
- ¹⁰² Secino, A, 2013, Why Unqualified Candidates Get Hired Anyway, HBS Working Knowledge, 25 July 2013 records the studies as having been conducted by Swift, S.A., Moore, D.A., Sharek, Z.S. and Gino, F and published in July 2013 in the *Journal PLOS ONE*.
103. Catalyst, 2005, Women 'Take Care', Men 'Take Charge': Stereotyping of U.S. Business Leaders Exposed. See also Eagly, A.H. & Karau, S.J., 2001, Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders, *Psychological Review*, 3; Heilman, M.E., 2001, Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organisational Ladder, *Journal of Social Issues*, 4; Schein, V.E., 2001, A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management, *Journal of Social Issues*, 4; Schneider, D., 2005, *The Psychology of Stereotyping*, Guilford Press.
104. Catalyst, 2007, The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned if You Do, Doomed if You Don't.
105. One recruiter's research shows indicators for success in a role fall into three categories: the low level indicator of performance (technical skills and experience), the mid-level indicator of potential (capability and attributes to deepen the employer's understanding of what aspects of the candidate's behavioural capacity can be applied in the organisation) and the high indicator of motivation and career fit. Australian and New Zealand employers focus overwhelmingly (63%) on the performance category; 30% address potential and only 7% measure the 'want to' category of motivational fit and career fit, including the depth of commitment the candidate will bring to the role. And yet, when Australian and New Zealand employers were asked their thoughts on what distinguishes a high performer from the average one, not a single one cited the performance category tools of 'good references', 'years of experience/experience', 'education/qualifications' or 'where they have worked before'. What they do cite is 'willingness to go the extra mile to exceed targets, their higher level of motivation and their enthusiasm, all in the 'want to' category. These manifest in a desire for continual self-improvement and maintenance of a positive attitude, underpinned by loyalty and commitment, and an ability to inspire others and boost team productivity. In other words, in predominantly hiring on past performance, employers are thinking far less about what the employee might want from their career and how much value they will deliver to the performance of the business. As a result, employers are finding that 44% of their hires are not good: Hudson White Paper 2020, 2010, Positioning for Growth.
106. High motivation to control prejudice will moderate stereotypic activation and application; when interviewers are not so motivated, they will allocate more attention to stereotype-consistent information than to stereotype-inconsistent information or scrutinise stereotype-inconsistent information more critically and discount it to preserve their stereotypes: Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
107. Pitterman, H., 2008, The Leadership Challenge: Women in Management; and helps minimise bias Griffiths, J., 2005, *Masculine Wives*, *People Management*, 11(21).
108. Bauer and Baltes, 2002, *Sex Roles* 9/10, 465.

-
109. Negatively stereotyped groups must perform above and beyond the levels required for positively stereotyped groups simply in order to be perceived as equivalent. As a result, work products tend to be perceived as higher quality when attributed to men than to women and unexpected performance elicits a stricter standard because the decision-maker requires stronger evidence that the performance was due to ability: Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, *Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process*, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
110. Biernat, M., & Ma, J. E., 2005. Stereotypes and the confirmability of trait concepts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31.
111. Macan, T. & Merritt, S., 2011, *Actions Speak Too: Uncovering possible implicit and explicit discrimination in the employment interview process*, *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 26(8).
112. Even when men and women adopt the same career advancement strategies, men benefit more from such strategies in terms of advancement and remuneration growth, across organisations of all sizes, leaving women less satisfied with their careers and remuneration; women do advance further and secure sponsors when they make their achievements visible and ask for promotions: Carter, N.M. & Silva, C., 2011, *The Myth of the Ideal Worker: Does doing all the right things really get women ahead?*, *Catalyst*.
113. Babcock, L. & Laschever, S., 2003, *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide*, Princeton University Press; Kulich, C., Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., 2008, *Why women don't ask: the impact of gendered experiences on attitudes towards pay negotiation*, *Social Psychology Seminar*, University of Queensland. Lesser remuneration reflects lesser valuing by the company, lesser perceived influence, ability, credibility and agency and underrating of women, including when negotiating remuneration in promotion or appointment process; it may also undermine retention of women: Kulich, C., Trojanowski, G., Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., & Renneboog, L.D.R., 2011, *Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 32 and Ridgeway, C.L., 2001, *The emergence of status beliefs: from structural inequality to legitimising ideology*, in *The Psychology of Legitimacy*, (Jost, J.T. & Major, B. eds.) Cambridge University Press.
114. Tannen, D., 1995, *The Power of Talk: Who gets heard and why*, HBR, 73.
115. For more on the gender differences in style and the limitations on women's progression due to style differences see Bain & Co & Chief Executive Women, 2011, *What stops women from reaching the top? Confronting the tough issues*; Van Keer, E., Bogaert, J. & Trbovic, N, *Could the Right Man for the Job be a Woman? How Women Differ from Men as Leaders*, Hudson; Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T., 1990 *Gender and Leadership Style: a meta-analysis*, *Psychological Bulletin*, September Volume 108 (2); Carless, S.A., 1998, *Gender differences in transformational leadership; an examination of superior, leader and subordinate perspectives*, *Sex Roles*, volume 39, 11 and 12; Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., & Atwater, L. 1996, *The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women*, *Applied Psychology*, volume 45.
116. Pitterman, H., 2008, *The Leadership Challenge: Women in Management*; Watt, B., Busine, M. & Wienker, E., 2005, *Recruiting for Cultural Fit: are you getting value(s) from your selection activities?*, DDI; Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, E. & Axelrod, B., 2001, *The War For Talent*, HBS Press; Lyness, K.S & Heilman, M.E., 2006, *When Fit is Fundamental: Performance Evaluations and Promotions of Upper-Level Female and Male Managers*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4).
- ¹¹⁷ Ibarra, H. Ely, R. & Kolb, D., *Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers*, *Harvard Business Review*, September 2013.
118. Kawakami, C., White, J.B. & Langer, E.J. 2000 *Mindful and masculine: Freeing Women leaders from the constraints of gender roles*, *Journal of Social Issues*; Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J., 2002, *Role congruity theory of prejudice towards female leaders*, *Psychological Review*, 109(3); *Catalyst*, 2007, *The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned if You Do, Doomed if You Don't*.
119. Pitterman, H., 2008, *The Leadership Challenge: Women in Management*.
120. Ibarra, H. & Obodaru, O., 2009, *Women and the Vision Thing*, HBR.
121. Genat, A., Wood, R. and Sojo, V, *Evaluation Bias and Backlash: Dimensions Predictors and Implications for Organisations*, November 2012.
122. Silva, C., Carter, N.M. & Beninger, 2012, *Good Intentions, Imperfect Execution? Women get fewer of the 'hot jobs' needed to advance*, *Catalyst*: 11% of men and 10% of women declined international assignments.
123. Bain & Co and Chief Executive Women, 2013, *Creating a Positive Cycle: Critical Steps to Achieving Gender Parity in Australia* and Carter, N.M. & Silva, C, 2010, *Pipeline's Broken Promise*, *Catalyst*, each dispel the myth that women have lower aspirations than men.
124. McKinsey research among MBA graduates shows that, like men, most women (38%) who leave a job, move to another, for faster career advancement, rather than exit the workforce; like men, the next most cited reasons were more money/better benefits (26%) or a career change (27%). However, more women

(25%) than men (16%) leave companies because of a difficult manager. Only 3% of women (2% of men) left for child rearing reasons: Barsh, J & Yee, L., 2011, Changing Companies' Minds about women, The McKinsey Quarterly, September; Carter, N.M. & Silva, C., 2010, Pipeline's Broken Promise, Catalyst.

BUSINESS COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA

42/120 Collins Street Melbourne 3000 T 03 8664 2664 F 03 8664 2666 www.bca.com.au

© Copyright November 2013 Business Council of Australia ISBN 978 1 922058 47 8 ABN 75 008 483 216

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or used in any way without acknowledgement to the Business Council of Australia.

The Business Council of Australia has taken reasonable care in publishing the information contained in this publication but does not guarantee that the information is complete, accurate or current. In particular, the BCA is not responsible for the accuracy of information that has been provided by other parties. The information in this publication is not intended to be used as the basis for making any investment decision and must not be relied upon as investment advice. To the maximum extent permitted by law, the BCA disclaims all liability (including liability in negligence) to any person arising out of use or reliance on the information contained in this publication including for loss or damage that you or anyone else might suffer as a result of that use or reliance.