

Diversity as Fault Tolerance in Governance

Introduction

Anyone who has participated in committee-based decision-making will recognise a familiar pattern: the more cohesive the group, the smoother the deliberation, and yet the smoother the deliberation, the more likely that consequential risks are passing unexamined. The question of why diversity in governance spaces leads to better decision-making is, at root, a question about this phenomenon. The easiest responses treat diversity as either a moral claim (fair representation) or a performance claim (better results). Both can be true. Yet neither reaches the underlying governance mechanism: why does a heterogeneous “decision architecture” systematically outperform a homogeneous one when uncertainty is high and consequences are large?

A better starting point is borrowed from safety-critical engineering. In systems where failure is catastrophic, engineers design for fault tolerance. They add layered defences, redundancy, and most relevant here, design diversity, so that the system is less likely to fail through a common-mode vulnerability. The purpose of diversity is not aesthetic; it is statistical. If multiple components are built the same way, they tend to fail the same way. If they are genuinely independent, failures are less correlated. The classic N-version programming literature formalises this idea: multiple independently developed versions of software are used to reduce the chance of shared design faults bringing down the whole system.[1] The governance translation is straightforward: the greatest board risks are often correlated errors of judgment, everyone being wrong in the same direction for the same underlying reasons.

Ecology reaches the same conclusion through the concept of response diversity. Resilient ecosystems do not just have “more species”; they have multiple organisms performing similar functions but responding differently to disturbance, so that when one response type collapses, another still holds the system together.[2] Monocultures illustrate the opposite: genetic and functional uniformity can turn a disturbance into a cascade, as in agricultural systems where a shared susceptibility allows a single pathogen to devastate crops.[3] Boards operate in a world of disturbances, rate shocks, supply disruptions, regulatory shifts, and technological discontinuities, where the core governance challenge is to detect weak signals and prevent cascades.

The thesis of this essay is therefore a risk-management thesis: diversity improves governance decisions because it de-correlates error. It broadens the set of questions asked, the anomalies noticed, and the assumptions tested. The immediate benefit is not comfort or harmony; it is disciplined disagreement. The cost is what I will call dynamic friction: diverse groups can feel slower and less socially smooth, but that “roughness” is often the experience of hidden risk becoming visible and discussable.[4]

Boardroom Dynamics

To explain why diversity can improve decision-making, it is essential to separate demographic diversity from cognitive diversity. Demographic diversity refers to observable characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, age, or nationality. Cognitive diversity refers to differences in knowledge, expertise, professional experience, values, and problem-framing heuristics. These concepts are linked but not interchangeable. Demographic diversity can be intrinsically valuable for legitimacy and stakeholder alignment, but its governance mechanism often runs through cognition: diverse lived experience and career pathways change what people notice, what they treat as “normal,” and what they consider plausible.[5]

The real governance question is not “Is diversity present?” but “Does it change the deliberation?” One observable indicator is dissent. Research that operationalises cognitive diversity using director dissent (e.g., voting against proposals) finds that directors who are dissimilar relative to board peers, particularly in tenure and experience, are more likely to dissent, and boards that are heterogeneous in tenure, experience, and gender exhibit more dissent at the board level.[6] Dissent matters because it is one of the few mechanisms by which a board can force re-examination of assumptions before a decision becomes path-dependent. In engineering terms, dissent is an internal sensor and alarm; without it, a system can look stable right up to the moment it fails.

Behavioural research explains why homogeneous boards are vulnerable to correlated error. Individuals tend to favour information that confirms existing beliefs (confirmation bias), and they systematically misjudge probabilities and evidence under uncertainty.[7] In cohesive groups, these individual tendencies can become group-level pathologies. Classic formulations of groupthink describe how groups can prioritise unanimity and cohesion over critical evaluation, with structural conditions including social homogeneity and leadership dynamics that discourage challenge.[8] A closely related

governance failure is the Abilene paradox: groups collectively take actions that none of the members actually want because each assumes, wrongly, that others prefer it, and because disagreement is treated as disloyalty.[9] In boards, this often looks like selective silence: directors see the weakness in the story but assume “someone else must have checked,” or infer that raising concerns will be interpreted as naive, negative, or damaging to trust.

Diversity changes these dynamics, but not by magic. It changes the *default mode of cognition* in the room. Research and synthesis work argue that, when people expect disagreement, they engage in more careful processing: they explain reasoning more explicitly, search for more information, and rely less on shared shorthand.[10] This is where dynamic friction enters. A meta-analysis of multicultural work groups finds that diversity can produce process losses through increased task conflict and reduced social integration even while producing process gains in creativity and satisfaction.[11] Strategic decision-making research similarly shows that conflict is paradoxical: task conflict can improve decision quality while relationship conflict undermines cohesion and implementation.[12] The governance implication is that “smooth” is not necessarily “healthy.” A board that is always smooth may simply be untested.

This conversion of difference into decision quality depends on inclusion and psychological safety: the felt permission to question, disagree, and surface concern without reputational punishment. Foundational research on psychological safety links it to speaking up and learning behaviours in teams, implying that even high cognitive diversity is wasted if people do not voice it.[13] This is consistent with the Institute’s own work on board behavioural dynamics, which argues that board effectiveness is driven equally by people acting together and decision tasks, and that governance practice has historically under-specified the “people side” of boards.[14] Diversity without the dynamics to use it becomes decorative.

Risk Management in Practice

If diversity is a form of fault tolerance, it should be most valuable in risk management, especially for correlated, ambiguous, and socially uncomfortable risks. Notably, UK financial regulators have made this logic explicit. In their joint discussion paper, the Financial Conduct Authority, Bank of England and Prudential Regulation Authority framed the linkage between insufficient diversity and inclusion and groupthink as a

“serious risk to safety and soundness,” with the goal that improved diversity and inclusion should translate into better internal governance and risk management.[15] This is a substantial reframing: diversity is treated not as public relations, but as a prudential control.

The collapse of Carillion plc provides a vivid example of correlated governance error. The joint parliamentary report of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee and the Work and Pensions Committee characterised Carillion’s rise and fall as a story of “recklessness, hubris and greed,” and explicitly stated that non-executive directors failed to scrutinise or challenge reckless executives.[16] It documented an internal culture of “making the numbers” and “wilful blindness,” and concluded that the board was either negligently ignorant of the rotten culture or complicit in it.[17] Whether or not the board resembled a demographic monoculture is not the only point; the governance failure was functional: challenge did not fire when it was needed, and optimism reinforced itself until it became insolvency. In fault-tolerance terms, the system lacked independent error-checking.

The failure of Silicon Valley Bank shows how risk blindness can emerge even in highly data-literate environments. In its post-mortem, the Federal Reserve identified as its first key takeaway that SVB’s board of directors and management failed to manage their risks.[18] It described SVB as highly vulnerable due to foundational managerial weaknesses, a highly concentrated business model, and reliance on uninsured deposits, leaving the bank exposed when interest rates rose and conditions in the technology sector tightened.[18] It also stated that the full board did not receive adequate information and did not hold management accountable; that the bank failed its internal liquidity stress tests; and that SVB managed interest rate risk with a focus on short-run profits, including removing hedges rather than managing long-run risks.[19] SVB is also a warning against superficial readings of diversity. Public commentary noted substantial gender representation on SVB’s board, yet the Federal Reserve review highlighted gaps, including a board lacking large bank experience and a prolonged chief risk officer vacancy that removed a layer of internal oversight.[20] The lesson is not that diversity is irrelevant; it is that meaningful diversity includes domain-relevant cognitive variety and the cultural conditions for challenge.

A third, cross-disciplinary case study reinforces the mechanism: the Challenger and Columbia disasters in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shuttle

programme. The Rogers Commission concluded that the decision to launch Challenger was flawed and that decision-makers were unaware of critical engineering concerns and prior recommendations relating to launch temperature.[21] The Columbia Accident Investigation Board later emphasised organisational causes, including barriers that prevented effective communication of critical safety information and stifled professional differences of opinion.[22] These are, fundamentally, governance problems: gatekeeping structures existed, but dissent did not travel upward with force. The analogy is not that corporations are spacecraft; it is that complex systems fail when disagreement is systematically filtered out.

These narratives are supported by broader empirical evidence that links board diversity to risk outcomes. A Journal of Financial Economics study using a multidimensional measure of board diversity reports that greater diversity is associated with lower realised firm risk and more stable corporate policies, consistent with the view that diversity produces more robust choices and reduces extreme financial risk-taking.[23] Related research on board gender diversity suggests governance channels as well as outcomes: women directors are associated with stronger monitoring inputs (including attendance and committee participation), implying that demographic diversity can alter board behaviour in ways that plausibly improve oversight.[24] Bank-focused studies further examine risk directly and often find associations between greater gender diversity and reduced risk-taking, though results vary by context and governance design.[25] Taken together, the evidence supports a qualified conclusion: diversity is not a guaranteed performance enhancer, but it is a credible risk-mitigation mechanism when it is real, relevant, and voiced.

The Challenges of Achieving Meaningful Diversity

If diversity can be a governance control, why is meaningful diversity so difficult? The first barrier is tokenism: presence without influence. Tokenism theory predicts that when a minority is numerically tiny, its members become highly visible yet structurally marginal, facing stereotyping, performance pressure, and limited ability to reshape norms.[26] In boards, this is why “one diverse appointment” frequently under-delivers: the individual may not have the coalition support to affect how decisions are framed. Research on “critical mass” suggests that moving from one or two women to three or

more can materially change participation and influence, shifting the experience from tokenism toward meaningful contribution.[27]

The second barrier is the “golden skirts” phenomenon: an unintended concentration of appointments among a small elite of underrepresented directors. Studies of Norway’s quota experience explicitly describe the replacement of old boys’ networks with “golden skirts,” where a limited number of women accumulate multiple board seats.[28] From a fault-tolerance perspective, this is a subtle design failure. Representation improves, but the system’s cognitive resilience does not increase proportionally because the same perspectives are replicated across boards. Diversity’s goal is not only to encompass different demographics, but also to reduce the correlation of judgment.

The third barrier is inclusion: how a board integrates differences into decisions. A board can recruit diversity and still operate with what might be called a monoculture conversation: norms of politeness that punish challenge, meeting structures that reward speed over scrutiny, or power gradients that make it unsafe to question. Recent scholarship on boardroom communication theorises how “unsaid known” knowledge persists when concerns are jointly held but not voiced in formal deliberation, illustrating how silence can be socially produced rather than individually chosen.[29] The regulators’ own culture work recognises this dynamic: it highlights groupthink as a recurring factor in post-crisis reviews and connects psychological safety, reduced “cultural fit” hiring, and diversity as partial remedies, while also warning that the deeper structural incentives that drive conformity must be confronted.[30] Inclusion is therefore not a “nice-to-have”; it is the switch that allows diversity to affect the control system.

A final barrier is that governance reforms unfold in a contested political economy. The 2021 UK regulatory framing that diversity and inclusion reduce groupthink and support safety and soundness was unusually direct.[31] Yet in 2025, UK regulators publicly stepped back from proposed new diversity and inclusion rules for financial firms, citing concerns about regulatory burden and tensions with competitiveness.[32] This matters for boards because it signals that diversity initiatives will be scrutinised, sometimes reframed as bureaucracy, and vulnerable to backlash. The governance response cannot be to retreat to homogeneity in the name of “efficiency.” Instead, it is to articulate diversity’s function in risk management with greater precision, and to build the cultural and procedural infrastructure, agenda design, information flow, independent voice, chairing practices, that converts difference into better decisions. That is precisely the gap the Institute’s

board behavioural dynamics work attempts to address: boards need a named, explicit approach to the people side of governance, not just periodic box-checking on composition.[33]

Conclusion

Diversity in governance spaces leads to better decision-making because it functions like design diversity in safety-critical systems and response diversity in resilient ecosystems: it reduces correlated failure. In boardrooms, the most dangerous errors are often shared errors, reinforced by confirmation bias, groupthink, and socially produced silence.[34] Diverse boards, when they are genuinely diverse in cognition and experience and when they are inclusive enough to surface disagreement, create a more robust decision process: more hypotheses are tested, more risks are seen, and overconfidence is harder to sustain.[35]

The forward-looking implication is simple but demanding: boards should stop treating diversity as an adjunct to governance and start treating it as governance: a core control in organisational risk management. That reframing clarifies why tokenism and “golden skirts” are not only equity problems but resilience problems, and why boardroom discomfort can be a governance asset rather than a cultural defect. It also clarifies what “meaningful diversity” entails in practice: deliberate board design that lowers correlation of judgment, and behavioural dynamics that make it safe and expected for directors to disagree in service of the organisation’s long-term survival.[36]

References

- [1, 36] A. Avizienis, 'The N-Version Approach to Fault-Tolerant Software', IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, SE-11(12) (1985), pp. 1491–1501. Available at: <https://people.cs.rutgers.edu/~uli/cs673/papers/N-VersionFaultTolerant85.pdf>
- [2] H. Elmqvist et al., 'Response Diversity, Ecosystem Change, and Resilience', Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 1(9) (2003), pp. 488-494. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3868116>
- [3] University of California Museum of Paleontology, 'Monoculture and the Irish Potato Famine: Cases of Missing Genetic Variation', Understanding Evolution. Available at: <https://evolution.berkeley.edu/the-relevance-of-evolution/agriculture/monoculture-and-the-irish-potato-famine-cases-of-missing-genetic-variation/>
- [4, 10] K.W. Phillips, 'How Diversity Makes Us Smarter', Scientific American (October 2014). Available at: <https://ideas.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Phillips-2014.pdf>
- [5] K.A. Jehn and K. Bezrukova, 'The Faultline Activation Process and the Effects of Activated Faultlines on Coalition Formation, Conflict, and Group Outcomes', Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 112(1) (2010), pp. 24-42. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.11.004>
- [6] B. Ke et al., 'Director Heterogeneity and Its Impact on Board Decisions', PHBS Working Paper. Available at: <https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2017/preliminary/paper/z4B8bRDQ>
- [7] 'Confirmation Bias', Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/science/confirmation-bias>
- [8, 34] 'Groupthink', Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/science/groupthink>
- [9] J.B. Harvey, 'The Abilene Paradox: The Management of Agreement', Organizational Dynamics 3(1) (1974), pp. 63-80. Available at: https://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Group_Dynamics/Harvey_Abilene_Paradox.pdf
- [11] D. van Knippenberg et al., 'Unraveling the Effects of Cultural Diversity in Teams: A Meta-Analysis of Research on Multicultural Work Groups', Journal of International

Business Studies 42(3) (2011), pp. 295-311. Available at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46526123>

- [12] A.C. Amason, 'Distinguishing the Effects of Functional and Dysfunctional Conflict on Strategic Decision Making', *Academy of Management Journal* 39(1) (1996), pp. 123-148. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/256633>
- [13] A.C. Edmondson, 'Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44(2) (1999), pp. 350-383. Available at: https://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Group_Performance/Edmondson%20Psychological%20safety.pdf
- [14, 33] Chartered Governance Institute UK and Ireland, *Board Behavioural Dynamics Handbook* (2025). Available at: https://www.cgi.org.uk/media/kajj1cql/board-behavioural-dynamics-handbook_website-optimised_cgi-1-july-2025.pdf
- [15, 31] Financial Conduct Authority, Bank of England and Prudential Regulation Authority, 'Diversity and Inclusion in the Financial Sector: Working Together to Drive Change' (DP21/2, 2021). Available at: <https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/discussion/dp21-2.pdf>
- [16, 17] Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee and Work and Pensions Committee, *Carillion* (HC 769, 2018). Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmworpen/769/769.pdf>
- [18, 19] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 'Review of the Federal Reserve's Supervision and Regulation of Silicon Valley Bank' (2023). Available at: <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/svb-review-20230428.pdf>
- [20] A. Edgecliffe-Johnson, 'GoWokeGoBroke: Really?', *Financial Times* (2023). Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/d7d31da9-c35e-4fca-b4c6-6ca11ad73bfd>
- [21] Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident, *Report to the President* (1986). Available at: https://sma.nasa.gov/SignificantIncidents/assets/rogers_commission_report.pdf
- [22] Columbia Accident Investigation Board, *Report Volume 1* (2003). Available at: <https://sma.nasa.gov/SignificantIncidents/assets/columbia-accident-investigation-board-report-volume-1.pdf>
- [23, 35] G. Bernile, V. Bhagwat and S. Yonker, 'Board Diversity, Firm Risk, and Corporate Policies', *JFE* 127(3) (2018), pp. 588–612. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304405X17302775>

- [24] R.B. Adams and D. Ferreira, 'Women in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Governance and Performance', *Journal of Financial Economics* 94(2) (2009), pp. 291-309. Available at:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304405X09001421>
- [25] E. Sila et al., 'Women on Board: Does Boardroom Gender Diversity Affect Firm Risk?', *Journal of Corporate Finance* 36 (2016), pp. 26-53. Available at:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0929119915001248>
- [26] M. Torchia, A. Calabrò and M. Huse, 'Women Directors on Corporate Boards: From Tokenism to Critical Mass', *Journal of Business Ethics* 102(2) (2011), pp. 299–317. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0815-z>
- [27] J. Joecks et al., 'Women on Boards and Firm Performance: What Exactly Constitutes a Critical Mass?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 118(1) (2013). Available at:
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2235877_code842839.pdf?abstractid=1858347
- [28] H. Gregoric et al., 'Revisiting the Golden Skirts: Appointment of Women to Top Position in Norwegian Firms', paper presented at ANZAM (2011). Available at:
https://www.anzam.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf-manager/473_ANZAM2011-148.PDF
- [29] G. Ravazzani and D. Merilainen, 'The Unsaid in Boardroom Communication', *Frontiers in Communication* 9 (2024). Available at:
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/communication/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1347271/full>
- [30] Financial Conduct Authority, 'Transforming Culture in Financial Services' (DP18/02, 2018). Available at: <https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/discussion/dp18-02.pdf>
- [32] Reuters, 'UK Financial Watchdogs Drop Diversity Name-Shame Reforms' (12 March 2025). Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/world/uk/uk-financial-watchdogs-drop-diversity-name-shame-reforms-2025-03-12/>

Word count, 2,382