



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Metz, M;Kulik, CT

Title:

Gender equality in the Finance industry: The challenging 'last mile'

Date:

2021-12-03

Citation:

Metz, M. & Kulik, C. T. (2021). Gender equality in the Finance industry: The challenging 'last mile'. Galvin, P (Ed.) Proceedings of the 34th Annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM) Conference, pp.483-501. ANZAM.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/303085>

## 4. Gender, Diversity and Indigeneity

**Champions of Change: Why do some CEOs champion gender diversity?**

Professor Isabel Metz

Melbourne Business School, University of Melbourne

200 Leicester Street, Carlton, Victoria, Australia 3053

Email: [i.metz@mbs.edu](mailto:i.metz@mbs.edu)

Professor Carol T. Kulik

School of Management, University of South Australia

Adelaide, South Australia, Australia 5001

E-mail: [carol.kulik@unisa.edu.au](mailto:carol.kulik@unisa.edu.au)

**Acknowledgements:** This project was supported by an Australian Research Council Linkage Project LP130100252 in partnership with the 100% Project and the Australian Senior Human Resources Roundtable. We thank Elizabeth Tupper for assisting with the project's administration and data coding.

## **Gender equality in the Finance industry: The challenging ‘last mile’**

### **ABSTRACT:**

*Organisational efforts to increase gender equality in leadership have had limited success, and Australia’s ranking in the global gender equality index has slipped since 2006. We call this challenging stage in gender equality efforts the ‘last mile’. To understand what hinders or assists organisational efforts in the ‘last mile’ we conducted an in-depth study of the diversity efforts in a business unit of a large Australian bank. Interviews, focus groups and archival data analyses demonstrated that the bank’s gender equality performance was better than their institutional field, and the workforce was more optimistic about gender equality outcomes than executives. Ironically, these illusions of progress hindered the bank’s ability to travel the ‘last mile’.*

**Keywords:** Gender equality, diversity policies, people practices, leaders.

There is continued pressure on organisations worldwide to address gender imbalances in senior roles (McKinsey & Co, 2020). For Australian companies, this pressure has intensified in the last decade. In 2010 the Australia Security Exchange (ASX) Corporate Governance Council introduced gender diversity reporting requirements for the top 200 publicly listed companies. Also in 2010 the emergence of the Male Champions of Change, an advocacy group for gender equality in leadership comprising high-profile leaders, increased the pressure on their peers to follow suit (Metz & Kulik, 2016). Media coverage of this Male Champions of Change group also raised social awareness and stakeholder expectations of women's representation in leadership. In 2014 the Australian government introduced the Workplace Gender Equality (minimum standards) Instrument, which requires employers with 500 or more employees to demonstrate a minimum commitment to gender equality in their workplaces as part of their reporting on gender equality indicators to the Workplace Gender Equality Agency [WGEA] (<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2014L00365/Explanatory%20Statement/Text>).

Despite these pressures, organisational efforts to increase gender equality in leadership have had limited success (McKinsey & Co, 2017). Women's representation on ASX 200 boards has increased (33.6% in 2021, up from 8.3% in 2009; AICD, 2021). But Australia's ranking in the global gender equality index has been slipping (50<sup>th</sup> place among 156 countries, down from its original 15<sup>th</sup> place in 2006) despite ranking first in educational attainment equity for women (WEF, 2021). In 2019-2020, only 18.3% of CEOs and 32.5% of key management positions were held by women (mostly in support roles like HR), and the overall proportion of female managers was 39.9% (WGEA, 2020b). These statistics show that progress toward gender equality has been slow. In addition, progress can backslide in tough business environments such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Deloitte, 2021).

This situation suggests a very challenging stage in gender equality efforts. We call this stage the 'last mile' because it involves the last step in a chain of efforts to increase women's representation in leadership. Given the potential of gender equality to lead to positive economic outcomes for organisations (McKinsey & Co, 2020), it is important to understand what hinders or assists organisational efforts in the 'last mile'. We contribute to that understanding with an in-depth study of the diversity efforts in one large Australian organisation.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Diversity policies and practices have improved modestly in Australian organisations (e.g., Fenwick, Costa, Sohal & D'Netto, 2011; WGEA, 2020a). An Australian study of 650 Human Resource managers and other leaders found that, in general, workforce diversity management is neither well understood nor prioritised (Davis, Frolova, & Callahan, 2016). Yet, successful gender diversity (GD) change likely entails concerted commitment to gender equality policies and practices for the sustained delivery of gender equality goals. Such commitment requires widespread understanding of the organisation's reasons behind gender equality and people capability to enact change. Collectively, these factors comprise an important but especially challenging stage in the successful delivery of gender equality goals, analogous to the difficulties of the delivery stage or 'last mile' in a supply chain (Aized & Srail, 2014).

Organisations do not adopt uniform strategies to increase and manage women's representation. The tactics an organisation chooses derive from the organisation's fundamental 'diversity paradigm': the normative beliefs and expectations about employee diversity and its role in the organisation (Dass & Parker, 1999; Thomas & Ely, 1996; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). The literature has identified four distinct paradigms based on how actively an organisation embraces diversity (Dass & Parker, 1999; Thomas & Ely, 1996). Specifically, the *Resistance* paradigm encompasses organisations that concentrate on enhancing organisational effectiveness and productivity by maintaining the demographic homogeneity of its workforce and the status quo. Organisation members may actively discourage diversity or ignore diversity issues. The *Discrimination-and-Fairness* paradigm focuses an organisation's attention on providing equal opportunities in hiring and promotion, suppressing prejudicial attitudes, and eliminating discrimination in its practices. An *Access-and-Legitimacy* paradigm encourages an organisation to develop a workforce that reflects the diversity within the labour force and the organisation's customer base (e.g., hiring more women to attract and serve female customers). Finally, an organisation adopting an *Integration-and-Learning* paradigm uses the entire range of insights, skills, and experiences of a diverse workforce to rethink its primary tasks and redefine its business practices in ways that will advance its mission. These diversity paradigms can similarly describe organisations' efforts to manage gender diversity.

In the case of gender diversity, some organisations successfully navigate the change process by progressively *shifting* toward more proactive paradigms; others are likely to experience *sticking points* that hinder their gender diversity efforts. For example, factors external to the organisation, such as legislation and reporting agencies' requirements, have motivated Australian organisations to develop better gender diversity strategies, policies and practices. However, this progressive shift toward a more proactive paradigm has been 'modest and uneven' (Fenwick et al., 2011; WGEA, 2020a: 6). Practices such as diversity training can backfire because they send signals that are interpreted in unintended ways (Leslie, 2019). Men can feel threatened (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016) and decision-makers can become complacent about their biases in the presence of GD policies and practices (Castilla, 2016; Castilla & Benard, 2010). Thus, external factors can initiate gender equality change efforts, but for change to be sustainable that efforts must align with the organisation's diversity paradigm and be embedded within the organisation.

We know that senior management involvement is a necessary but insufficient factor to successful change in general (Kotter, 2007) and to diversity change in particular (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000). CEOs, for example, can launch diversity initiatives and ensure that resources are available to support them (Metz & Kulik, 2008; Ng, 2008). But while senior managers can provide top level commitment to diversity management policies, mid-level managers implement policy on a day-to-day basis (Kirton & Greene, 2009). Therefore, mid-level managers need to understand the reasons behind the gender equality policies and practices to be able to enact them and inspire their staff to do the same. Further, successful change requires the endorsement of most of the workforce (Kotter, 2007). Similarly, women's increased representation in leadership likely benefits from everyone's commitment to gender equality efforts in their workplace (Metz, 2020).

Thus, we focus in this study on understanding the internal factors that allow or hinder an organisation's shift towards a more progressive gender diversity paradigm. This understanding is important to stem the under-utilization of a highly educated female population and Australia's continued decline in global gender equality ranking (WEF, 2021).

## **METHODS**

We used a case study method to investigate the factors that might assist or disrupt gender equality change efforts in an organisation. A case study methodology may be best suited to understand how an organisation's values affect and sustain organisational development and performance (Yin, 2009). We collected interview, focus group, and archival data. Triangulation across data sources provides multiple perspectives, supplies more information on emerging concepts, and yields stronger substantiation of constructs (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Our case is a substantial business unit in one large Australian bank. To ensure confidentiality, we refer to our study site as Finance. This is an appropriate site to conduct our study for two reasons. First, Finance is one of the top 200 publicly listed companies in the ASX. As such, the company is required to comply with both the ASX Corporate Governance Council's gender diversity reporting requirements and WGEA's minimum standards. Second, the Finance and Insurance Services sector has shown modest gains in women's representation in top roles (McKinsey & Co, 2017). These modest gains suggest that these external factors incentivised finance and insurance organisations to initiate gender equality change but are failing to embed those change efforts in this sector.

### **Sample and Data Collection**

Finance provides a suite of products and services for its clients, has a workforce of more than 6000 and a presence in more than a dozen Asia-Pacific markets. The Chief Executive requested we conducted this study expressing concern with the relatively low numbers of women in leadership and management roles in Finance, despite considerable effort to improve their representation. This effort had been ongoing for at least five years.

We interviewed nine members of Finance's top management group: the Chief Executive and his direct reports, which included the HR executive. The average interviewee's company tenure was 15 years, ranging from 9 to 22 years; three interviewees were female and six were male. We call this group 'Executive' hereafter.

We also conducted focus groups (FG) of senior- and mid-level managers and a few non-managerial employees. A focus group methodology is particularly appropriate where members of different demographic groups are likely to disagree on the effectiveness of an organisation's diversity management strategies (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). Specifically, we conducted eight gender-mixed and

one women-only focus groups. The average company tenure of the FG participants was seven years, ranging from 1.5 to over 20 years. Focus groups' participants were 73% female and 27% male. We call this group 'Non-Executive' hereafter.

Finally, we obtained clarification on some of the information provided by the study's participants (e.g., policies, initiatives, and staff demographics) from our organisation contacts. The archival data assisted with documenting and verifying Finance's representation of women over time (Yin, 2009). Based on archival data, we established that about 43% of Finance's management were women, but this percentage was greater at low than high levels of management. Women in leadership positions had remained at around 16% for the previous four years. Thus, the Chief Executive specifically asked us to investigate why the pace of change had been slow.

We drew inspiration from Lester, Kickul and Bergmann (2007)<sup>1</sup> in developing four short narratives that captured the essential elements of diversity paradigms described by Thomas and Ely (1996) and Dass and Parker (1999). We described the four paradigms within brief narratives (see Figure 1). We opened all the interviews and focus groups by asking each participant to individually identify the paradigm they felt most closely represented Finance's approach to diversity management.

---

Insert Figure 1 about here

---

The interview and focus group protocols comprised semi-structured questions. Specifically, we asked participants to describe the history of the organisation's approach to diversity management, including any challenges or opportunities. The paradigm narratives and protocol questions mentioned 'diversity' rather than 'gender diversity' to avoid priming the participants.

The interviews lasted one hour on average and the focus groups 1.5 hours. All sessions were digitally recorded with the participants' permission and later transcribed. The transcripts were analysed using an inductive, interpretative approach (Langley 1999). The data analysis comprised a two-step process. In the first step, we analysed the individual responses and generated first-order categories using the comparative method of analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). In the second step,

---

<sup>1</sup> Lester et al. (2007) developed short narratives of four different types of psychological contracts to describe the relationship between each employee and their employer (i.e., transitional, transactional, balanced, relational).

we clustered the individual codes by Executive and Non-Executive to look for cross-group patterns; this led to second-order themes. Figure 2 shows our coding process and data structure. We present ‘power’ quotes in-text to illustrate the findings (Pratt, 2009: 860). We assigned ‘FG#’ or ‘IN#’ to each focus group and interviewee respectively, and a number for each participant. We also attach the participant’s gender to each quote.

---

Insert Figure 2 about here

---

## FINDINGS

### Diversity Management Paradigms at Finance

Some participants found it challenging to pick one paradigm that best described their organisation’s current approach to diversity. In such cases, participants wrote a number on the paradigm sheet, say 2.5, to indicate that Finance was operating between the second and third paradigms. We recorded all integers and all rounded-down fractions (corresponding to the less active paradigm) in Table 1. We call this tally a ‘Conservative’ summary of all participant responses to the paradigm exercise.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Based on Table 1, we make three observations. First, in Table 1 no Executive and only two Non-Executive participants positioned Finance in the least active *Resistance* paradigm. Further, 77.8% (seven interviewees) of the Executives identified *Discrimination-and-Fairness* as Finance’s paradigm, although four Executives indicated that Finance had started its journey towards *Access-and-Legitimacy*. The Conservative summary suggests that Executives understand that more needs to be done.

... *the stat that I really wanted to move [women’s representation] ... to send a positive message back to them to say “Yes we can do this.” I didn’t get it. Anyway, we’ll keep going.* (IN#2, M)

Second, Non-Executives (particularly male ones) were more optimistic about Finance’s approach to diversity management than Executives. Table 1 shows that the Non-Executives were almost evenly split between the *Discrimination-and-Fairness* (48.8% or 42 FG participants) and *Access-and-Legitimacy* (51.2% or 44 FG participants) paradigms. However, male Non-Executives were more likely to identify a more

active paradigm and to think that the organisation had progressed than their female colleagues.

*I've been with [area A] for just over eleven years, and there's obviously been a lot of change in that time (FG#5; M)*

*I've been with [area A] for about four years ... in the leadership positions that we're exposed to, there is a higher level of males in those leadership roles opposed to females (FG#5; F)*

Thus, there seems to be greater alignment between Executives' and female Non-Executives' views of Finance's diversity management efforts than between Executives and male Non-Executives. While male Non-Executives' views were based on observations, female Non-Executives' views were often also based on their lived experiences. For example, women mentioned experiencing pushback and resistance from male colleagues about gender equality policies and practices.

*Someone in HR will want to meet with the females ... when we sit back down, the older men will say "oh, when is the meeting for men in finance" ... it's a joke, but there's obviously ... a bit of pushback (FG#2; F)*

*There are comments and things that just shouldn't be tolerated.... I've heard, "oh maybe the business would be better if they [women] didn't work flexibly" (FG#4; F)*

Third, Table 1 shows greater heterogeneity of perceptions at the Non-Executive than at the Executive level regarding Finance's approach to diversity management. This heterogeneity suggests varied understanding and implementation of gender equality policies and practices across the organisation.

*... the policies are the same across [Finance] but the way that they've been implemented or the psyche and the underlying culture ... been quite tribal and ... driven by the leader ... and the leadership team at that particular business. So, it varies. (IN#5, F)*

The Chief Executive's understanding aligned with women's views: *We are stuck...in 2017...what has changed?* To verify his statement, we asked study participants to tell us the history of the organisation's approach to diversity management, including any facilitators of or obstacles to diversity change.

### **The History of Diversity Management at Finance**

The participants mentioned both facilitators of and obstacles to diversity change at Finance, but the latter surpassed the former almost threefold. Further, the facilitators were mostly efforts at the organisation level; the obstacles were factors at both the interpersonal and organisational levels that obstruct the delivery of diversity goals during the 'last mile' of diversity change efforts. For example, participants regularly mentioned the portfolio of policies and initiatives adopted or made more visible in the last five or so years as

a key facilitator. Most obvious were policies around recruitment and flexibility.

*... what's changed is that policies have been put in place...at a group level...they probably were in place about five years ago...we started doing things such as all roles flex<sup>2</sup>, opening up maternity leave to be parental leave...the 50% females on a short list, females as part of an interview panel ... (IN#9; F)*

However, a gap seemed to exist at Finance between policy and practice. Executives and Non-Executives largely agreed that this was due to interpersonal factors such as 'biases', 'lack of follow through' and male backlash; organisational factors such as communication; or a mix of both. For example, biases comprised potentially unconscious and conscious biases such as sexism and traditional mentality.

*when I first met with [male manager], ...He couldn't figure me out... "who earns more money in your relationship... who has the balance of power in your relationship"... I remember just not knowing how to answer ...and ...quickly thinking "what is he really trying to get at?"... I don't want him thinking that I have another income via my husband, because then my bonus will be impacted...this is modern day, and this was just four years ago ... (IN#9; F)*

Lack of follow through encompassed both interpersonal and organisational factors. Participants spoke of diversity efforts not being part of systems and processes, and decision makers' passive resistance to change by, for example, feigning compliance with gender equality policies. Both male and female Executives were aware of this resistance to change.

*... when you look across the ...whole business, have we really changed the practices? ... for example, flexibility, ... people are more accepting of that and we're trying to make sure there's a female on every short list and there's a female interviewer ...but when it goes beyond that, I'm not sure that we've really made the same level of progress as what we should have made ...there's still quite a bit of attitude ... from "okay, get a female to be on the interview panel", ... tick the box and "we've got [NAME]; well, she's on the short list, she's not going to make it, I know that" ... (IN#4; M)*

However, among the FG participants, 85% of the resistance to change and 100% of male backlash stories were provided by female Non-Executives.

*... in the kitchen there was a lot of discussion and there was a lot of negativity around it [superannuation for women] ... we hear a lot of that negativity ... any time there's a female appointed into a senior role. If there are men who don't make the short list, there is a lot of moaning about if they were female, they would have been short listed. (FG#4; F)*

---

<sup>2</sup> 'All Roles Flex' is an initiative introduced by Telstra in 2013 which declared all roles in the organisation could be done flexibly thus placing the onus on the managers to explain why a role could not be performed so.

Another example of an organisational facilitator of change was the extensive communication on ‘what’ Finance sought to achieve. On the flipside, an often-mentioned obstacle to change was the lack of detail in the communication on ‘why’ the organisation wanted more diversity at all levels, and ‘how’ to achieve that in a challenging business environment.

*... one thing that would suggest ... we're not quite in the paradigm 3 [Access-and-Legitimacy] ... is just, through the broader business, people really understanding what the value of diversity is rather than being maybe some 'headline' kind of symbolic ... (IN#6; M)*

The challenging business environment was an organisational obstacle to change that encouraged people to focus on short- over long-term business imperatives. Managers were under pressure to cut costs, grow business and profit, and reduce staff numbers. The participants explained that managers thus avoided making ‘risky’ selection and promotion decisions.

*... the environment we're in ... isn't giving people an opportunity to take chances on anyone ... you're kind of pushed to get someone who is very qualified for the job already rather than having ... diversity of opinion or diversity of way of working, which might benefit [the team] in the long-term ... (FG#7; F)*

*... if I have five roles that are vacant and I can only fill three I am probably more likely to appoint someone I think is 100% ready for the role as opposed to appointing someone who is 80% there, because I can't really afford to have them coming up the curve ... (FG#3, F)*

The language used implied women were ‘riskier’ selections than men, a bias that few seemed aware of.

*... we judge [women's] performance ... and their behaviours more harshly ... the environment has a level of toxicity in it for them ... (IN#2; M)*

In addition, these quotes suggest that in downward economic cycles decision makers at Finance do not perceive diversity to be a business priority. As one participant put it:

*We're going to go from [x] staff down to whatever, [y] staff and it's going to massively impact roles ... the diversity issue is not a massive issue (FG#4; M).*

This short-term focus was driven by Finance’s masculine culture (e.g., competitive) and bottom-line performance measures (e.g., return on investment), which were seen as barriers to achieving gender equality.

*It's a very dog eat dog culture ... there is a lot of competition and silos... conversations that then create that culture...it trickles down... (IN#9; F)*

*... communication is based on how to drive the business, how do we improve the return, how do we have more productivity for the business. ... I do not see much focusing on the diversity... (FG#2; F)*

Notably as many (or more) men as women described the culture in positive terms (e.g., Team focussed; Values and people driven), despite men being in the minority in all but two focus groups.

## DISCUSSION

We aimed in this study to understand the internal factors that advance or disrupt organisational efforts to move from a less to a more proactive gender diversity approach to increase women's representation in leadership. To achieve this aim we conducted an in-depth study of diversity efforts in a large business unit of one of Australia's four major banks. Based on Table 1, Finance was still at the early stage of maintaining fair practice and eliminating discrimination. Its investment in managing diversity centred on changing recruiting and selection practices to increase the gender diversity of its workforce and on normalising work flexibility. Yet, these efforts and high workforce awareness of 'gender' as a focus of Finance's diversity approach failed to change women's representation in leadership. Other diversity dimensions, such as age, disability and race, were infrequently or never cited by the participants. Altogether, few participants felt Finance was shifting its approach to a more proactive paradigm. This is consistent with previous research evidence. In their study of organisations in the U.S., Thomas and Ely (1996) found that only a small number of organisations were in the most proactive Learning-and-Effectiveness paradigm. Generally, of concern is the fact that participants identified almost *three times* as many obstacles as facilitators to gender diversity change in Finance. This imbalance likely explains the slow progress made in achieving gender equality in leadership over the last five years; it also will continue to thwart diversity change efforts unless addressed.

Specifically, while Finance has had some very good gender diversity policies 'on paper' for a few years (e.g., to have at least one woman on a selection panel), employees experienced considerable variation in how these policies were implemented by their managers. Finance's strong gender diversity policies might have created conditions in which some managers were not motivated to actively monitor their own behaviour, trusting that the system would 'catch' any errors (Castilla & Benard, 2010).

Some men (and a few women) may have felt ambivalent about or threatened by the top-down directives to change practices (Dover et al., 2016; Kotter, 1996). Finance was viewed by staff as

having an outcome-oriented competitive culture that encouraged a focus on short-term results over long-term business goals. Commitment to diversity is a medium- to long-term endeavour (Slater, Weigand, & Zwirlein, 2008). Thus, Finance's short-term focus and competitive culture diverted many individuals' attention from the implementation of gender equality policies across the organisation. In addition, managers knew of Finance's most proactive and strategic diversity initiatives (e.g., 'all roles flex'), but they were less informed about how to implement them. Further, the challenging economic environment and organisational culture allowed many decision-makers to circumvent Finance's gender equality policies. Biases and traditional mentality continued to infuse recruitment and selection practices and protect the status quo (Metz, 2011).

### **Implications for Practice**

Generally, our study offers a user-friendly measure of diversity paradigms that organisational decision-makers can use as an auditing tool to assess their current approach to managing diversity. Our narratives can also be used to initiate ground-level conversations about GE and to identify workforce 'faultlines' in paradigm endorsement, thus starting the process towards paradigm change.

Specifically, the interview and focus group data identified several opportunities for Finance to strengthen its gender diversity messaging. Finance was embarking on a cost-cutting and redesign initiative, and the information gathering planned in this process could provide a starting point to collect and interpret gender diversity data and open the door to more candid discussions about gender equality issues. Finance could narrow the policy-practice gap by explicitly making managers accountable for their teams' gender diversity, and by demonstrating a willingness to reward managers who do, and sanction those who do not, behave in alignment with Finance's gender equality goals.

In addition, the obstacles to change highlight the importance of communicating a consistent message to employees that explains the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of its gender equality change efforts. Moving from the broad to the detailed in communicating and educating the workforce on the organisation's gender equality aims, plans and progress is key to getting employees to embrace change and work together towards delivering on those goals (Slater et al., 2008). Associated with education on 'why' and 'how' is the need to measure progress, communicate benefits gained and reward performance on achieving gender equality change (Kotter, 1996), none of which occurred at

Finance. As one participant advocated *To keep the ball rolling, it [gender diversity change] has to be everybody's job ... Accountability; matrix-based definition of success; measurement and report* (FG#9; F).

Finance could also make performance on gender equality goals a criterion for promotion, screen applicants for gender equality values, and train line managers on how to effectively implement gender diversity policies. Most importantly, Finance has an opportunity to shift to a more proactive gender diversity management paradigm by leveraging its people-oriented cultural characteristics to nurture a workplace in which women feel welcomed and valued. Non-executive women had particularly negative views of the culture, characterising it as competitive and siloed. This suggests a need to pay particular attention to how gender influences workplace experiences (Carberry & Meyers, 2017) and identifies managers as critical links in delivering on Finance's gender equality efforts.

### **CONCLUSION**

Progress at Finance is hindered by a few ironies. First, Finance shows us how 'traditional' obstacles (e.g., biases and male backlash) are made intractable by the organisational context (e.g., localised pressures to show short term performance and culture). Second, the workforce sees more progress than executives, so there is not going to be a big groundswell from below. Third, even though executives recognise the lack of progress (and are enlightened enough to investigate it) they still look fine in their institutional field.

Thus, this case study shows how a lack of genuine commitment to increasing gender equality by many employees undermines organisation efforts and maintains the status quo. This inertia occurs despite the presence of factors necessary for successful change, such as leadership advocacy, solid diversity policies and practices, and widespread awareness of the organisation's focus on women. Thus, a gap exists between knowing and doing at all organisation levels that explains the missed delivery of concrete and sustainable increases in women's representation across areas. Organisations such as Finance need to continuously communicate their gender diversity vision, provide training in all aspects of gender diversity management, and establish gender diversity accountability and monitoring. Without accountability and monitoring, it will be challenging for organisations to assess the enactment of espoused gender diversity values and the consistent implementation of policies across all areas, regularly review plans against progress, and successfully travel the last mile of gender diversity change.

## REFERENCES

- AICD (2021). *Board diversity statistics*. Retrieved June 6, 2021 from <http://aicd.companydirectors.com.au/advocacy/board-diversity/statistics>
- Aized, T. & Srail, J.S. (2014). Hierarchical modelling of Last Mile logistic distribution system. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 70, 1053–1061.
- Carberry, E. J., & Meyers, J. S. (2017). Are the “best” better for everyone? Demographic variation in employee perceptions of Fortune’s “Best Companies to Work For”. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 36, 647-669.
- Castilla, E. J. (2016). Achieving meritocracy in the workplace. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 57(4), 35.
- Castilla, E. J. & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543-676.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. California, USA: Sage publications.
- Dass, P. & Parker, B. (1999). Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 13(2), 68-80.
- Davis, P. J., Frolova, Y. & Callahan, W. (2016). Workplace diversity management in Australia: What do managers think and what are organisations doing? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 35(2), 81-98.
- Deloitte (2021). *Women @ work: A global outlook*. Retrieved June 6, 2021 from <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/women-at-work-global-outlook.html>
- Dover, T. L., Major, B. & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Diversity policies rarely make companies fairer, and they feel threatening to white men. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-6.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.
- Fenwick, M., Costa, C., Sohal, A. S. & D’Netto, B. (2011). Cultural diversity management in Australian manufacturing organisations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49, 494-507.
- Kirton, G., & Greene, A-M. (2009). The costs and opportunities of doing diversity work in mainstream organisations. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19, 159-175.
- Kossek, E. E. & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 61-81.
- Kotter, J. (2007). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 86, 97-103.
- Kulik, C. T. & Roberson, L. (2008). Diversity initiative effectiveness. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 265-317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 691-710.
- Leslie, L.M. (2019). Diversity initiative effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(3), 538-563.
- Lester, S. W., Kickul, J. R. & Bergmann, T. J. (2007). Managing employee perceptions of the psychological contract over time. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(2), 191-208.
- McKinsey & Co (2017). *Women in leadership: Lessons from Australian companies leading the way*. Retrieved June, 6, 2021 from <https://www.wgea.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/Women-in-Leadership%20report-BCA.pdf>
- McKinsey & Co (2020). *Diversity wins: How inclusion matters*. U.S., McKinsey & Co.
- Metz, I. (2011). Women leave because of family responsibilities: Fact or fiction? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49, 285-307.
- Metz, I. (2020). How do you solve a problem like Maria? My journey as a “Pracademic”. In Q. Roberson, E. King & M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Research on Social Issues in Management: Perspectives on Gender and Work*. (pp. 198-207). U.S., Information Age Publishing.
- Metz, I., & Kulik, C.T. (2008). Making public organizations more inclusive: A case study of the Victoria Police Force. *Human Resource Management*, 47, 369-387.
- Metz, I. & Kulik, C.T. (2016). *Male Champions of Gender Equity Change*. AOM HR Division's International Conference. Sydney, Australia.
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2), 856-862.
- Slater, S.F., Weigand, R.A. & Zwirlein, T.J. (2008). The Business Case for Commitment to Diversity. *Business Horizons*, 51, 201-209.
- Thomas, D. A. & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(5), 79-90.
- Workplace Gender Equality Agency [WGEA] (2020a). *Annual Report 2019-2020*. WGEA, Sydney, Australia.
- WGEA (2020b). *Australia's Gender Equality Scorecard*. Retrieved June 6, 2021 from [https://www.wgea.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2019-20 Gender Equality Scorecard FINAL.pdf](https://www.wgea.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2019-20%20Gender%20Equality%20Scorecard%20FINAL.pdf)
- World Economic Forum (WEF) (2021). *Global Gender Gap Report 2021*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

**Figure 1: Diversity Management Paradigms**

<b>Resistance</b>	
In my organisation, diversity is not a major agenda item. Employees work in relatively homogeneous workgroups, units, or departments. There is no compelling business reason for us to proactively recruit a more diverse workforce. Given the nature of our work, an increase in employee diversity is unlikely to have a major impact on performance indicators (e.g., profitability, cost reduction, or employee job satisfaction). So far, we haven't had any major diversity concerns raised by either job applicants or employees. Therefore, we are primarily focusing on other key issues for our business.	<b>1</b>
<b>Discrimination-and-Fairness</b>	
In my organisation, we have a commitment to maintaining fair practice and eliminating discrimination. We've made sure that our policies and practices will not interfere with the hiring and promotion of employees from EO groups. We do our best to create a level playing field where employees can perform to the best of their abilities, and be appropriately rewarded for that performance. As a result, the representation of Equal Opportunity groups in my organisation has increased over time. But we have not made any major changes to our day-to-day work practices as a result of greater diversity within our workforce. Our philosophy is that "people are just people" and our employment practices can be applied effectively across the board.	<b>2</b>
<b>Access-and-Legitimacy</b>	
In my organisation, we have made a concentrated effort to reach out to EO groups in our broader community. We've paid particular attention to changing our recruiting and selection practices so that the demographic composition of our workforce is a more accurate reflection of the demographic composition of our customers or clients. We believe that our efforts to recruit and retain a diverse workforce provide us with a better understanding of our customers' or clients' needs, and that gives us a competitive advantage.	<b>3</b>
<b>Integration-and-Learning</b>	
In my organisation, we have actively tried to build on the various skills, experiences, and ways of thinking of a diverse workforce. We've used employee diversity as a resource for learning and adaptive change -- as our workforce has become more diverse, we have dramatically changed our day-to-day work practices. We've rethought primary tasks, redefined markets, and overhauled our organisational culture. The demographic diversity of our workforce has been a major source of growth and learning for my organisation.	<b>4</b>

Note: The paradigm labels are included in the Figure for the reader's benefit. Research participants did not see these labels, only the narrative paragraphs.

**Table 1 – Conservative summary of perceptions of Finance’s current approach to diversity**

<b>Diversity Management NOW</b>				
	Resistance	Discrimination- and-Fairness	Access-and- Legitimacy	Integration- and-Learning
Executives n = 9	0%	77.8% <sup>1</sup>	22.2%	0%
Non-Executives - Female n = 62 <sup>2</sup>	3.1% <sup>3</sup>	56.5% <sup>4</sup>	37.1%	3.2%
Non-Executives - Male n = 24	0%	20.8%	70.8% <sup>5</sup>	8.3%
Total = 95	2.1%	49.5%	44.2%	4.2%

Note. Not all rows add to 100% because of the rounding of decimal places.

<sup>1</sup> Three male and one female executives reported that Finance was between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Paradigms

<sup>2</sup> There were 64 female participants but 2 did not complete their paradigm sheet

<sup>3</sup> One female participant reported that Finance was between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Paradigms

<sup>4</sup> Three female participants reported that Finance was between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Paradigms

<sup>5</sup> One male participant reported that Finance was between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Paradigms

Figure 2: Data Structure

