

Review of: "Sustaining Gender Parity in Corporate Leadership Roles by Means of Random Selection"

Mahmoud Elmarzouky¹

¹ Aston University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: Sustaining Gender Parity in Corporate Leadership Roles by Means of Random Selection

In this thought-provoking article, Robert Wright argues that random selection from pools of qualified candidates is a sustainable approach to increase the representation of females and other underrepresented groups in corporate board roles. The author suggests that by implementing random selection, more individuals from diverse backgrounds would be motivated to acquire the necessary qualifications, leading to increased gender and intellectual diversity within corporate leadership.

The article begins by highlighting the persistent lack of diversity in corporate boards despite efforts to promote inclusion. It references recent social movements such as #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter as catalysts for renewed action. Drawing upon previous research, the author asserts that random draws from qualified applicant pools can eventually achieve parity in various human characteristics, including gender. Additionally, the integration of AI-enabled recruiting is proposed as a complement to the random selection process.

The author employs a net cost-benefit model with rational expectations to understand why the corporate leadership pipeline experiences significant leakage. The model considers the expected benefits and costs of pursuing corporate leadership positions compared to alternative career opportunities. The discussion emphasizes the rational decision-making of potential aspirants and the crucial role of expectations in shaping their choices.

The results indicate that if individuals perceive no possibility of becoming corporate leaders due to their exclusion from the in-group, they are more likely to pursue alternative paths. To address this issue, the article suggests that corporations must credibly commit to hiring based on criteria other than in-group status, thereby inducing qualified candidates from diverse backgrounds to acquire the necessary qualifications.

The proposed method of making commitments to hire more female corporate leaders involves credible corporate pledges and the use of random selection from pre-qualified candidate pools. The author acknowledges previous attempts at random selection in Italian academe but emphasizes the potential effectiveness of AI-enabled bots in objectively screening candidates. The discussion highlights the benefits of random selection, including reduced biases, enhanced decision-making, and the potential for higher-quality hires.

The article concludes by addressing potential criticisms and challenges associated with random selection. It emphasizes

the importance of diversity variables, considering their impact on achieving rational parity. The author argues that while random selection can achieve gender parity, not all diversity variables can be addressed in the same manner. The article calls for an actuarially fair chance for qualified candidates from all backgrounds to obtain leadership roles.

Overall, this article presents a compelling argument for using random selection as a means to sustain gender parity and increase diversity in corporate leadership roles. The author effectively incorporates relevant research and provides insightful analysis on the benefits and challenges of implementing this approach. However, further exploration of potential limitations and practical considerations, as well as a more extensive review of related literature, would strengthen the article's impact.

Here are some suggested comments can improve the quality of the paper:

1. In the introductory paragraph, change "prominent" to "palpable and salient" to better reflect the context.
2. In the results section, change " $\beta = 0$ " to " $\beta = 0$)" for consistency with the equation format.
3. In the discussion section, change "lead" to "lead to" for clarity.
4. In the discussion section, change "Oswald 2019)" to "Oswald, 2019)" to properly attribute the source.
5. In the conclusion section, change "it is clearly 50 percent" to "it is clearly 50 percent in the case of gender-at-birth" to provide more context.