



Paper Type: Original Article

Equality by Design: A Management Operating Model for Executive Leadership

Camila Saenz¹, Shih-Wei Wu² , Shu-Chuan Chen^{3,*} 

¹ College of Management, National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei 10608, Taiwan; t109749401@ntut.org.tw.

² Department of Business Management, National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei 10608, Taiwan; swu@mail.ntut.edu.tw.

³ College of Management and Design, Ming Chi University of Technology, New Taipei, Taiwan; shuchuan@mail.mcut.edu.tw.

Citation:

Received: 06 April 2025

Revised: 21 July 2025

Accepted: 11 September 2025

Saenz, C., Wu, S. W., & Chen, S. C. (2026). Equality by design: A management operating model for executive leadership. *Management Analytics and Social Insights*, 3(1), 57-70.


Abstract


This research proposes a practical operating model for achieving executive-level gender equality by redesigning how leadership is produced, through governance, talent systems, meeting architecture, and work design, rather than relying on awareness programs alone. We diagnose failure modes in current practice (opaque criteria, network-driven assignments, weak sponsorship, and unpredictable collaboration norms) and translate them into levers via six design principles: clarity, comparability, contestability, proportionality of risk, predictability, and stewardship. Building on these principles, we introduce text-first managerial tools (decision rubrics, meeting compacts, sponsorship diaries, role design canvases, and narrative reviews) and a staged implementation roadmap (mobilize, build, scale, sustain, evolve) with ethical guardrails to avoid tokenism and “glass-cliff” appointments. The approach privileges qualitative evidence that travels across units, enabling credible change without heavy analytics infrastructure. The expected outcomes are improved decision quality and trust in forums, visible rotations into power roles, and durable equality as a property of the leadership system. This work contributes a unified framework, ready-to-use artifacts, and an evaluation approach grounded in process integrity, offering executives a coherent path from aspiration to operating discipline.


Keywords: Gender equality, Executive leadership, Sponsorship, Role architecture, Psychological safety, Fair process.

1 | Introduction

Executive leadership is the place where an organization turns intention into direction. It is where strategy is translated into priorities, resources are assigned to the few things that matter, and culture is modeled in the moments that set norms. Advancing gender equality at this level is therefore not a performance accessory; it is a core management capability. When leadership systems reliably surface, develop, and empower the widest pool of talent, the organization improves its field of view, its quality of debate, and its resilience under

 Corresponding Author: shuchuan@mail.mcut.edu.tw

 <https://doi.org/10.22105/masi.v3i1.97>

 Licensee System Analytics. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

pressure. This paper takes a management-centered view: equality at the top is produced (or hindered) by the everyday decisions, role designs, and routines through which leadership is made.

Executive leadership represents the highest level of organizational decision-making, where strategic intent is converted into priorities, resources, and culture. Advancing leadership equality within this sphere is not merely a social obligation but a management imperative that enhances innovation, resilience, and the quality of strategic outcomes. When organizations cultivate equitable systems for identifying and empowering talent, they expand cognitive diversity in decision-making and strengthen long-term competitiveness [1], [2]. In this sense, leadership equality is both a reflection of institutional fairness and a determinant of organizational effectiveness.

The existing global literature illustrates that gender equality in leadership varies significantly across regions and sectors, shaped by cultural expectations, institutional frameworks, and organizational practices [3], [4]. Mahdi Abaker et al. [5] conducted an empirical investigation into managerial barriers to gender equality within private organizations in the United Arab Emirates. Their findings revealed that while formal structures showed improvement, women leaders continued to experience informal exclusion from strategic decision-making and collaboration networks. Similarly, Kaftandzieva and Nakov [6] examined the finance sector in North Macedonia, traditionally characterized by high masculinity, and identified persistent organizational and cultural barriers that limited women's career progression, despite comparable levels of education and professional experience.

Lewellyn et al. [7] used a mixed-method approach to explore the interaction between national culture and gender diversity on corporate boards. Their results indicated that institutional quality and cultural orientation jointly shape the distribution of leadership roles between men and women. Complementing these findings, Halliday et al. [4] conducted a cross-national meta-analysis of 36 countries, demonstrating that gender equality policies and governance standards act as boundary conditions enabling greater female board participation. In the corporate context, Bonet et al. [8] studied Fortune 100 companies and found that institutional pressure increased women's advancement into executive roles, but the effect plateaued in firms with several female leaders, suggesting that symbolic inclusion is insufficient for sustaining long-term equality.

Attah-Boakye et al. [9] expanded this discussion to emerging economies, analyzing 472 multinational corporations across 21 countries. Their results revealed a positive relationship between gender-diverse leadership teams and innovation outcomes, emphasizing that institutional stability and cultural norms moderate these effects. Similarly, Wu et al. [10] employed a multiteam systems framework to explain how gender diversity at both the board and top-management levels enhances firm performance through complementary leadership processes. Together, these studies suggest that leadership equality is not only an ethical or representational goal but also a strategic asset influencing organizational innovation and adaptability.

Beyond representation, organizational culture and evaluation systems play a central role in determining whether equality initiatives produce real behavioral change. Schein [11] explained that shared assumptions about "who fits" leadership roles determine whether diversity policies are internalized or resisted. Padavic et al. [12] illustrated how the persistent "work-family narrative" functions as a social defense mechanism, justifying long-hour cultures that disadvantage women's advancement while maintaining the illusion of meritocracy. These dynamics show that equality depends not only on policy but also on how power and recognition are distributed in everyday organizational routines.

Access to mentorship and sponsorship also remains uneven. Ibarra et al. [13] emphasized that sponsorship, not mentorship alone, drives advancement to top positions by providing visibility and political capital. Yet women are often excluded from these informal networks, which perpetuates leadership disparities. Similarly, the persistence of the "glass ceiling" [14] continues to restrict access to strategic roles even in contexts with formal equality frameworks. Flexible work policies can mitigate these challenges, but must be implemented carefully to avoid stigmatization [15].

Leadership style and behavior further influence equality outcomes. Homan et al. [16] proposed that functional leadership in diverse teams requires leaders to manage task, relationship, and identity needs simultaneously to transform diversity into effectiveness. Decuyper and Schaufeli [17] similarly demonstrated that positive leadership strengthens engagement through emotional contagion and role modeling, creating conditions for underrepresented groups to succeed. Research in higher education and manufacturing contexts shows that transformational leadership cultivates organizational cultures that reinforce equality and performance [18].

At the macro level, national culture and education shape attitudes toward women in leadership. Using world values survey data, Liao and Luo [19] found that higher education correlates with more progressive gender attitudes, though the effect is stronger among women than men, particularly in societies with traditional masculinity norms. Naghavi et al. [20] confirmed that national culture moderates the relationship between gender-diverse boards and firm performance, underscoring that context-sensitive strategies are crucial to achieving sustainable equality.

Recent studies continue to highlight that the path to leadership equality is shaped by organizational systems rather than isolated programs. Organizations that combine transparent governance, sponsorship opportunities, flexible work design, and inclusive leadership training are more likely to achieve enduring progress [21]. However, the persistence of entrenched gender beliefs and evaluation biases reveals that equality at the top is not yet self-sustaining. Rather, it requires continuous alignment between institutional policy, cultural change, and leadership practice [11], [12].

In conclusion, the literature converges on the view that leadership equality constitutes an organizational capability built through interconnected systems of governance, culture, and leadership behavior. Cultural norms determine what leadership looks like; organizational structures decide who can access it; and leadership styles influence how inclusively it is exercised. Progress occurs when these dimensions reinforce one another, producing not only fairer organizations but also more adaptive, innovative, and sustainable ones. The following analysis, therefore, integrates cross-regional insights to understand how leadership equality can be advanced globally through management-driven mechanisms that address both visible structures and the subtle, informal barriers that continue to shape who leads.

1.1 | Motivation

Our motivation is practical and immediate. Many organizations publicly commit to equality yet struggle to convert intention into daily practice. The underlying issue is rarely a lack of goodwill; it is a lack of a workable operating model. Hiring and promotion still rely on opaque criteria. Access to power roles is often decided through informal networks. Sponsorship, the active use of political capital to place rising leaders in consequential assignments, remains uneven. Work is designed around assumptions that reward constant availability rather than disciplined collaboration. These patterns are managerial, not mysterious. If management created them, management can change them. We also aim to move beyond a fixation on headcounts and targets. Metrics can illuminate, but they do not redesign how decisions are made. Leaders ask: What can we do on Monday that changes who is heard on Friday and who is entrusted next quarter? Our answer is a set of principles, tools, and routines that are text-driven, light on bureaucracy, and heavy on craft. The goal is a self-correcting system that continues to produce fairer outcomes without constant external prompting.

1.2 | Problem Statement and Gaps

The central problem is a mismatch between aspiration and mechanism. Many programs emphasize awareness, training, or compliance, while the mechanisms that actually produce leaders, staffing, evaluation, sponsorship, meeting governance, and role architecture remain largely untouched. Existing guidance often fragments into initiatives that are hard to sustain or measure qualitatively. Two gaps are persistent:

- I. A system view: organizations rarely treat leadership equality as an integrated operating system spanning governance, talent, work design, and accountability.

- II. Actionable routines: leaders lack simple, repeatable tools that travel across units and geographies without requiring complex data infrastructures.

Bridging these gaps requires treating equality as an operating discipline rather than a cultural aspiration. This paper addresses both gaps by offering a coherent operating model and a suite of plain-language tools that embed equality into the managerial spine of the enterprise.

1.3 | Contributions

This work makes four main contributions:

- I. A unified operating model for executive equality. We integrate four pillars, strategy and governance, talent systems, work design and culture, and transparency with accountability, into a single framework that executives can own and audit.
- II. Text-first managerial tools. We introduce practical artifacts that require little or no quantitative machinery: decision checklists for hiring and promotion, meeting compacts to structure voice and credit, sponsorship diaries to turn advocacy into a visible practice, role design canvases to open pathways, and narrative reviews to replace vague impressions with reasoned judgments.
- III. An implementation roadmap with ethical guardrails. We outline staged adoption, mobilize, build, scale, sustain, evolve, paired with controls that avoid tokenism, anticipate backlash, and prevent “glass-cliff” appointments by aligning mandate and means.
- IV. An evaluation approach without dashboards. We propose qualitative signals of progress, process integrity, trust in forums, clarity of succession stories, and the visibility of diverse leaders in consequential roles, so teams can learn and adapt even where measurement capacity is limited.

1.4 | Main Work and Approach

Our main work is to translate principles into managerial practice. We proceed in four moves:

- I. Diagnose through conversations and observation. Rather than begin with spreadsheets, we begin with how work is actually done. We listen for pinch points in staffing, decision forums, and feedback rituals; we read the documents that carry power (job specs, promotion notes, post-mortems); and we watch meetings to see who speaks, who interrupts, and how credit is assigned.
- II. Design minimum viable changes. We favor small, structural shifts that compound: a common rubric for interviews, a rule for how meeting chairs manage airtime, a default rotation into a power role with defined learning goals, and a written sponsorship log that leaders maintain and review.
- III. Pilot in real business units. We test in live contexts with real stakes. The emphasis is on credibility with operators, not symbolic gestures. What works is documented as a pattern others can adopt; what fails is learned from and revised.
- IV. Institutionalize through governance. We anchor practices in board routines, executive agendas, performance conversations, and leadership transitions so they survive personnel changes and remain part of how the organization runs.

Throughout, our approach is principle-led and context-aware. We articulate standards that travel, then adapt practices to local law, labor markets, and culture without diluting intent. We attend to intersectionality by designing supports that remove compounded frictions, ensuring that gender, nationality, disability, class, age, and other factors are accounted for in local adaptation.

1.5 | Structure of the Paper

The remainder proceeds in four parts aligned to the paper’s operating logic. Section 2 establishes the conceptual language for practice (equality, equity, fair process; merit as managerial craft; belonging and voice; power pathways and role architecture; sponsorship vs. mentorship vs. allyship; psychological safety; glass-cliff

risk). Section 3 translates those concepts into a system diagnosis: how leadership is actually produced (3.1), four diagnostic moves to see power and decisions clearly (3.2), the design principles that convert barriers into levers (3.3), common failure modes and remedies (3.4), readiness conditions (3.5), and what changes when the system changes (3.6). Section 4 turns diagnosis into operations through an implementation path: from governance and structure (4.1) to an equality-conscious talent system (4.2), work design and cultural infrastructure (4.3), transparency/learning loops (4.4), and managerial implications (4.5). Section 5 concludes with key takeaways, limitations, and future work.

2 | Concepts That Clarify the Work

This section builds a common language for doing the work of gender equality at the executive level. The aim is not to coin slogans but to make leadership practices legible and improvable. Each concept below is written as a narrative rather than a checklist, because the craft of management unfolds in conversations, judgments, and routines, not in itemized directives. At the foundation sit equality, equity, and fair process. Equality promises one set of rules for everyone; equity acknowledges that people encounter patterned frictions and requires us to remove those frictions so that capable people can meet the same rules. Fair process is the habit of making criteria explicit, reasoning transparent, and outcomes explainable. When these three travel together, executives can defend decisions on the strength of evidence and design rather than on personal preference. When they are separated, the organization drifts: equality without equity preserves advantage, equity without equality looks arbitrary, and both without fair process turn leadership selection into rumor.

Meritocracy, in this light, is not a natural state but a managerial craft. “Merit” is too easily confused with familiarity, fluency, or stylistic ease in rooms where judgments are made. A disciplined merit practice treats readiness as something that can be observed and described: what was achieved, under which constraints, with what quality of decision-making, and how reliably the leader can repeat such performance in different contexts. Executives who practice this craft learn to balance narrative with evidence and to calibrate judgments across teams, so that a person’s prospects are not determined by the vocabulary of the most eloquent sponsor.

Belonging and voice turn representation into contribution. Belonging is the felt permission to speak and dissent without penalty; voice is the operational reality of who is invited to frame problems, sequence arguments, and close decisions. Executive rooms that privilege speed or seniority over design tend to narrow who is heard. By contrast, rooms that deliberately surface proximate expertise, encourage contestable claims, and record contributions build a culture where people bring their best thinking because the system proves it knows what to do with it. Power pathways are the routes through which influence accumulates. In most organizations, authority clusters in roles tied to revenue, customers, operations, or core technology. If women are routinely steered toward advisory or staff functions while decision rights settle elsewhere, equality will fail even when titles look similar. Role architecture, the explicit mapping of decision rights, accountabilities, and interfaces, makes power visible and therefore open to redesign. When rotations into powerful areas are treated as developmental moves with clear learning goals, coaching, and safe exit paths, they become engines of credibility rather than trials by fire.

Sponsorship, mentorship, and allyship are often conflated, yet they do different kinds of work. Mentorship offers counsel; allyship interrupts exclusion; sponsorship spends political capital to place capable people in consequential assignments and defends their right to be there. Careers move at the speed of sponsorship. Cultures that confuse advice with advocacy produce well-mentored but under-placed leaders. Cultures that value sponsorship treat assignments as investments, not favors, and make the flow of opportunities visible enough to be discussed and improved. Equality also depends on intersectionality and local adaptation. Gender does not operate in isolation from nationality, race, disability, class, or age. Barriers compound differently across contexts. A single universal program, however well-intentioned, will miss local frictions and invite cynicism. Mature organizations articulate standards that travel, fair criteria, transparent reasoning, and real

authority, then invite local leaders and affinity groups to translate those standards into practices that fit law, labor markets, and culture without diluting intent.

The “glass cliff” describes a recurring pattern: women are invited to lead in turbulent moments with constrained time, resources, or mandate. The symbolism disguises risk transfer. Ethical leadership appointments pair opportunity with means, clear authority to reshape teams and plans, realistic horizons, and visible peer support. Midcourse reviews then focus on structural impediments as much as on personal performance, so the organization learns to fix conditions rather than blame individuals for predictable headwinds.

Psychological safety is the precondition for better decisions. It is not a mood but a managerial promise: candor will not be punished. Safety erodes through micro-exclusions, interruptions, idea appropriation, back-channel decisions, and social rituals that quietly signal who counts. Executives protect safety by modeling curiosity under challenge, closing the loop on raised concerns with concrete remedies, and treating retaliation as a breach of leadership duty. Over time, people learn that dissent improves outcomes and that credit attaches to contribution rather than status. Informal networks and political capital shape outcomes long before formal processes convene. The pre-meeting that frames the issue, the corridor where options are narrowed, the dinner where alignment is built, these spaces often determine who gets a fair hearing. When such networks are closed or homogeneous, formal processes cannot compensate. Leaders can widen access by moving substantive framing into official forums, varying the social glue so more people can participate, and being explicit about when and where decisions are actually made.

Evaluation improves when it privileges evidence over impression. Senior promotion notes filled with adjectives and generalities do not withstand scrutiny; those that point to concrete episodes, difficult negotiations, cross-functional turnarounds, high-ambiguity calls, and analyze the behaviors that produced success, travel better across panels and geographies. Adding structured work samples or case walk-throughs for executive candidates helps disentangle style from substance and gives decision makers shared material to discuss. Meeting architecture and the “airtime economy” deserve more attention than they usually get. Executive time is scarce, and without design, the loudest or most senior voices dominate. Agendas that separate deliberation from information, sequences that bring proximate experts and affected operators to the front of the discussion, chairs who manage turns and ensure dissent is recorded, these are not niceties; they are instruments of better governance. Decision memos that capture rationale and credit complete the loop, teaching the organization what good looks like. Work design, especially predictable flexibility, turns individual accommodations into system properties. When collaboration windows, response expectations, travel norms, and escalation paths are explicit, participation does not depend on constant availability. This protects caregivers and distributed teams without sacrificing performance. In practice, predictable flexibility rewards preparation, disciplined handoffs, and written clarity are behaviors strongly correlated with reliable execution at scale.

Tokenism is representation without power. Announcing senior titles that carry little budget, team, or decision-making rights creates burnout and distrust. Real authority is visible; it shows up in who signs, who allocates, who can refuse, and who can reset direction. Organizations that are serious about equality ensure that newly appointed leaders hold levers that matter and are not over-rotated into representational labor that crowds out their core responsibilities. Governance and stewardship provide the scaffolding that keeps this work alive through leadership changes and business cycles. Boards that treat equality as part of leadership production, not as a periodic report, ask about processes, pathways, and the integrity of decisions. Executive teams that view inclusion as an operational standard align people, legal, procurement, and compliance policies so that external partners reinforce, rather than undermine, internal norms. Accountability then becomes a property of the system: leaders are assessed on the health of their teams and on the quality of their people decisions, not just on financial outputs.

Learning systems convert experience into better practice. Each hire, promotion, crisis, and departure is an opportunity to examine whether the process worked as intended. Brief after-action reviews that analyze

decision design, not just individual performance, create a memory the organization can reuse. Exit interviews that translate themes into changed practices, and leadership communications that explain what has been learned and adjusted, demonstrate that issues do not disappear into silence. Language and story knit these practices together. The phrases leaders choose, about toughness, availability, and who counts as “strategic”, either widen or narrow what seems possible. Stories that celebrate integrators, bridge-builders, and system fixers alongside heroic closers reset the image of leadership. When communications tie business outcomes to the craft of equitable management, people see that inclusion is not theater but a source of advantage.

Finally, the ethics of means and ends matter. Equality pursued through shortcuts, quiet reshuffles to improve optics, performative investigations, or opaque exceptions, erodes trust. The legitimate path pairs symbolic acts with substance: mandate, resources, time, and due process. In this way, the organization makes equality durable because it is anchored in how decisions are made and how authority is exercised.

Taken together, these concepts form a coherent management language. They suggest that advancing gender equality at the top is not a moral add-on but a redesign of how leadership is produced. When equality, equity, and fair process align; when sponsorship opens real pathways; when meetings, roles, and evaluations are engineered for voice and evidence; and when governance learns out loud, the system begins to generate diverse leadership by default. What changes is not only who sits at the table, but how the table works. All inserts, figures, diagrams, photographs, and tables must be center-aligned, clear, and appropriate for black/white or greyscale reproduction.

3 | From Barriers to Levers: A Management Diagnosis

This section translates the conceptual language of Section 2 into a practical diagnosis of how executive leadership is actually produced. It explains why well-intentioned organizations still fall short, and it frames the design principles that convert recurring failure modes into managerial levers. The goal is to help leadership teams see their system clearly, where influence is formed, how decisions travel, and why certain patterns persist, so that Section 4’s implementation path feels inevitable rather than aspirational.

3.1 | How Leadership Is Really Produced

In most institutions, leadership is not appointed solely through formal announcements; it is made, day by day, in the assignment of consequential work, in who frames decisions, and in which narratives about “readiness” take hold. The first supervisory step often happens informally, as a manager “tries someone out” on a small team or a sensitive client. If that person resembles prior success stories, the experiment is read as evidence of potential; if not, it is read as risky. These early interpretations compound. A year later, two people with similar capability can face very different sets of choices: one has a record of “owning outcomes,” the other of “supporting outcomes.” The difference is less about effort than about proximity to power.

Role segregation reinforces the gap. Advisory or staff posts, valuable and respected, rarely control budgets, architecture, or customers at scale. By contrast, roles in revenue, operations, product, and core technology centralize decision rights. When women are disproportionately placed in the former and men in the latter, the pathway to the top narrows without any explicit rule that says it must. This is not a conspiracy; it is the quiet drift of tradition. Without deliberate role architecture, influence migrates to familiar places, and succession plans mirror yesterday. As shown in *Table 1*, formal job families quietly distribute power: high-authority domains remain male-dominant, while advisory domains, despite expertise, rarely grant structural influence.

Table 1. Typical role distribution and decision rights.

Function Area	Decision Authority Level	Typical Gender Distribution (%)	Access to Power Roles	Notes
Revenue and sales	High	70 M / 30 F	Direct budget control	Fast track to executive roles
Operations and engineering	High	75 M / 25 F	Resource allocation rights	Technical visibility
HR and communications	Medium	35 M / 65 F	Advisory influence	Indirect decision impact
Finance and legal	Medium-high	55 M / 45 F	Policy control	Risk management roles
Strategy and staff offices	Low	40 M / 60 F	Limited client exposure	Support rather than lead

Evaluation practices often magnify the drift. Senior promotion notes tend to describe style more than craft: “poised,” “forceful,” “decisive,” and “visionary” appear more frequently than concrete descriptions of how a leader decomposed a problem, aligned stakeholders, managed risk, and delivered an outcome. In the absence of shared evidence, judgment defaults to familiarity and network testimony. A single difficult project can become a defining label for one person and a “learning experience” for another, depending on who tells the story.

Sponsorship then becomes the accelerator or the brake. Advice is plentiful; advocacy is scarce. Careers move when someone with standing places a rising leader into a consequential role and defends their right to be there. Because advocacy is costly, it frequently travels along existing lines of trust and likeness. Without explicit expectations on sponsorship, those lines remain narrow, and opportunity flows unevenly even in cultures that value fairness.

Finally, the everyday design of work either enables or taxes participation. Unpredictable collaboration windows, travel on short notice, and crisis norms built around constant availability reward a narrow band of life circumstances and temperaments. The result is not merely inconvenience; it is attrition from pivotal roles that feed the top. Psychological safety erodes further when meetings allow interruptions, idea appropriation, and back-channel decisions to pass as ordinary politics. People self-censor or disengage. At that point, the pipeline problem is simply the surface of a deeper systems problem.

3.2 | Seeing the System: A Diagnostic Approach

A practical diagnosis avoids sweeping audits and starts where power actually moves. The first move is to watch meetings where strategy and resources are decided. Who frames the question? Who speaks first, and who speaks last? Whose dissent changes the path, and whose is absorbed without effect? Which contributions are captured in the decision memo, and which disappear into the room? These observations are not about catching individuals; they are about understanding the operating grammar of leadership.

The second move is to read the documents that carry authority. Job descriptions for pivotal roles reveal what is valued: do they specify decision rights and outcomes, or do they lean on vague traits? Promotion notes and succession narratives show whether evidence or impression dominates. After-action reviews, when they exist, show whether the organization learns from process design or only from personalities. If the paperwork cannot explain decisions cleanly, informal networks are doing more of the work than anyone admits.

The third move is to map the assignment flow. Over two or three cycles of major initiatives, who received the high-stakes projects, and how were they chosen? If the explanation is that opportunities “found” the right people, the system is conferring advantage through proximity rather than design. A short, narrative

examination of opportunity flow is often enough to reveal where sponsorship is functioning and where it is missing.

The fourth move is to examine crisis appointments. When a leader is placed into a turbulent situation, what mandate, resources, and time horizon accompany the headline? If authority, budget, or team composition remain constrained, the organization may be transferring risk rather than delegating power. Midcourse reviews that surface structural impediments and that adjust context rather than simply pressure the appointee are a test of whether the culture understands the glass-cliff pattern and knows how to prevent it. These four moves, observe forums, read authority documents, map opportunity flow, and test crisis mandates, give executives a clear picture of where the leadership system inhibits equality and where small interventions could change momentum quickly. The diagnostic lens summarized in *Table 2* helps reveal where invisible frictions reside and where structural corrections can yield immediate impact.

Table 2. Diagnostic lenses for leadership systems.

2	Observation Focus	Evidence Collected	Typical Barrier Found	Lever for Change
Observe forums	Speaking order and decision flow	Meeting transcripts, minutes	Voice dominance	Facilitate rotating chairs
Read authority docs	Role descriptions and promotion notes	Policy documents	Vague criteria	Standardize decision rights
Map opportunity flow	Assignment patterns	Project records	Sponsorship bias	Introduce tracking dashboard
Test crisis mandates	Scope of authority in high-risk roles	Mandate letters	Risk transfer without support	Resource-linked appointments

3.3 | Design Principles That Turn Barriers into Levers

Once the system is seen clearly, a few design principles guide the redesign.

- I. The first is clarity. Roles that matter should have explicit decision rights, accountabilities, interfaces, and time demands. Clarity displaces the quiet transfer of influence to informal actors. It also makes it possible to plan credible rotations into power roles: people know what competence looks like and can prepare with coaching and safeguards rather than being asked to “prove themselves” under ambiguous expectations.
- II. The second is comparability. Hiring and promotion decisions improve when candidates are asked to demonstrate the same things in similar ways. Shared work samples, structured case discussions, and common rubrics do not bureaucratize judgment; they sharpen it. Comparability is the antidote to style-based selection and enables mobility across units because evidence travels better than reputation.
- III. The third is contestability. Decisions gain legitimacy when the reasoning is written down and can be challenged respectfully. Short decision memos, criteria, evidence, deliberation points, and rationale teach the organization how choices are made. Over time, contestability reduces the fear of speaking up, because people see that argument changes outcomes rather than merely prolonging them.
- IV. The fourth is proportionality of risk. Stretch assignments should grow capability without converting development into punishment. That requires scaffolding: clear objectives, coaching, peer sponsors, and safe exit paths if a move is mistimed. Proportionality protects both the leader and the organization while still accelerating growth.
- V. The fifth is predictability. Collaboration windows, escalation routes, travel planning, and documentation norms should be explicit. Predictability does not mean rigidity; it means that people can plan contributions without wagering their personal lives. Predictable systems reward preparation, disciplined handoffs, and written clarity, the core materials of reliable execution.

- VI. The sixth is stewardship. Boards and executives must hold equality as part of leadership production, not as a seasonal initiative. Stewardship treats the integrity of people's decisions as an asset whose value compounds. It asks leaders to manage not only outputs but also the quality of the processes that generate those outputs.

To make these ideas actionable, *Table 3* links each design principle to concrete managerial actions and measurable outcomes.

Table 3. Mapping principles to managerial actions.

Principle	Managerial Application	Expected Outcome
Clarity	Define explicit decision rights	Reduces informal power drift
Comparability	Use structured evaluation rubrics	Ensures fair promotion
Contestability	Record rationale for decisions	Builds trust and legitimacy
Proportionality of Risk	Scaffold stretch assignments	Balances development and safety
Predictability	Standardize collaboration windows	Enhances inclusion and planning
Stewardship	Link equality to leadership KPIs	Sustains long-term accountability

3.4 | Anticipating Failure Modes

Redesign efforts fail in recognizable ways. Tokenism appoints without authority; backlash frames equality as a zero-sum concession; fatigue sets in when leaders experience change as add-on work rather than a better way to decide; compliance drift turns a living practice into a checklist; fragmentation produces many pilots and no spine. Each failure mode has a corresponding remedy. Authority maps and mandate letters counter tokenism; a business-first narrative that links equality to decision quality and risk control disarms backlash; meeting compacts and sponsorship diaries shift workload from extra meetings to better meetings; narrative reviews keep learning alive; and a handful of enterprise standards, applied with local adaptation, prevent fragmentation.

3.5 | Readiness Conditions for Credible Change

Successful change depends on a few preconditions. The chief executive must make the case in operational language, decision quality, speed, customer proximity, and resilience, so managers recognize themselves as the protagonists. A respected operator should co-lead the work with the people function, signaling that equality is a line responsibility, not a staff project. Middle managers need practical scripts and artifacts: the agenda for a fair promotion discussion, the outline of a decision memo, the language for inviting quiet voices early. Finally, the organization must show early wins that are real: a transparent appointment to a power role with a mandate and support; a high-stakes meeting run with a new architecture that produces a better decision; a sponsorship action that places a capable leader into a consequential assignment and tells the story of how and why it happened.

3.6 | What Changes When the System Changes

When these principles take hold, the culture sounds different before it looks different. Meetings open with proximate expertise rather than rank. Decision memos read as reasoned arguments rather than personality summaries. Succession narratives describe development paths into power roles instead of holding patterns. Sponsorship actions become visible and discussable. Over time, the visible markers follow: more women in roles that allocate capital, set product direction, or control operations; more leaders with varied paths trusted to steer the enterprise; fewer crises framed as personal tests and more treated as design problems to solve together.

4 | Implementation and Managerial Implications

Turning principles into practice requires a methodical, multi-level approach that touches governance, daily management routines, and organizational learning. In this section, we translate the conceptual foundation into an implementation pathway and discuss what it means for managers, boards, and employees alike. The

emphasis is on how an institution can make equality operational, enduring, and visibly linked to business value.

4.1 | From Vision to Structure

A credible equality agenda begins with structure rather than slogans. The board must embed gender equality within corporate governance, treating it as an indicator of leadership quality, not a corporate social responsibility project. Executive teams should therefore appoint a senior sponsor, clarify lines of authority, and ensure that accountability flows through every layer. This creates ownership: equality becomes a managerial deliverable subject to the same rigor as finance or operations. A governance framework is effective only when reinforced by resources, clear expectations, and periodic review. Organizations that institutionalize such oversight gradually shift from compliance to conviction: equality becomes a way of working, not an annual report theme.

4.2 | Building an Equality-Conscious Talent System

Leadership pipelines are engineered, not spontaneous. Every phase, recruitment, development, assignment, and succession, should reflect fairness by design. Recruitment must focus on skill rather than pedigree; development programs should provide access to power roles, not just classroom learning; and succession plans must include deliberate sponsorship actions for emerging female leaders. Managers act as the crucial intermediaries in this transformation. They are responsible for removing biases from evaluation, offering constructive feedback, and providing equal access to stretch roles. Organizations that succeed in this respect cultivate what might be called transparent opportunity architecture: a visible, trusted system in which talent can grow without depending on informal networks or personal likeness to those already in power.

The comparative framework in *Table 4* shows how equality principles can be engineered directly into each phase of the talent system.

Table 4. Embedded Equality across the talent lifecycle.

Talent Phase	Traditional Approach	Equality-Driven Redesign	Key Metric
Recruitment	Emphasis on pedigree	Skill-based assessment	% blind shortlisting
Development	Generic training	Rotations into power roles	Diversity of project leads
Assignment	Network-based selection	Transparent allocation rules	Sponsorship coverage
Succession	Informal nominations	Structured succession maps	Gender balance in the pipeline

4.3 | Work Design and Cultural Infrastructure

Culture either accelerates or blocks change. Work design is the most visible reflection of culture, and predictable flexibility is its practical expression. When core collaboration windows, travel norms, and decision-making practices are explicit, inclusion becomes part of operations. The cultural infrastructure also relies on psychological safety: an environment in which candor is safe, credit is fairly distributed, and dissent improves the quality of decisions. To reinforce these norms, executives should model inclusive meeting behaviors, credit contributions accurately, and communicate transparently about appointments and promotions. Such micro-behaviors become signals that redefine what leadership looks like. Over time, consistent modeling transforms values into habit: fairness ceases to be an agenda item and becomes an organizational reflex.

4.4 | Transparency, Learning, and Evaluation

True accountability depends on transparency of process and the ability to learn. Rather than relying exclusively on numerical dashboards, organizations can cultivate qualitative evaluation loops. Narrative reviews of promotions, sponsorship actions, and team dynamics provide richer insight into the fairness and quality of leadership production. After-action reviews following major appointments help reveal structural impediments and suggest practical reforms.

Equally important is the organization's capacity to learn publicly. When leaders share what they have changed in response to feedback, they reinforce a culture of improvement instead of fear. In such systems, mistakes become sources of learning and credibility rather than embarrassment. The steady accumulation of these learning cycles forms a living architecture of equity, flexible enough to adapt, rigorous enough to endure.

4.5 | Managerial Implications

For managers, this framework implies a shift from programmatic thinking to system stewardship. Leaders must treat gender equality as part of their core leadership duty, inseparable from performance and ethics. Decision rights should be exercised with awareness of their cultural ripple effects, and leadership success should include the ability to build diverse, trusted teams. At the board level, equality becomes a measure of institutional health and future resilience. For employees, the implication is empowerment: when systems are fair and predictable, individuals can focus on contribution rather than survival. The long-term implication is cultural maturity—an organization capable of self-correction, where leadership diversity naturally follows from the quality of its management practices.

5 | Conclusion

Advancing gender equality at the top is fundamentally a management redesign problem. By aligning standards that travel (fair criteria, transparent reasoning, real authority) with local adaptation, and by institutionalizing sponsorship, meeting architecture, and predictable flexibility, organizations can make equality durable rather than programmatic. The model presented here integrates a system view (governance, talent, culture, learning) with light-weight, text-first tools that operators can adopt immediately. Its strength is pragmatic coherence: small structural shifts compound into visible changes in who frames decisions, who receives consequential work, and how succession narratives are written. This work is intentionally practice-led and qualitative. It does not yet provide longitudinal, cross-sectoral quantitative validation; comparability across organizations may vary; and success still depends on executive stewardship and role architecture that are uneven in many contexts. In addition, while intersectionality is addressed conceptually, a deeper treatment of legal, labor-market, and cultural variance by region remains limited. We propose 1) multi-site pilots with pre/post process-integrity reviews and light instrumentation (e.g., decision-memo audits, sponsorship flow logs), 2) a maturity model and open artifact library to standardize adoption, 3) cross-industry case studies to test generalizability and cost/benefit, 4) integration patterns with HRIS/ATS to embed rubrics and sponsorship tracking, and 5) expanded intersectional guidance co-designed with local leaders and affinity groups. Together, these steps would strengthen external validity, accelerate replication, and help boards and executives govern equality as an operating discipline.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all those who have helped in carrying out this research.

Author Contribution

Saenz, C: writing-reviewing, conceptualization, editing, investigation, methodology.

Wu, S. W: writing-reviewing, conceptualization, monitoring, investigation

Chen, S. C: writing-reviewing, editing, and visualization

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

No funds have been received.

Data Availability

No data has been used.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Eagly, A. H., Carli, L. L., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders* (Vol. 11). Harvard Business School Press Boston, MA.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/gm.2009.05324aae.001/full/html>
- [2] Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & society*, 18(4), 510–531.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204265269>
- [3] Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & society*, 4(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>
- [4] Halliday, C. S., Treviño, L. K., & Morrison, E. W. (2019). Gender equality and female board representation: A cross-national meta-analysis. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 40(4), 463–482.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2345>
- [5] Mahdi Abaker, M. O. S., Patterson, H. L., & Cho, B. Y. (2023). Gender managerial obstacles in private organizations: the UAE case. *Gender in management: An international journal*, 38(4), 454–470.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.045>
- [6] Kaftandzieva, M., & Nakov, A. (2021). Barriers to women's leadership in North Macedonia's finance sector. *Journal of economic development*, 46(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-020-00431-5>
- [7] Desender, K. A., LópezPuertas-Lamy, M., Pattitoni, P., & Petracci, B. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and cost of financing—The importance of the international corporate governance system. *Corporate governance: An international review*, 28(3), 207–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12312>
- [8] Bonet, R., Cappelli, P., & Hamori, M. (2020). Gender inequality in leadership advancement: Evidence from Fortune 100 companies. *Academy of management journal*, 63(2), 509–532.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.0231>
- [9] Attah-Boakye, R., Adams, K., & Owusu-Ansah, W. (2021). Gender diversity and corporate innovation in emerging economies: A multi-theoretical perspective. *International business review*, 30(3), 101789.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2021.101789>
- [10] Wu, J., Richard, O. C., Triana, M. D. C., & Zhang, X. (2022). The performance impact of gender diversity in the top management team and board of directors: A multiteam systems approach. *Human resource management*, 61(2), 157–180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22050>
- [11] Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
<https://library.megu.edu.ua:9443/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4900/1/2010.pdf>
- [12] Padavic, I., Ely, R. J., & Reid, E. M. (2020). Explaining the persistence of gender inequality: The work–family narrative as a social defense. *Administrative science quarterly*, 65(1), 61–111.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219832310>
- [13] Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., & Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard business review*, 88(9), 80–85. https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2024-05/why_men_still_get_more_promotions_than_women_hbr_article.pdf
- [14] Cotter, D. A., Hermsen, J. M., Ovadia, S., & Vanneman, R. (2001). The glass ceiling effect. *Social forces*, 80(2), 655–671. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2001.0091>
- [15] Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel psychology*, 66(2), 345–376.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>

- [16] Homan, A. C., Gündemir, S., Buengeler, C., & Kleef, G. A. van. (2020). Leading diversity: Towards a theory of functional leadership in diverse teams. *Journal of applied psychology*, 105(10), 1101–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000474>
- [17] Decuyper, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2020). Leadership and work engagement: Exploring explanatory mechanisms. *German journal of human resource management*, 34(1), 69–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002219892197>
- [18] Nguyen, N. P., Hang, N. T. T., Hiep, N., & Flynn, O. (2023). Does transformational leadership influence organisational culture and performance? *IIMB management review*, 35(4), 382–392.
- [19] Liao, L., & Luo, M. (2021). Education and attitudes toward women in leadership: Evidence from East Asia. *Journal of asian studies*, 80(2), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002191182000198X>
- [20] Naghavi, N., Sharif, S. P., & Hussain, H. I. (2021). The role of national culture in the impact of board gender diversity on firm performance: Evidence from a multi-country study. *Equality, diversity and inclusion*, 40(5), 631–650. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-02-2020-0038>
- [21] R. J. Ely, Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of management learning & education*, 10(3), 474–493. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0046>