Where are the women leaders?

Invisible selves: writing women leaders into business school case papers

“Business schools hold the key to helping to increase the number of female leaders.”

Viviane Reding, European Commission Vice-President, 2011
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ABSTRACT

Gender balance at middle and senior levels of organisations is currently a hot topic.
The 2011 European Business School and European Commission Call to Action Report views that business schools have a vital role to play in achieving gender diversity in leadership and on boards. Further to this, the report recommended that, among other actions, business schools could assist by increasing men’s awareness of gender issues by revising teaching materials and presenting more case studies that include women leaders.

The case method approach proposes to teach students to learn to lead and connect theory with real-life experience (Ellet, 2007). Few studies have been carried out on the overt and covert messages about women and leadership these papers collectively give to management students.

In-depth analysis was conducted on 50 award-winning case papers from 2009 to 2013 (inclusive) as well as a cross-study of 16 best-selling case papers from the same period. A qualitative survey was also conducted with MBA students and business school alumni. A key research finding is that there is a systemic lack of female lead protagonists and an overall absence of women in case papers. Across five years there were seven papers featuring a female protagonist and 28 papers without a woman in them at all. This research shows how case papers used in business schools are maintaining the status quo (Marvin & Bryans, 1999). Lack of women in case papers, combined with a majority male cohort, few female professors and fewer female board members at business schools undermines female managers’ ability to create a leader identity and see themselves as leaders. Women remain “invisible” in business schools. Neither men nor women read women into leadership.
Keywords: case papers, business schools, women leaders, leader identity, think manager–think male, gender and leadership, identity conflict, (in) visibility.

INTRODUCTION

“The world would be a better place with more women in senior positions.” — Niall Fitzgerald, KBE, Deputy Chairman, Thomson Reuters, 2011

Gender balance at middle and senior levels of organisations is currently a hot topic. In 2011 the European Commission, in collaboration with concerned business schools and female board leaders in their eco-system, published a Call to Action Report to European business schools to assist in shattering the glass ceiling for women obtaining leadership roles and places on boards. The report considers that business schools have a vital role to play in achieving gender diversity in leadership and on boards. However, numbers have not improved dramatically; in 2013, there were still only 16% of European women on boards and 14% of women on the board of the Fortune 500 companies (Catalyst-a, 2013). Among other actions, the Call to Action Report specifically recommended that business schools could assist in increasing men’s awareness of gender issues by revising the teaching material for gender balance and presenting case studies that feature women leaders (Call to Action Report, 2011). In a recent article (Kantor, 2013), the New York Times highlighted the endemic gender bias of the Harvard MBA programme and noted the gender “imbalance in case papers.”

Business schools around the world use the case method approach as a tool for learning on MBA and executive education programmes. The case method is heralded as a way of enabling students to learn to lead and to connect theory with real-life experiences (Ellet, 2007). Minority groups, including women, are not often featured as protagonists in case papers. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the
“think manager-think male” scenario prevails; most cases have a male lead and “white western male” lead at that (Call to Action, 2011; Smith, 1997). If women are present in case papers they are often represented in secondary roles.

Business schools advertise leadership skills as a component of learning in MBA, EMBA and executive programmes. The latest leadership theory is away from a “static and hierarchical” conception of leadership to a more dynamic, social and relational sense of leadership (DeRue & Ashford, 2010) to create a leader identity. From this some academics are positing that business schools can become “identity work spaces” for leaders to play in and envisage a leader identity (Ibarra, 2003; Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010).

However, the lack of role models, the “think manager-think male” model and second-generation gender bias can undermine women’s ability to see themselves as leaders. In fact, these underlying messages may mean women leaders experience “identity conflict” between their identity as a “leader” and their “gender” identity (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012).

This paper analyses award-winning case papers from 2009 to 2013 highlighting how many times a women is the lead protagonist and how often women are mentioned across all papers. Key themes and the messages women and men may be receiving about women as leaders are explored.

The framework of this thesis is the literature on identity and leadership identity development for women. I analyse the data and explore the key themes of women’s leadership. In conclusion I look at what this research implies for women and business schools and their role in developing women leaders for the 21st century.
AIM OF THIS RESEARCH

The aim of the research is to analyse award-winning case papers used in business school programmes. The research focuses on how these papers represent women. The question I asked was: Are women evident in case papers? In particular, how and where do women feature in case papers? Attention is given to the gender of the lead protagonist as well as how women are described and the roles they play in the papers. From this I continued to analyse the overt and covert messages these papers give about women leaders.

I set the research in the context of female MBA and EMBA students who may be in the process of developing a leader identity.

From this I hoped to gain some understanding of what messages these papers could be giving both male and female students about women as leaders at business schools and the implications this could have.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Identity, Leader Identity and Invisibility

There are no widely agreed definitions of leadership (Avolio, 2007; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). Instead, there are myriad theories and ways of defining it. It is also clear that academics find it a difficult terrain to define (Nohria & Khurana, 2010; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). However, there is a current trend and body of work emerging in leadership theory that is moving “away from a static and hierarchical conception of leadership toward a more dynamic, social and relational conception of the leadership development process” (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). There is emerging a body of academic work drawing on the idea of “identity” and “social identity” theories in leadership development.
From this research also comes the idea of business schools becoming “identity workspaces”, as managers use them as a place to facilitate career change or transitions (Ibarra, 2003; Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010; Petriglieri, Wood, & Petriglieri, 2011). During this time students (managers) may be more open to questioning who they are and where they are going (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010). Being in a unique setting away from familiar environments and the normal constraints of life offers the possibility to practise and experiment with new ways of “doing” and “being” as a leader (Ibarra, 2003, 2007; Petriglieri et al., 2011). Further, other sources (Bell, Connerley, & Cocchiara, 2009; Call to Action, 2011; Mavin & Bryans, 1999) state that business schools are uniquely placed to challenge individuals on the way they work, and to model a way of leading that challenges the traditional ways of management. This in turn would help to break down current management stereotypes.

Business schools offer a variety of programmes. For this research, I concentrated mainly on Masters of Business Administration (MBA) and Executive MBA (EMBA) programmes.

**Identity**

Identity has many different definitions depending on what psychological discipline it is approached from. In the literature the words “self” and “identity” at times seem interchangeable (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, de Cremer, & Hogg, 2004). In existential practice the “self” is not fixed but instead “self becomes” who we are, through the ways we live and conduct ourselves (Van Deurzen & Adams, 2011). The ever-present paradox in existential theory is that we gain a resilient and coherent sense of self “because of and not in spite of our ability to be different in different circumstances” (Van Deurzen & Adams, 2011). Jung (2003) suggests the concept of individuation, or the successive integration of unconscious complexes over a lifetime.
The goal of individuation is to become more and more of who we are, in relation to others, yet distinct from them. An important part of this process is for us to bring the unconscious into consciousness (Jung, 2003).

This recognition of the continuity of self is what Erikson (1968) called “identity”. Identity from Erikson’s perspective is how we view ourselves internally and in relation to others (Stevens, 2008; Gecas, 1982). Identity is a subjective energetic sameness and continuity; it is a sense of being “actively alive”. Erikson (1959) explained the four dimensions of identity as:

“a conscious sense of individual identity; … an unconscious striving for a continuity of personal character, … the silent doings of ego synthesis; and …an inner solidarity with a group’s ideals and identity.”

Our identity is also framed by our relations with others and is relative to the cultural context and communities to which we belong. Building an effective sense of identity requires recognition and response from others. Identity is dynamic and evolves during our lifetime through direct experience of our self and of our self in relation to others (Erikson in Stevens 2008; Van Deurzen & Adams, 2011; Ibarra 2003). To be an individual, and at the same time to belong to and identify with a group, we need something to believe in, role models or significant others to observe (Stevens, 2008). Erikson in Stevens (2008) posited that we are more than ever concerned about who we are, who we should believe in and who we may become. Social or group identity is described as the foundation of who we are based on our group membership (Tajfel, 1982), together with the emotional meaning or significance we attach to group membership (Devos & Banaji, 2003: Tajfel, 1982). Personal identity and group identity are intertwined; group-typical characteristics and attributes (group identity) can be internalised as characteristics of the self (individual identity) (Ashforth & Mael,
Considering how many groups an individual may belong to, her social identity may consist of a mix of these identities, that is, woman, leader, mother, student, etc. These social identities are inherently hierarchical and reflect how humans classify things more generally (Crisp, 2010). Categories like “male/female” or “black/white” are at the most basic level of categorisation, while “all humans” is the most inclusive category. Crisp (2010) states that an individual’s many social identities may at times be in conflict with their own identity. Ashforth and Mael (1989) state that it is not identities that are in conflict but the values, norms, beliefs and demands inherent in these different identities. Gender identity, which is one part of our identity, is central to how we view ourselves (Young-Eisendrath & Wiedemann, 1987). Young-Eisendrath & Wiedemann (1987) believe that gender is based on the archetype of difference, where the archetype of opposites is the instinctive tendency to categorise between self and not-self (1987). Work identity refers to how individuals view their work-related self, that is, what groups they belong to, professional/occupational experiences, etc., (Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2007; Schein, 1978). Work identities are formed by what groups individuals identify with and how others in the group and/or organisation perceive them.

**Leader identity**

Yoder (2001: 815) states, “Leadership does not take place in a genderless vacuum, leadership itself is gendered.” The way women shape their role as a leader is inseparably woven with the basic realisation that they are women and this brings with it stereotypical gender biases (Bartram, 2005; Karelaia, 2012; Yoder, 2011). Furthermore, “leadership is a process that occurs within a social context that itself is gendered” (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001). Stereotypes, biases, cultural and organisational settings often do not favour women’s leadership development (Cames, Vinnicombe &
Developing as a leader and how one takes up that role is basically about identity (Ely et al., 2011; DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Ely et al., (2011) see leadership identity as evolving and incorporating interrelated responsibilities: internalising a leadership identity (DeRue & Ashford, 2010) and developing a higher sense of purpose (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2009; Ely et al., 2011; Petriglieri, 2011; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012; Quinn, 2004). Developing a leader identity is important to a leader’s ongoing development (Day & Harrison, 2007; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Ibarra, Snook, & Guillen Ramo, 2010; Lord & Hall, 2005: Tonsberg, 2013; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Many researches see leadership development as a time of transition (Anderson, 1987; Ericsson & Charness, 1994; Glaser & Chi, 1988; Ibarra et al., 2010; Patel & Groen, 1991). One begins to see oneself and be perceived by others as a leader through a set of relational and social processes. We put ourselves into positions where we can experiment with new leadership actions and follower feedback is important to validate our self-view as a leader. We subsequently modify our actions dependent on the feedback we receive, a mutual process that can produce a negative or positive spiral (Agnoletto, 2013; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011; Lord & Hall, 2005).

In 1970 and 1995 Schein (2001) produced empirical evidence that showed that sex stereotyping among middle-management students in America revealed a “think manager-think male” belief. She found that both men and women perceived characteristics for management success were more likely to be associated with men than women. Women situated in male-dominated organisations took on and demonstrated more masculine traits in their management style (Cames, Vinnicombe, & Singh, 2001; Kanter, 1997: Eagly & Johnson, 1990: Ely & Rhode, 2010). Women
who adopt masculine leadership traits are disadvantaged (Ely & Rhode, 2010; Yoder, 2001; Ibarra et al., 2013). Stereotypical agentic or instrumental leadership styles work for “most men” but not for “most women” (Street, Kimmel, & Kromrey, 1995); this can put women into a “double bind”, as women leaders who then show more stereotypical female behaviour can be judged as too soft, emotional and unassertive (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ely et al., 2011). de Beauvoir (1952) stated that women are in a position that is “the other”, that is, not the norm – to the “one”, being that of men (Irigaray, 2007). Organisations and environments in which hierarchies are predominantly male and leadership behaviours are more associated with men unintentionally show women that they are unequipped to lead (Ely et al., 2011; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2007; Schein, 2001). Karelaia (2012) in research with women leaders found that women in organisations where they are reminded of female stereotypes are less likely to express an interest in assuming leadership roles.

Karelaia and Guillen (2012) define identity conflict as “a perceived incongruity between a woman leaders ‘leader’ identity (being a leader) and their ‘gender’ identity (being a woman) (2012). The incongruity is between the meaning and values of belonging to the social group of “leaders” and the meaning and values of the “female” social group (Ely, 1995). Women leaders experience more identity conflict in organisations that are predominantly male and this is consistent with literature on stereotype threats (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012). In these organisations women may often see an incongruity between their work and gender roles. Karelaia and Guillen (2012) also show a direct link between women’s under-representation and the level of their identity conflict (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012). They also show that identity conflict has consequences for women’s psychological health by increasing stress and
a sense of duty to lead while reducing life satisfaction, the motivation to lead and the pleasure of leading (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012).

“A leader’s identity is tied to her or his sense of purpose” (Ely et al., 2011). A leader’s ability to influence his or her followers is often seen as critical part of leadership (van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Leaders are more effective when they pursue a purpose that is aligned with their values and directed towards helping the common or collective good (Ely et al., 2011; Lord & Hall, 2005; Quinn, 2004) and furthermore are perceived as authentic. Second-generation gender biases are unintentional, submerged barriers that exclude women (Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013). They include cultural beliefs about women as well as organisational structures and patterns that prevent women from advancing their career (Ibarra et al., 2013; Karelaia 2012; Ely & Rhode, 2010). When women recognise these overt and covert biases they can feel empowered to take action that counteracts these effects (Ely et al., 2011; Ibarra et al., 2013). A pivotal part of developing a leader’s identity and being perceived as a leader is to develop a sense of purpose and subsequently express that sense of purpose to others (Ely et al., 2011). For women leaders, having a purpose is even more critical as it can buffer stereotypes and biases. From their research with women leaders Bash et al., (2009) found that having meaning is integral to how women lead: “Meaning is what inspires women leaders, guides their careers, sustains their optimism, generates positive emotions, and enables them to lead in creative and profound ways.” Having a purpose helps women to direct their attention to where they need to be, what they need to learn and how they will achieve it, instead of defining themselves by a gender stereotype (Ibarra et al., 2013).

Another part of learning about leader identity is identifying with role models (Ely et al., 2011; Ibarra, 1999). Experimenting with provisional identities and gaining feedback from internal and external standards is important when developing a leader identity.
(Ibarra, 1999). We also construct identity by looking forward to our future “possible selves” (Ibarra, 2003; Ibarra et al., 2010). Kierkegaard in Smith (2012) states, “An existing individual is constantly in the process of becoming”. Our possible selves are the images of ourselves that we project into the future, the identities that we may become (Ibarra, 1999; Markus & Nurius, 1986; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Eccles, Nohria, & Berkley, 1992; Lord & Hall, 2005). These “possible selves” are important for organising and motivating us into our imagined areas for development. They also shape how we recognise and internalise future opportunities and possibilities and incentivise our future behaviour (Markus & Nurius, 1986). As women have fewer work-related social networks than men, this leads to less obvious role models for women to establish an external standard of what leadership could look like for them. In addition, the failure of women to see female role models may indicate to them that they are in the “wrong place” (Karelia 2012).

**Invisibility and leader identity**

This leads to the notion of (in)visibility, which is ever present for women in business (Simpson & Lewis, 2005, 2007). Ely et al., (2011) state that as women rise in the hierarchy they increasingly become a minority and are therefore in the spotlight and become more “visible”; this can lead women to be “under the microscope” and to become risk-adverse. Hence to fit in with the norm and thus become “invisible” could mean a woman concentrating on “male” leadership attributes. Simpson and Lewis (2005) state that to be “invisible” in this context is to “to have power” thus women leaders align with the norm with that being of “male” leadership traits.

**RESEARCH SETTING**

Women in North America and Europe presently earn more undergraduate and Master’s degrees than men (Catalyst, 2013a; Call to Action report, Call to Action...
Report 2011). However, the rate of enrolment of women in Masters business degree programmes remains approximately 30% (FT, 2013). In 2013, some North American and Asian schools admissions tipped the 40% mark. In the US, women earned approximately 35% of MBA degrees, a figure that has remained static over the past 10 years (Catalyst, 2013b). On average, US-based schools have a larger percentage of women students than their European counterparts. Yet still the average percentage globally seems to be around 30–35%. MBA and EMBA programmes are heralded as a way to improve future earnings; however, women still exit business schools on lower salaries than men and over time this gap is not made up (Catalyst Pipeline Report, 2013). Female lecturers and board members also seem to be in short supply at business schools. Women still remain a minority group in business schools (see Tables 1 and 2).

**Table 1: FT Global MBA Rankings Top Ten Business Schools, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>Women faculty (%)</th>
<th>Women students (%)</th>
<th>Women on board (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Graduate School of Business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania: Wharton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Business School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSEAD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESE Business School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong UST Business School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT: Sloan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago: Booth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: FT Global EMBA Rankings Top Ten Business Schools, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>Women faculty (%)</th>
<th>Women students (%)</th>
<th>Women board (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg/Hong Kong UST Business School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsinghua University/INSEAD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia/London Business School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trium: HEC Paris/LSE/NYU Stern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA: Anderson/National University of Singapore</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University: Olin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania: Wharton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University: Fuqua</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago: Booth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2013

LEADERSHIP LEARNING AND BUSINESS SCHOOLS

Leadership learning on executive programs is promoted as one of the key reasons for attending business programmes (Harvard, 2013a; INSEAD, 2013a; IMD, 2013a). Although leadership-specific learning in these institutions can at times be a peripheral topic in MBA/EMBA programmes (Nohria & Khurana, 2010), Marvin, Bryans, and Waring (2004) believe that business schools play a crucial role in challenging individuals about their way of working. The institutions’ websites sell the development of leadership as a primary outcome of taking the MBA programme. For example, Harvard welcomes students “into two years of leadership practice immersed in real-world challenges” (Harvard, 2013a); INSEAD states, “The accelerated 10-month curriculum develops successful, thoughtful leaders and entrepreneurs who create value for their organisations and their communities” (INSEAD, 2013a).

Business schools also maintain that the case method approach gives students real preparation in leadership skills (Ellet, 2007). For example:

“Simply put, we believe the case method is the best way to prepare students for the challenges of leadership.” (Harvard, 2013b).
“INSEAD believes that the case method offers the most effective way to provide lessons in leadership.” (INSEAD, 2013b).

“Renowned for their international focus, IMD cases are used in schools all over the world and have proven to be highly effective in developing the leadership capabilities of executives at every stage of their career.” (IMD, 2013b).

“The HKU MBA programme adopts an experiential-learning approach, with the extensive use of business cases that enable students to become effective problem-solvers and decision-makers...” (Hong Kong Business School, 2013).

Ellet (2007) states that “case papers are the bedrock for teaching in business schools”. The case paper is used as the cornerstone for learning about business on MBA, EMBA and many executive education programmes. This approach to teaching is used by business schools around the world (Christensen & Hansen, 1987; Brennan & Ahmad, 2005). On an MBA programme a student can read more than 500 cases (Harvard, 2013b). Case paper content aims to reconstruct a real-life example of a business situation (Ellet, 2007; Harvard, 2013b; Jennings, 1996; Brennan & Ahmad, 2005). It presents students with business and organisational dilemmas, often multiple scenarios and real people issues that enable students to engage with the content (Ellet, 2007). There are no answers to a case: the student becomes the decision maker through theory formation, class discussion, listening to different perspectives, building on others’ ideas and making judgements (Ellet, 2007; Harvard, 2013). Kamran Kashani of IMD states, “Cases help students discover reality in its full complexity, which in itself is an energising experience” (The Case Centre, August 2013).

This approach is not without its critics. Weil, Oyelere, Yeoh and Firer (2001) note there are a number of skills that can be learned by case studies; however, there is a lack of investigation into the usefulness of case papers from the point of view of the
student with “no empirical evidence on the effectiveness of this method”. With the ease of accessibility to case papers through case clearing houses that sell case papers and their accompanying teaching notes, it can also seem a popular approach for tutors because of the convenience to them rather than to student learning (Stonham, 1995; cited in Brennan & Ahmad, 2005). Female students, as well as those from different ethnic groups, cultural backgrounds and minority groups often find the group work and class participation and discussion associated with the case method difficult to engage in, due to different linguistic styles (Brennan & Ahmad, 2005; Sinclair, 1995; Bartram, 2005; Gilligan, 1982; Smith, 1997). Gloeckler (2008) questions the case method approach as it may be good for teaching about making decisions but is not useful in framing problems.

There are case papers available in which women feature as lead protagonists. These papers are known to be used, and not exclusively on women-only leadership courses such as those run at INSEAD. Using case papers with woman protagonists on woman’s leadership programmes can help women see themselves as change agents, present role models and show different effective leadership styles (Ely et al., 2011). However, there is a lack of cases featuring women as the lead protagonist. Dr Lee at the University of Hong Kong recently wrote 10 cases with women protagonists for a women’s leadership course that she was convening as she deemed there where a dearth of papers with women protagonists.

**RESEARCH**

**Prize-winning Case Papers**

Because the case method of teaching is so popular, case clearing houses have burgeoned throughout the world. Case clearing houses sell case papers and their accompanying teaching notes. Some case clearing houses award annual prizes for
cases in individual learning areas, for example, marketing, finance, engineering, and so on, with one case winner per area and one overall winner. There are also highly prized case-writing competitions, best-selling case papers, classic collection cases and innovative peer-reviewed case teaching competitions. Institutions rate their winning cases highly, often posting notifications of prizes on their media pages and in their case paper listings.

The Case Centre (CC) is a non-profit case paper clearing house with offices in Europe and the USA and is recognised as one of the largest and most influential sellers and educators of the case paper method. Students at business schools are directed to its website (primarily) as a source for purchasing case papers required for their course work. Until recently, the Case Centre was known as the European Case Clearing House (ECCH); it was originally set up in 1973 and is recognised by business schools as a leader in distributing case paper materials and an expert in case teaching and learning. Each year the Case Centre announces approximately nine category award winners and one overall award winner. It is from this case clearing house that the cases are researched.

**Methodology and the Research Process**

Over a five-year time frame (2009–13), 50 award-winning case papers were researched and analysed (in fact, 49 papers, as one paper won more than one prize). Award-winning case papers are those that are taken up by more institutions in one year than any other cases. These papers have a wider distribution among teachers and institutions than any other group in that year. Other prizes are awarded to case papers; however, these are based on peer reviews and/or on total sales and therefore from the perspective of this report not seen as viable. As a cross reference I also researched the Case Centre’s (CC) top three best-selling cases for each year.
2009–13 and its overall best-selling paper of all time. This represented 16 papers (in fact, 7 different papers as these papers won across multiple years).

As well as reading the 49 (see above) award-winning and 7 best-selling papers I sent out a qualitative questionnaire to students and alumni of MBA, EMBA and executive education programmes. I attempted to use students from INSEAD Fontainebleau and also colleagues from a variety of business school backgrounds. The questionnaire focused on current students’ and alumni’s perceptions and views of gender in case papers and the overall gender balance on their programmes. The questionnaire supported the research on the case papers by gathering real-time views on the research topic. However, the response to the questionnaire was disappointing; I received a total of 20 completed questionnaires, 14 from men and six from women.

In writing this thesis and analysing the data I took a methodological perspective consisting of thematic analysis approach while adding some aspects of reflexivity and feminist research. Reflexivity research is underpinned by hermeneutic philosophy.

In hermeneutic research the process is iterative and is concerned with the relationship between the part and the whole. The whole can only be understood by its parts (Schwandt, 2007). The case papers were read as individual pieces; however, I was always conscious of the position of each paper in relation to the 49 total. As a model for my analysis I used the thematic research methodology Braun and Clarke (2006) describe in their six-step model:

1. Familiarise yourself with data, read, re-read and note down ideas.
2. Generate codes, coding interesting features across all papers.
3. Search for themes.
4. Check if the codes work with the coded extracts - generate a map of themes.
5. Define and name themes.
6. Select analysis and write up.

In identifying the overall themes, I also began to see individual differences and similarities. This was an iterative process which enabled me to identify increasingly confidently a certain number of recurring themes. From a Hermeneutic process it is a given that I approach the text with a view which is changed as I read the text. This in turn changed how I read the text.

Reflexivity methodologies came out of my understanding that I could not take myself out of this research. Reflexivity is the process of reflecting critically on the self, “the human instrument” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005: 115), as a researcher. My beliefs and judgements are intrinsically embedded in this topic. In fact, I am integral to this research and yet as I worked through it my prejudices were continually revised. Reinhardz (1997) writes about how we bring ourselves into the field of research and also create the self in the field of research. My personal voice is in the research (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) and I also impart the voice of the subjects of the research. Naming and exploring my own beliefs, values and prejudices about this topic enabled me to be my own critic. I continuously used my beliefs as a gauge of how I interpreted the data. Was I being biased? What were the underlying messages or what I was reading? What might I be missing? And am I seeing things that are not really there? I also used my lived experiences of gender bias to inform what I was hearing, reading and feeling while conducting the research. I applied my knowledge of feminist theory, in particular that of patriarchy, power, women’s visibility and invisibility. Reinhardz (1997) suggests that we have many selves as a researcher – so instead of trying to take myself out of the research I used myself as part of the research.
The Research Begins

I began my research by contacting the Case Centre at their European headquarters in London to acquire a list of all their prize-winning papers since the competition started in 1991. I then picked the cases that won their annual Case Centre Awards competition according to the following criteria:

“All cases registered with the Case Centre during the last five years are put forward for consideration. The winning case in each category is the one that has achieved the highest growth in popularity among peers worldwide, based on the number of individual organisations ordering and teaching the case during the last calendar year. A case that has won a category award in a previous year cannot win again, but is eligible, once, for the overall award (e.g. the 2010 overall award-winning case won the marketing category in 2009).” (Case Centre, 2013).

I then condensed these cases into a five-year time frame, 2009–13, in order to bring it up to date and relevant to today’s courses. Ten cases were used each year, with there being one overall case winner and nine category winners. The categories for winning papers are as follows: Overall Winner, Economics, Politics and Business Environment, Entrepreneurship, Ethics and social responsibility, Finance, Accounting and Control, Human Resource Management/Organisational Behaviour, Knowledge, information and communication systems Management, Marketing, Production and Operations Management, Strategy and General Management.

As one paper won both an individual subject prize and the overall winner prize (Red Bull, marketing 2009 and overall winner 2010) the actual number of papers read was 49. In the total research number I counted this paper twice as the prizes won were in two different years and so different institutions would be using it at different times (n = 50). As a cross reference I also researched the top three best-selling case papers from CC 2009–13 and the overall best-selling case of all time from its classic case collection, easyJet – the web’s favourite airline (Kumar & Rogers, 2002).
Phases 1–2: Data Familiarisation and Coding

Before reading, papers were categorised by year of award, with 10 papers in each year. I read all papers and as I went I grouped them as (1) male protagonist; (2) female protagonist; (3) organisational (no protagonist) within each year. I then re-read and refined this in terms of where and how the protagonist was mentioned. Was the protagonist “clear” in the paper? Some papers open with an obvious protagonist on the first page; others mention a person who made a substantial contribution to the case later in the paper. For both these instances I deemed there to be a protagonist in the paper (see the section below on male protagonist papers for a deeper definition).

At the same time I also noted the number of male and female “other characters” mentioned in the papers. Papers were then re-categorised as papers with female protagonists, papers that mention women in “other” roles, papers with male protagonists and all other papers. I now had a list of female protagonist papers and papers that mentioned women.

Symons Test

I then categorised each paper on whether it met the Symons Test. As part of the research I have adapted the Bechdel Test, or Mo Movie Measure or Bechdel Rule (Feminist Frequency, 2013). The Bechdel Test is a simple way to gauge the active presence of female characters in Hollywood films. It also shows how active and complete these roles are. The Test was created by Alison Bechdel in her comic strip “The Rule” found in “Dykes to Watch Out For” in 1985. Today many movies still fail to past this test and it demonstrates how women are under-represented or non-existent in the film industry (Bechdel, 2013). The Bechdel test for movies is:
“One, it has to have at least two women in it, who, two, talk to each other about, three, something besides a man” (Bechdel, 1985).

The rule I used (Symons Test) for case papers was: (1) It has to have one woman in it; (2) in a leadership position (the protagonist in this research); (3) who talks to another woman about the business.

In the listing (see Appendix 1.1–5 and Appendix 2) I used the following icons:

😊 = meets all three of the rules  😞 = meets two of the rules

😊 = meets one of the rules  😞 = meets none of the rules

Phases 3–4: Searching for Themes and Reviewing Themes

Cases with women protagonists and cases with women in them

I re-read these papers and captured in a separate document how the protagonist was described (if at all), her job title and role, and whether she a clear protagonist or played an integral role in the paper. I listed the industry that the case was in and how that industry was described.

From the exact words used for describing the female protagonists, her role in the paper, the context of her role and the business imperatives of the paper I started to highlight in different colours any similar themes and similar words. I re-read the papers once more. While doing so, I also noted how I was feeling about what I was reading. I did this until I had exhausted all apparent themes and similarities.

I conducted the same exercise for the papers in which women where mentioned. I noticed here that the papers had (1) women in roles that were integral to the paper’s story; (2) where women seemed secondary; and (3) papers where a woman’s name was mentioned or a short quote by a woman was embedded in the story but had no
relevance to the case or story. The last category required at least three readings of the papers to detect the presence of a woman in the paper. For category three I judged that women are not present in the papers. However, I have listed these papers in the acknowledgements. I then list also all the titles that women are given in these papers.

**Overall award winners**

I went through the same process for the papers that had won the overall category award annually for the five years.

**Male protagonist papers**

I further categorised the papers with a male protagonist into “clear” protagonists versus those that had in-depth descriptions of their character and their leadership style. A clear protagonist description can start from the first line of the paper or at least the first page of the paper, for example, “Felix Keck, General Manager and Head of Lufthansa Cargo’s Revenue Management Department, looked out of the window...” (Huchzermeier & Hellermann, 2002). I deemed that where there was a clear description of a manager and his/her role or someone who made a major contribution to the story in the paper that they were also protagonists but not clear protagonists. In separate documents I listed the exact words used for these protagonists. I also collected other themes that were prevalent in the male protagonist papers. Where I state the “presence” of men, I did not research this in depth, so in view of this I considered the papers with a man present to have at least one additional man in the paper other than the protagonist. This is in fact an under-representation of the actual number.
Case paper writers analysis

I listed the first writer gender for each paper and grouped this by year, by protagonist (male or female) and by papers with women mentioned in them. I repeated the exercise for second and third writers.

Best-selling case papers

For these papers I went through a similar process, however, in less depth that I had done for the award-winning papers. Here, I was looking for any major differences from my findings with the award-winning papers.

Student and Alumni Questionnaire

Further to the case papers analysis, I also sent out a questionnaire to current students and alumni of INSEAD and also colleagues who had studied at a variety of other business schools on a MBA or EMBA programme. The objective of this was to get some real-time feedback about students’ perceptions of gender balance in case papers and business schools. From the outset of designing the questionnaire I chose not to conceal the topic. The questionnaire was explicit about what it was measuring. I asked a number of questions that elicited further comments together with questions that required a rating. I wanted to understand what students remembered about case paper protagonists: whether they remembered the gender; whether they could describe the protagonists; whether the topic was important to them. After putting together the questionnaire I asked friends and associates to sample it and comment. I repeated this process a further three times, updating and refining the questions with each round of feedback. This marked the beginning of my research, as people’s comments and views of the topic were already being expressed and aired. (There is more information about this stage in the Findings section.) For ranking, I used a
seven-point Likert-type scale anchored at 1 = under-represented and 7 = over-represented (see Appendix 3 for a sample questionnaire).

**Respondents**

To access respondents I used Yammer, the INSEAD global network, to connect with students. I also sent the questionnaire out to my network of business associates and fellow CCC participants. Although posting many times on Yammer I got little to no response through this forum. This could have been due to the time of the year: in Europe August and September are holiday months. I received a high level of response from my CCC colleagues and their networks. Because of the lack of response, in September 2013 I spent almost a day and a half at INSEAD’s Fontainebleau campus canvassing students. I received interest and email addresses from students, yet ultimately few responses.

**Collating the data**

I categorised each returned questionnaire in one of three categories: gender (F/M); students from INSEAD (F1/M1); students from other institutions (F2/M2). In order of receipt each questionnaire was given a number, so F1.1, for example, was the first female respondent from INSEAD.

Because of the low number of returns (20 in all), I then categorised them as (1) female students; (2) male students; and (3) all students. Even with this low return rate some themes emerged.

I then proceeded through the thematic model for the questionnaires, as described earlier.
FINDINGS

Fifty award-winning cases and 16 best-selling cases from the Case Centre (2009–13) were researched. In order to combine the findings across the two research areas I have used the premise of “different papers” read in each area researched rather than total number of papers.

Few Women in Papers

Table 3: Award-winning and best-selling papers (Case Centre 2009–13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total papers</th>
<th>Total different papers</th>
<th>Female protagonist papers</th>
<th>Male protagonist papers</th>
<th>Female written in papers</th>
<th>Male written in papers</th>
<th>Female presence in papers</th>
<th>Male presence in papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award winning</td>
<td><em>50</em></td>
<td><em>49</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best selling</td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *One paper has (no clear protagonist)  ** includes overall best selling (paper of all time)

Women are “invisible” in all papers. As Table 3 shows, across the two sets of case papers women appear as a protagonist in seven of the 56 different papers. In two of these seven papers the female protagonist role was originally written as a male protagonist. Therefore women were intentionally written as a protagonist in five of the 56 different papers. One paper does not have a clear protagonist. Forty-eight of the 56 papers feature a man as the protagonist and 42 of these papers have a “clear” male protagonist. One paper features women only in the paper. Women are written into a further 21 papers. However, I have only categorised women as “present” in eight of these papers due to their minimal appearance. Where women feature in these papers they are often from marginalised groups. Therefore, women are not written into 28 (50%) of these case papers and not present in 41 (73%) of the award-winning and best-selling papers.
Table 4: The Symons Test results overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Symons Test results overview</th>
<th>Meets all 3 of the rules</th>
<th>Meets 2 of the rules</th>
<th>Meets 1 of the rules</th>
<th>Meets 0 of the rules</th>
<th>Total cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total award winning cases 2009-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total best selling cases 2009-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the 56 papers met all three criteria for my Symons Test (having a woman in it, in a leadership position (the protagonist), who talks to another woman about the business). Another four papers met two of the Symons Test criteria (having a woman in it in a leadership position (protagonist) and a further eight papers met one rule of the Symons Test (having a woman in it). Forty-one papers did not meet any of the Symons test criteria. In the woman protagonist’s papers her background or character is not described in the papers. However, the “male” company founder is often described in the same paper. Out of the seven female protagonist papers, five are from Harvard, one from INSEAD and one from a collaboration of Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla and the University of Warwick. A woman is the lead writer of seven of the 56 different papers.

“Pink Topics”

The OPED Project Byline Report 2012 tracks most influential ideas and individuals in US national and global conversations. It tracks major media sites and publishers as well as social media. OPED coined the phrase “pink topics” to describe topics that:

- fall into what was once known as “the four Fs”: food; family (relationships, children, sex); furniture (home); fashion
- woman-focused subject matter, e.g. woman-specific health or culture.
Pink topics are not seen as any less important than other topics; they simply identify areas where women were predominantly in print in the past (The OPED Project 2012). All papers with a woman protagonist fit into the “Pink topics” or within the Four “F’s” industries; Fashion, Furniture, Family and Food.

**Men’s presence in papers**

Men present in 55 of the 56 different papers. In most papers there is more than one man featured. There are few women in papers that have a male protagonist. Forty-one of the 56 papers do not meet any of the rules of the Symons Test. In the majority of papers the male protagonists are described along with any founder who is mentioned. A man is the lead writer of 49 of the 56 papers. Leadership descriptors in all papers substantiate a “think manager-think male” standpoint.

**Award-winning Case Paper Analysis**

**Overview**

Fifty award-winning case papers across ten award categories where researched between 2009 and 2013. The award-winning cases are those that have achieved the highest growth in popularity among peers worldwide in each category, based on the number of individual organisations ordering and teaching the case during the preceding calendar year. In this section I use all 50 papers in this category, as the one paper that won an award twice won the award across different years and different categories.
Table 5: Overview of women in award-winning case papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total papers</th>
<th>Protagonist papers</th>
<th>Organisational (no protagonist)</th>
<th>Present in other papers</th>
<th>Lead writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%F</td>
<td>%M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 50 award-winning papers one paper features only women and a further five papers have a female protagonist. As Table 5 shows six out of the 50 award-winning case papers feature a woman as the protagonist. Forty-three of the 50 papers featured a man as the protagonist with 37 of these papers having a clear protagonist. Forty-nine of the 50 papers feature at least one man and more often more than one. One paper does not have a clear single protagonist. Women are written in a further 17 papers. However, I have only categorised women to be present in seven of these 17 papers because of their minimal appearance. Therefore women are not written into 27 of papers (54%) and are not present in 37 (74%) of the 50 award-winning papers. Only two papers meet all three of the Symons Test criteria (having a woman in it, in a leadership position (protagonist), who talks to another woman about the business). A further four papers meet two of the criteria (having a woman in it in a leadership position (protagonist)) and in a further seven papers all meet one criterion (having a woman in it). Thirty-seven papers do not meet any of the Symons Test criteria. The lack of women in leadership throughout these papers renders women “invisible”. Of the six female protagonist papers, two were originally written with male lead protagonists and the names subsequently changed when the
papers where revised and updated. Therefore only four papers were originally and intentionally written with a female protagonist in mind.

Women are not present in the five overall award-winning papers across the five years. Female protagonists feature in four of the nine award-winning categories: Economics, Politics and Business Environment, Ethics and Social responsibility, Finance, Accounting and Control and Marketing.

Six out of the 50 award-winning papers have a woman as the lead writer. Of the 69 secondary writers for these papers, 28 (41%) are women. There are no women writers at all for 21 (42%) of the papers. Three of the six papers featuring a woman as a protagonist were written by the same lead writer, Professor Christopher A. Bartlett from Harvard Business School. In five out of six teaching notes I read, “gender” is not mentioned as discussion topic even when there is only one woman in the paper.

**Six papers where women are the protagonist**

**Table 6: The six cases with female protagonists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject area/category award</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author and year of publication</th>
<th>Business school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
All six papers are written about real events. Three are Harvard “brief papers” (disguised but based on actual events) – Levendor Café, United Cereal and New Heritage Doll Company. Two papers describe real-life events where the company and its leaders are named: IKEA’s Global Sourcing Challenge and Dove. All the lead writers are male and three have the same lead writer (Bartlett, HBS).

Two papers meet all three criteria for the Symons Test – Dove and New Heritage Doll Company – and feature predominantly women in all roles mentioned. Three papers feature only one woman (the protagonist) among many men and meet two of the Symons Test criteria are: IKEA’s Global Sourcing Challenge, United Cereal and Levendor Café. All three papers were written by Professor Christopher A. Bartlett from Harvard Business School. Infinity Bank (A) features two women; however, they do not speak to each other so this paper meets just the first two of the three Symons Test criteria.

Brief overview of each case

- Infinity Bank (A) Retail Branches and Customer Profitability
  Richard, the CEO of the bank, asks Philippa Smith, Head of Customer Intelligence, to review a new strategy proposed by the retail banking division. Richard does not trust the management team in this division and wants Philippa to “tell me if the strategy is intelligent”.

- IKEA’s Global Sourcing Challenge: Indian Rugs and Child Labor (A)
  IKEA is a global furniture manufacturer and retailer of furniture. The paper traces the history of IKEA’s response to a television report that its Indian carpet suppliers were using child labour. Marianne Barner is a newly appointed IKEA Business Area Manager. She then learns of further evidence that suppliers to
IKEA are using child labour. “How should she react to the crisis? How should the company deal with the ongoing issue of child labour in the supply chain?”

- United Cereal: Lora Brill’s Eurobrand Challenge
  Set in the European division of a giant multinational company, the original paper was written with a male protagonist. Lora Brill is United Cereal’s European vice-president. She has to decide whether a new product launch should become the company’s first Eurobrand and have a coordinated launch Europe-wide. This involves making major strategic and organisational decisions.

- Dove: Evolution of a Brand
  This case is about the evolution of one of Unilever’s masterbrand campaigns: Dove. Unilever will need to take the brand to market sectors beyond soap. The case does not open with a clear protagonist; however, Silvia Lagnado is Global Brand Director for Dove and leads the investigation into women’s responses to the iconography of the beauty industry. It ends up being a controversial campaign about the meaning of “real beauty”.

- New Heritage Doll Company
  New Heritage Doll Company is a large American company manufacturing and selling dolls and doll accessories. It was founded in 1985 by a child development psychologist Ingrid Beckwith. Emily Harris is vice-president of the company’s product division. Emily has to make a decision about two proposals based on how they strengthen her division’s innovative product line and drive future growth.
• Levendary Café: The China Challenge

This paper was originally written with a male protagonist. Levendary Café is an American based fast-food chain. The company is concerned that its expanding operation in China is moving too far away from the company’s store design and menu concepts. “Mia Foster is a first-time CEO with no international experience” and is flying to China for the first time to meet Chen, the head of the company’s China operation. What can Mia do about the China operation and can she manage Chen?

Themes across the six female protagonist papers

There are three themes across these six female protagonist papers: think manager–think male; a topic with a sense of purpose or meaning; pink topic categories.

Protagonist qualities and descriptions

Think manager–think male

Unlike papers that feature male protagonists, in the papers in which female protagonist’s appear, their character and qualities are not described. Also, in the female protagonist papers where there is a male founder, his qualities are described in the paper. The male characters in three of the six papers are given more space than the female protagonist. In five of the six papers the female protagonists’ qualities are not described. Only in one of the papers, where the protagonist was originally a man, is there a short description of the protagonist. Within the papers the leader described is a man; this supports the concept that a leader’s attributes are “male” and the think leader–think male theory.

In the Dove paper neither the protagonist nor any other characters featured in the case are described. In a further two cases the protagonist’s position title and area of
responsibility is given but no further qualities are described. However, these two cases go on to describe the companies’ founders:

“To understand IKEA’s operations, one had to understand the philosophy and beliefs of its 70-year-old founder, Ingvar Kamprad. Despite stepping down as CEO in 1986... Kamprad retained the title of honorary chairman... Yet perhaps even more powerful than his ongoing presence were his strongly held values and beliefs... The cultural norm and values that developed in IKEA to support the strategy’s implementation were also... an extension of Kamprad’s personal beliefs and style.” (IKEA)

“Established in 1910 Jed Thomas was an immigrant grocer from England... Thomas grew the company with a set of strong values that endured through history and “commitment, diligence and loyalty” were watchwords in UC.” (United Cereal)

In the case of Levendary Café, which describes the protagonist, Mia Foster, the founder of the company, Howard Leventhal, and other four male managers are also described. This is one of the cases where the protagonist was male in the original version of this case and later changed. Mia Foster’s description retains “male or agentic” (Street, Kimmel, & Kromrey, 1995) descriptors, for example, “her frank style and strong execution”.

Mia Foster is described as:

“a first time CEO, known for her frank communication style and strong execution ... Given Foster’s lack of previous international management...”

Howard Leventhal is described as:

“the beloved founder of the popular chain... who had grown a small Denver soup restaurant... to a $10 billion business. Leventhal’s approach was to “delighting the customer” this translated across the company...”
In Infinity Bank both the CEO (male) and the protagonist Philippa Smith are described as “new”. Philippa Smith is new to the bank as Head of Customer Intelligence and was expecting “something exciting”… “She is having difficulty understanding why she was hired”.

In one case only, Heritage Doll, all case characters, including the protagonist, are female. This is the only case across all papers researched that does not mention a man. In this case women speak to each other about the business and are represented as having responsibility to and for the entirety of the business. In this case the three other characters are the company founder, Ingrid Beck, and two other women who are both in brand management positions and responsible for the proposals put to Emily Harris, the protagonist. However, Emily Harris is not described in the paper, although the founder of the company is:

“…[F]ounded in 1985 by Ingrid Beckwith, a retired psychologist specializing in child development and the grandmother of two girls. Dr Beckwith believed that the dolls produced by major toy companies did little to develop girls’ imagination or foster positive self-image.”

In five of the papers where the protagonist is a female and her qualities are not described, four describe a male manager or the company’s founder. In three of these four cases the founder is a man. In the male protagonist papers both the male protagonist and the male founder’s qualities and characteristics are described.

**Sense of purpose or meaning**

In three (50%) of these papers, Dove, New Heritage Doll and IKEA, there is a theme of bringing a wider meaning to the business and of “making a difference”. In these three papers the “original” protagonist was a woman and she is instrumental in bringing a “higher sense of purpose” or meaning to the organisation. The IKEA paper
won the Ethics and Responsibility case award in 2011. All three cases are based on real events.

In New Heritage Doll the founder, Dr Ingrid Beckwith, states “she wanted to develop girls imagination or foster a positive self-image”; in the Dove paper it states that “Dove needed to stand for a point of view” and wanted its advertisements “to change the way society views beauty and provoke discussion and debate about real beauty”; in the IKEA paper Berner, the protagonist, talks about her responsibility “to protect the business and IKEA’s brand image […] yet she viewed her responsibility as broader than this; she felt the company should do something that would make a difference in the lives of the children she had seen.”

In the 43 award-winning papers that feature a male protagonist, only seven (16%) of the papers have an explicit message about making a difference, improving employees’ working conditions or creating sustainable working conditions for others. Four of these papers were awarded the Ethics and Sustainability award in 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2013. In four of these seven papers women and a few men are written as being from marginalised communities.

**Pink topics**

In five of the six papers, the industries in which women featured as a protagonist could be clearly categorised as pink: New Heritage Doll (family and/or woman-specific), Dove (fashion and/or woman-specific), United Cereal (food), Levendary Café (food), IKEA (furniture). Infinity Bank is a story about a possible outlet of retail banking in a supermarket and therefore I would also consider this to fit into the pink topic of food.

Where the case paper has a male protagonist the topics are: technology (internet, mobile and IT initiatives, etc.) 31%; food 21%; motor industry and transport 14%;
family (health, retail and entertainment) 11%; fashion 10%; banking 5%; infrastructure 5%; commodities 3%.

**What is missing?**

In five of the six papers the companies are large global multinationals; only the Heritage Doll case has women in a more entrepreneurial environment. Considering that some of the more well-known women leaders today are from the social media sector, papers featuring women from the technology, social media and internet field are missing. In five of the six the cases the end user seemed to be predominantly female; however, in the male protagonist papers the end users were often women and men. Although the women were not described in detail, there was no indication that any of those represented as protagonists in the cases were other than white middle-class or came from ethnic groups. Gender was not mentioned at all in the papers. I was able to read five of the teaching notes accompanying these cases and none mentioned a discussion around gender, even when a woman was the only woman in the paper.

**Cases Featuring Women**

Women are written in all the cases shown in Table 7; entries in bold indicate papers in which women are “present”.

Women have a low presence in all other papers and are in a real sense invisible. Thirty-eight papers in this category do not meet any of the Symons Test criteria. All of these papers have a male protagonist; all those listed in **bold** meet the Symons criterion “has a woman in it”. Women are not present in an overall winner paper during the period 2009–13 and all these papers have a male lead writer. The majority of papers were about actual events and organizations and 10 different business schools were represented.
Table 7: The presence of women in the case papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject area/Category award</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author and year of publication</th>
<th>Business school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Subject area/Category</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author and year of publication</td>
<td>Business school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further analysis**

I grouped these papers together as follows:

1. Papers where women feature recurrently and play an integral role in the case (4);
2. Women in secondary roles deemed to be “present” in the paper (3);
3. Women named once or quoted or not critical to the story; deemed to be “not present” in the paper (10); and
4. Roles and titles of women from all papers researched.

Where there are further women in the female protagonist papers I have not included them here as I have already mentioned them and counted them in the previous section.
1. Papers where women feature recurrently and play an integral role in the case

Women in these cases are described in more detail than the women in the lead protagonist cases. In two out of the four papers in this category women are from marginalised groups: female sewing machinists in Sri Lanka and rural women in Bangladesh. In the other two papers one woman is a senior sales representative in a Chinese pharmaceutical company and the other is the wife of an expatriate living in Japan.

In three papers the topics are about a company recognising a social responsibility towards either their employees or their customers. The three papers that feature a social responsibility issue are MAS Holdings, Grameen Bank and Blue Monday.

In two of these papers (MAS, Grameen Bank) the women are from marginalised communities and are part of the problem being solved in the case. They do not have decision-making roles and men play a patriarchal role in looking after the women.

In MAS Holdings, which is a family-owned intimate apparel business in Sri Lanka, the opening page has a picture of a woman at a sewing machine. The company is the largest supplier to the retail chain Victoria’s Secret. The paper is about the company’s emergence as a global supplier with ethics. In a country where female labour-intense industries account for 24% of GDP, it is still frowned on for women to work outside the home. Women leave home from rural areas in their early teens and live in crowded hostels: At MAS they set up plants in rural areas and assist workers with transport to the factories. No worker is under 18 and they work in well-lit, air-conditioned factories with meals provided. Eventually MAS uses their forward thinking HR policies to market a campaign called “Going Beyond” to
“further career advancement, work-life balance, rewarding excellence and community activation” for women.

Grameen Bank in Bangladesh starts up by offering loans to women. This act “almost originated a social revolution” as most women were illiterate and men ran the household finances. It meant sending financiers into rural areas and educating women about this opportunity.

In the third paper the woman speaks the “unspoken” at a company meeting. Blue Monday is about the ethics of working for US-owned companies in China. Anita Li, a senior sales rep, broaches the topic of the company’s “kickbacks” to doctors. “For the second quarter she has not achieved her sales quota… [S]he thought about how she could explain her failure… [H]er supervisor she knew would not be pleased by her performance.” Anita continues to tell her manager (the protagonist) at a sales meeting, “I am sure we can make our sales targets… if we can offer the same kickbacks as our competitors.”

In the fourth paper a woman accompanies her husband (the protagonist) to Japan and hopes the relocation can help repair their shaky marriage. It doesn’t and she returns to America and files for divorce.

2. Women in secondary roles deemed to be “present” in the paper (3)

In these papers (Ocado, Xiameter, Ford Fiesta Movement (no clear protagonist)) women are hardly present and could be easily missed by the reader. In most women do not play an integral role in the story; there may be a photograph of a woman in the paper; and women’s titles in these papers are varied. Ford Fiesta does have a woman in a decision making role with 2 other men.
3. Women named once or quoted or not critical to the story; deemed to be “not present” in the paper (10)

The 10 papers in this category are: Evolution of a Circus Industry (A), Zara, Richard Murphy and the Biscuit Company, Southwest Airlines, Louis Vuitton in Japan, M-PESA (Kenya), Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand (twice), Procter & Gamble PuR and Marks & Spencer.

It required at least three read-throughs to find some of the female mentions in these papers. In each, either a female name or a name and title are listed. A few contain a small quote from a woman. In Southwest and M-PESA, women and men are listed as customers. In Zara there a picture of Madonna and in Louis Vuitton and Zara they mention other male and female stars.

4. Roles and titles of women from all papers researched

The following titles and roles are given to women across all the papers where I deemed women to be present and/or written into papers. In the vast majority of cases where women were mentioned their role was as the “customer” in areas such as groceries and washing powders, fashion and luxury goods, home appliances, travel, soap, cars and telecom. The following is a list of the titles given to women in these 17 papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Vice-President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Operations Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President Production</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing head/leader/director</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Roles and titles of women written in and present in case papers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and customer service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Customer Intelligence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sales Representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business area manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D section head</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (University of Edinburgh)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstresses/waitresses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women from low income groups or in poverty</td>
<td>Featured in 4 papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist/psychotherapist</td>
<td>2 (same paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models/actresses</td>
<td>Too many to name individually but appeared in a least 6 papers with women in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers/artists</td>
<td>Too many to list individually but appeared in 6 of these papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>In 8 of these cases however more across all other cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women’s (In)Visibility Across All Papers**

With only two of the 50 papers meeting all three criteria of the Symons Test, and women written in 23 papers with being “present” in 7, women are in a real sense invisible across these case papers, which fail to show a significant number of women at any level within organisations. More often than not women are in the roles of customer, feature as models and/or actresses or come from marginalised communities. Across these papers there is a lack of women’s presence whether they are protagonists or not. This also renders women leaders “invisible”. Interestingly, because of the general absence of women, they are also highly “visible” as leaders when they do feature, as they are often the only woman in a paper. No mention or discussion of gender was noted in any accompanying teaching notes.
Male Protagonist Papers

Of the 50 case papers, 43 (86%) had a male protagonist. Of these 43 papers, 37 had a clear male protagonist. The protagonist’s name, title and or description appeared in the first page of the paper and the protagonist was a strong influence in the paper. Twenty-nine of the papers (58%) had a male founder of the company who was also described. Other themes across the male protagonist’s papers included the prevalence of company “founders”, while a number of papers featured young male college (often Harvard) “friends” getting together to start businesses.

Examples of some representative descriptors of male protagonists include:

“Rene Obermann cut a youthful figure in contrast to his predecessors. He looked even younger than his 43 years. He liked fast motorbikes and thrash metal”.

“Chalon considered himself a tough but fair manager-he was results-driven, disciplined, and demanded complete accountability from his team.”

“In 1914, Thomas J. Watson Sr. (regarded as the father of modern IBM)....”

The new President, Jan Timmer... lost no time in launching an initiative that cut headcount by 68,000 or 22%..., earning Timmer the nickname ‘The Butcher of Eindhoven’.”

“Kelleher’s leadership style combined flamboyance, fun, and a fresh new perspective. Kelleher played Big Daddy-O in one of the company videos...”

“Keck had been abroad for the company at Lufthansa stations around the world for many years before being assigned his current job at Lufthansa's home base. Having started his professional career in the transportation business, he brought both the view of a practitioner and the appropriate theoretical mindset to this position”.

“Richard Murphy's commitment to the job was total. Employees who had worked with Murphy in the past described him as: "passionate", "committed", "able to see the big picture", "strong-willed", "courageous" and "energetic". ..... Murphy was also a bit of an adventurer. The owner of a 39-foot yacht, he loved to sail, and would often cross the channel in order to let off steam and relax. (His ambition is one day to sail around the world with his family)".
“The company’s headquarters feature open-space layouts and modern furniture, some of which Paulo Pereira da Silva designed himself. Art books and design magazines fill the space. His own office is filled with works of art and a large blackboard covered with Schrodinger and Maxwell equations, which he finds “incredibly beautiful”.

A good example is provided by Red Bull, the only paper to win two prizes over the five years. This paper also featured in the 2009, 2010 and 2013 top three best-selling papers list. It describes Red Bull’s marketing strategy, from the “dance culture” to “extreme sports”, and all pictures and examples in this paper are masculinised. The case paper is extremely colourful in presentation, with pictures of the founder, Dietrich Mateschitz, and the extreme sports that the brand supports.

“Red Bull also developed its own extreme sports events such as BMX-biking, Kite-boarding, extreme snowboarding,... paragliding and skydiving. Soon the drink became associated with dangerous, on the edge, adrenaline-fuelled activities…”

Across all papers, whether there is a female or male protagonist, the descriptors used for leaders are male and the think manager–think male mentality is prevalent.

**Best-selling Case Papers**

**Overview**

As a cross-reference I also analysed the three best-selling case papers per year 2009–13, a total of 15 papers. Best-selling case papers are those that have the highest number of individual paper sales. I also included in this list the case with the highest overall sales for the Case Centre, which is also part of its classic case collection. The classic case collection includes cases that have continued to sell well among institutions since initial publication. In 2011 more than 35% of cases sold at the Case Centre had been published more than 10 years earlier (CC, 2013).
Table 9: Best-selling papers 2009–13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Business school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand</td>
<td>Kumar, Linguri &amp; Tavassoli, 2005</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower</td>
<td>Moon &amp; Herman, 2002</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower</td>
<td>Moon &amp; Herman, 2002</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand</td>
<td>Kumar, Linguri &amp; Tavassoli, 2005</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zara</td>
<td>Ferdows, Machuca &amp; Lewis, 2002</td>
<td>Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Renova Toilet Paper: Avant-Garde Marketing in a Commoditized Category</td>
<td>De Souza, Bart, Chandon, &amp; Sweldens, 2010</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zara</td>
<td>Ferdows, Machuca &amp; Lewis, 2002</td>
<td>Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership And Innovation at Apple Inc.</td>
<td>Heracleous &amp; Papachroni, 2012</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand</td>
<td>Kumar, Linguri &amp; Tavassoli, 2005</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower</td>
<td>Moon &amp; Herman, 2002</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall best-selling case (Classic Case Collection)</td>
<td>easyJet – the Web’s Favourite Airline</td>
<td>Kumar &amp; Rogers, 2002</td>
<td>IMD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The themes found for these papers were similar to those in the award-winning category. Men are present in all the papers and women are present in two papers, one of which has a female protagonist. The Case Centre best-selling and classic collection paper, easyJet – the Web’s Favourite Airline, mentions a woman CEO of a competing company in two lines in an “illustration inset” section. I therefore deemed a woman not to be present in this paper. Unilever in Brazil has won the best-selling category for the past five years and I have considered a woman to be “present” in this paper. Three papers appear in both the award-winning and best-selling categories: Red Bull, Strategic Leadership and Innovation at Apple Inc. and Renova Toilet Paper. Of these 16 best-selling cases from 2009–13, four won across several years. Seven different papers make up the 16 best-sellers. Of these seven, a woman appears as a protagonist in one and there is also one female lead writer; men appear as the protagonist in six of the seven different papers. There is at least one man mentioned in all of these papers. Women are mentioned in two of the papers (including the one with a female protagonist). Of the 16 papers, over the five-year period a female protagonist is featured in the same case paper in 2011 and 2012 (Zara). In this paper all three criteria for the Symons Test are met: it has to a woman in it, in a leadership position (protagonist), who talks to another woman about the business. The women mentioned in a further paper are from marginalised communities. A female lead writer paper appears in 2009, 2010 and 2013 for Aqualisa. Interestingly the overall best-selling paper, easyJet, and the two-times award winner and a top three best-selling paper over the five years, Red Bull, are both written by the same author, Professor Nirmalya Kumar from IMD.

Further analysis

Both papers that have a woman protagonist and/or feature a woman within the case fit into the OPED pink topics, Unilever (family) and Zara (fashion). As in the award-
winning papers I have not considered that Red Bull and Aqualisa include a woman as a woman’s name is mentioned only once in the paper.

Unilever in Brazil, the best-selling paper for the past five years, features women from poor, low-income backgrounds. This paper mentions a customer (Maria) who cannot afford Unilever washing powder. The paper goes on to compare the clothes washing habits of women in southeast and northeast Brazil. Men hold the key leadership and marketing roles. The two pictures that feature on the front of the paper show Maria, her daughter and her grandchildren, Maria holding up a washing-powder box and her daughter holding her two children. This paper was published in 2002 and is from INSEAD.

The paper on Zara has a female protagonist but more space and description are given to the original owner than to the protagonist. The paper opens with “Isabelle Borges, one of the product market specialists in the womenswear department at Zara…”; however, on page three a whole paragraph describes the original owner of Inditex and Zara, Amancia Ortego Gaona. As opposed to EasyJet, the best-selling paper of all time a clear description is given of the male protagonist on the opening page:

“Stelios considered himself a serial entrepreneur …first achieved business success at 25……anxious to replicate his past success, Stelios aggressively pursued any business opportunity that he could operate profitably.”

It goes on further in the paper to say

“He considered himself a man of the people and worked hard to cultivate this image.”
Questionnaire Analysis

Researching the questionnaire

When developing the questionnaire and before sending it out, I solicited feedback from friends and colleagues. I observed two strong reactions from the women who read it: wow, what a great idea; and disbelief at not having recognised the gender imbalance in case papers before.

All the women I spoke too or contacted during the development of the questionnaire became excited, supportive and deeply interested in the research. Two were overwhelmed by the fact that they had not previously recognised the imbalance of women in case papers, and felt almost ashamed that they had not seen it. Women from all over the world emailed links to articles and asked me for a copy of the research when it was completed. The men I sent the questionnaire to had totally different reactions, ranging from “You have a problem”, “Who are you trying to blame?”, through requests for copies of the research as they “do not understand the topic and want to learn more”, to men who participated and wished me luck. A few men were as supportive as the women but they were in the minority. This reflected Cole’s (1998) experience as a woman participant on an MBA course:

“If I asked questions relating to gender there were three reactions: genuine puzzlement – what did I mean; hostility – did I not understand that this was a business course which was therefore gender neutral; polite interest but no knowledge or suggestions of where I might find such knowledge” (Cole 1998).

This is a hot topic, in more ways than one.
Questionnaire results

In total 20 questionnaires were completed, from fourteen male and six female respondents. I also held conversations with two women who had completed MBA and executive programmes. Respondents to the questionnaire were predominantly MBA/EMBA alumni or current MBA students at a university or business school. Eight of the male respondents were from INSEAD Fontainebleau, with the balance from Yale, JL Kellogg GSM, Anglia Ruskin University and Instituto de Empresa Spain. The female respondents were MBA participants or alumni from INSEAD Fontainebleau (two), Gordon Institute of Business Science, University of St Gallen, Boston College and University of Western Sydney Graduate School of Management. Appendix 3 contains a copy of the questionnaire. For this section of the findings I will focus on the themes that are relevant to this thesis.

Women rated an average of 2.1 out of 7 for representation of women in case papers. One woman felt the representation was balanced between men and women. Men rated the representation of women in case papers at 2.6 out of 7 with two men rating the representation of women as balanced.

How would you describe the male protagonist?

I categorised the descriptions into 1) strong, decisive language that represented masculine values for leadership; 2) other descriptions of leadership; 3) other descriptors; and 4) those that did not notice.

Both men (13) and women (4) similarly and overwhelmingly described the protagonist within the first category with descriptors such as: masculine, successful, bold, aggressive, white western businessman, business orientated, smart, driven, cunning, alpha male, ambitious, dominant.
Women also noted descriptors from section two, “servant leader”, “charismatic leader” and two men noted “dutiful” and “entrepreneur in trouble”. Two women and one man stated they could not remember a description for a male protagonist.

**How would you describe the female protagonist?**

Both male and female respondents had a greater variety of descriptors for female protagonists. However, more men than women seemed to describe women with “male leadership descriptors”. For category 1, the women used the words *masculine*, *hardworking*, and *determined*. Men listed *business orientated, focused and career driven, successful, smart ambitious, educated*. For section 2, one woman listed *democratic* and men listed *visionary, innovators*. Section 3 elicited most descriptors from three of the women: *unsure, emotional, fragile, erratic, generous, nice* and *inquisitive*. Men used words like *intricate* and *elaborate*. Also in section 3, two of the five women surveyed could not remember how women were described and three of the men did not pay attention to the gender of the protagonist.

The question that elicited most reaction and response from the survey was: “During the course did you recognise the lack of women protagonists (lead) in the case papers?” Five out of six women and nine out of 14 men did not recognise the lack of female protagonists. One woman and two men did notice the lack of female protagonists and one man and one woman failed to answer the question.

The questions that followed were: “Having had this topic now raised, is there anything else you would like to say (if at all) about gender balance of the protagonists in the case papers?” and “Is there anything else you would like to share about what you noticed?”
I separated the male and female answers to this question as the responses differed greatly by gender.

I then categorised the men’s answers into:

1) those who didn’t notice or believe in the relevance of the question and the lack of female protagonists

2) those who seemed to be defending the situation

3) those who believed that the lack of female protagonists was an issue.

1) Those who didn’t notice or believe in the relevance of the question and the lack of female protagonists

This section produced the largest number of answers, with eight comments expressing in various ways the belief that the gender of the protagonist was irrelevant to case papers or their learning.

“No. In the case studies information is presented in a neutral and fact-based way.”

“In my opinion the gender of protagonists is easily exchangeable and has no impact on the value of the learning or outcome.”

“Again, I believe the protagonist is not what matters in a paper.”

“I like to read biographies and they are mostly male, but I would have no issue to read a female one so again this is a non-issue for me.”

“The cases are representative of the time they were written. Most case studies are open-ended – they set the scene and the thinking what should be done is left to the students. In such a setting the gender of the protagonist doesn’t play and matter much.”

“In case studies there are also no remarks on ethnicity and sexual preference and also this would not have made an impact on the learning outcome.”
“I do not think MBA policy on gender has a lot of impact. I believe more in company policies especially mentoring and role models.”

2) **Those who seemed to be defending the situation**

A further six answers fell into this category. The opinion here was that the papers “lagged” behind in featuring female protagonists because of their age; respondents believed that newer papers featured more female protagonists. One respondent believed that there was “not a compelling reason” behind the diversity issue and this topic was more about “my issues” with diversity and “less about the world out there”.

“Lagged effect induces overrepresentation of males compared to today's environment.”

"Newer cases have more woman (as there are more women in business) and fictional cases are around 50%.”

"My concern would be a push to balance gender representation would put focus on gender issues instead of the case material. If there's a need to teach about gender issues in the workplace, this should be an isolated topic, and not mixed to dilute other subjects (doesn't do either topic justice)."

“Sometimes I believe people put too much emphasis on this diversity issue without a compelling reason behind it. Maybe it has more to say about how that person has been raised or affected by it at home or work so he/she needs to cope or change and less about the world out there.”

“I did not know whether it was just a lack of female protagonists or whether it was a reflection of the topics who favoured the male gender.”

“In real life it is the task of a manager to take team members as they are… Gender, ethnicity, sexual preference or other discriminating factors should not play any role in this but should be seen as an asset to elaborate multi-dimensional solutions to business problems, which will be superior to those elaborated by homogeneous groups with streamlined thinking.”

3) **Those who believed that the lack of female protagonists was an issue**
There were three comments in this section, with one person realising the relevance of this topic, now it had been raised, and another two recognising the value of input that comes from their female colleagues:

“I did not consider it at the time, but can see that it can have relevance for future leadership and cultural differences.”

“Cases in which the actual decisions taken by the protagonists are presented, gender balance would have been beneficial for the learning.”

“Female colleagues are quieter and they speak last however their input is highly valuable.”

Women responded in quite a different and diverse way to the same questions. Four responded that they had not recognised the lack of female protagonists; one had recognised it and one failed to answer the question. Comments ranged from “It’s a known truth that men and women are not equal” to “I feel more comfortable working with male colleagues as female students tend to be sensitive [...]”. Two comments raised the topic of the lack of female lecturers in academia:

“Considering that this issue had not crossed my mind before, I now think that this inequality in the form of case papers could colour how leaders are viewed in the workplace: men are competent and great leaders while women are emotional and irrational.”

“Again, don’t think they were focusing on gender aspects really. Now after going through this survey, I am thinking, this was may not be intentional choice but there are lesser women on the top of any organization. That may be the reason why when these case papers are being drafted we see less female protagonists.”

“I wonder if Business Schools are aware of the lack of female lecturers and whether this has to do with a lack of females in general in academia at a senior level.”

“Being a new working mother and reflecting on the work in the MBA there may have been value for me to understand how other women manage work life balance/having a voice amongst largely male
characters they are working with and understanding the gender differences to improve performance.”

“It's a known truth that men and women are not equal. I never felt any discrimination or gender issue during MBA studies coming from the school, methods of teaching etc. Also, yes, the Indians and Chinese in the class could not handle women very well [...] I would not go so far as to say that all Indians and Chinese I worked with had issues with females, quite the contrary.”

“I feel more comfortable working with male colleagues/students as female students tend to be sensitive, easy to become emotional, difficult to understand (especially Asian women tend to hide their emotion) although nationality also matters significantly in terms of comfort level in working together.”

Finally, when going through the responses I realised that when I asked a question about “gender” respondents immediately assumed this to mean “women”. The words “gender” and “women” seemed almost interchangeable. There was no assumption that gender could include and mean “men and/or women”.

**DISCUSSION**

**Implications from this Research for Women Developing a Leader Identity**

**Purpose**

In three of the six papers with women as the protagonist there was a theme of purpose to the paper content and to the leadership. All three papers describe “actual events”. These papers continue to reinforce how important having a leadership purpose is for women (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2009). These papers give clear role models and some examples of ways that women lead. This also reiterates how developing a leader identity is tied to an individual's sense of purpose (Ely et al.,
and this in turn can mitigate identity conflict for women leaders between their role as a “leader” and a “woman” (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012).

**Think leader–think male in case papers**

“Management is a masculine area: a set of practices reflecting and reinforcing masculinist modes of being” (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993; Sinclair, 1995), “the model of a successful manager is a masculine one” (McGregor, 1967; Sinclair, 1995).

Seven case papers out of the 56 have a woman as a protagonist and 48 have a man as a protagonist. Fifty-five papers featured more than one male manager. In all of the papers there was a description of leadership as “masculine”, using language and words that described masculine or agentic stereotypes. Further to this, in their responses to the questionnaire both male and female respondents readily attributed masculine leadership qualities to the male protagonists, as well as some of the female protagonists, using terms such as masculine, successful, bold, aggressive, white western businessman, business-orientated, smart, driven, cunning, alpha male, ambitious, dominant.

This sends a clear message that leadership qualities are “male”. This continues to undermine the ability for men to see women in leadership roles and prevents their discussion and awareness of this topic. This further undermines business schools as places to “critically challenge” their (individuals, professional bodies and organisations) ways of working and thinking” (Marvin, Bryans, & Waring, 2004) about leadership (Call to Action, 2011). This continues to embed stereotypes of leadership and management as male.
Second-generation forms of gender bias in papers

More case papers featured women in secondary or marginalised roles than as a protagonist. Women were also more clearly described in these roles. Furthermore, the papers that featured women protagonists went on to describe “male leaders”. This implicitly indicates that women are not leaders. Within the environment of the business programme and the business school it could also continue to encourage female management students to take on “male stereotypes of leadership” (Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013; Catalyst, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Having female protagonists in papers featuring companies within the pink topic categories transmits an unconscious bias that these are the areas in which women work and implicitly that they do not work in other areas of business. As one questionnaire respondent said, “I did not know whether it was just a lack of female protagonists or whether it was a reflection of the topics that favoured the male gender.”

(In)visibility and lack of role models

With so few female protagonists and women across case papers, few female professors and a dominant male cohort, there are few leader role models for female business students. When I questioned Professor Christopher Bartlett from Harvard Business School about his writing three of the female protagonists papers he notified me in an email:

“...it was my choice to replace the male central characters in the originals [case papers] with female executives in the leading roles. My motivation for doing so was that I felt there still are insufficient examples of strong, senior-level women in our classroom materials who can become role models for the current generation of MBA students” (Bartlett, 2013).

The message women could take from the lack of role models in the papers they study is that they are in “the wrong place” (Karelaia, 2012). The lack of women in
case papers and female role models render women in business and leadership “invisible”. This covertly tells women that they are not in a position of power or “leader” here (Simpson & Lewis, 2005). It also perpetrates second-generation bias. The representation of women holding senior positions is critical for the development of a woman’s leader identity (Ibarra, 1999: Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2007; Karelia, 2012). As Ibarra et al., (2013) states:

> “Fewer female leaders mean fewer role models and can suggest to young would-be leaders that being a woman is a liability – thus discouraging them from viewing senior women as credible sources of advice and support.”

The lack of presence of women in leadership roles makes those who are leaders “visible” and thus may impact on a woman’s motivation to lead and potentially render them liable for criticism when they do lead. Male and female respondents to the questionnaire also failed to recognise the lack of female leaders; as one respondent stated: “No. In the case studies information is presented in a neutral and fact-based way”. This prevents learning for both men and women about the value of both women and men as leaders. With a call to action for more women in senior roles and on boards this prevents important learning on leadership into the 21st century (Wittenberg-Cox, 2010).

**Business schools, identity conflict and women**

Without clear role models, a male-dominated cohort and management theories in case papers reflecting male stereotypes, women students could experience identity conflict between their identity as “women” and as “leaders” (Karelia & Guillen 2012). This in turn could lead to negative consequences on women “seeing themselves” as able to lead and thus interfere with their sense of a possible leader self. This could undermine business schools and MBA courses as “safe” “identity workspaces”
(Petriglieri et al., 2010) for women who may want to practise with a new leader identity.

**Business schools, women and (in)visibility**

With gender and leadership only recently emerging as an agenda item in business schools, women in leadership here still remain invisible. With low numbers of female professors, case writers and case protagonists, this could lead women to assume stereotypical “male” leadership qualities in order to become “invisible” by conforming to the “norm”. This doesn’t allow for debate – an important role for a business school – or the rethinking of leadership in terms of acknowledging and valuing the roles of both women and men (Mavin et al., 2004). The level of under-representation of women, their invisibility in case papers and as role models, together with the high visibility of women as a minority group in business schools could lead to further identity conflict between their role as “woman” and “leader” (Kareliaia & Guillen, 2012). Finally, the heightened visibility of women as a minority in all areas within business schools makes them more vulnerable to heightened criticism, thus undermining their motivation to experiment with a leader identity. Furthermore, by overlooking issues of gender and leadership, business schools maintain women’s “visibility”, and so continue to collude with the status quo (Mavin et al., 2004).

**What surprised me?**

I anticipated that there would be a lack of female protagonists in the case papers. What continually surprised me was:

- the extent to which women were invisible in the papers;
- the extent of the think manager–think male dynamic in the vast majority of papers;
• the hostile reaction I received from the majority of male colleagues who responded to the questionnaire, ranging from disbelief and comments about my background to a total lack of awareness of the topic;
• incidents where the gender of a lead character had been changed but the associated descriptors had not been altered, leaving women portrayed as men;
• how the word “gender” in this context became synonymous with “women”.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is first of its kind to look in-depth at case papers used on business school programmes and inevitably it has its limitations. The questionnaire response rate was too low to be a valid sample. Also I did not have information on the cases that the respondents actually read. Future research in this area with MBA students and their attitudes to case papers and gender at business schools would further enhance knowledge in this area. This research focused on papers from the Case Centre over a five-year period. It would be interesting to cross-research this with case papers used on a MBA-specific programme. Future research looking at men’s responses, values, beliefs and awareness of women on business programs would also useful. Whilst I focused on women’s presence in case papers, I did not differentiate between women’s backgrounds, culture or diversity within this sub-group. Further research would be also interesting on women case writers and what inhibits them being recognised as lead writers. In-depth research on how business schools (teachers) choose case papers and how they use them on programmes would add to this debate.
IN CONCLUSION

This research makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of implicit and explicit messages about women in leadership in case papers transmitted to business students. My research suggests that immediate change is required for business school case papers to show women as protagonists (leaders). Existing case papers embed categories of leadership that have male attributes and hold both women and men in the fixed identity of the think leader—think male paradigm. They continue to promote male attributes of leadership as the “norm” for both women and men.

Responses to the questionnaire revealed that both men and women failed to recognise the lack of women protagonists in case studies. Men also attributed “masculine” characteristics to the female protagonists in the cases. Women are not written into case papers, while theories of management are based on masculine attributes, which reinforces bias and maintains women in a position that is “the other” (de Beauvoir, 1953), i.e., not the norm, to the “one” being that of the male (Irigaray, 2007). This research highlights that, in 2013, the overall environment for women at business schools is predominantly masculine (Sinclair, 1995): as well as being a minority group in a predominantly male cohort on MBA/EMBA programmes, women are under-represented on the faculty and there is a lack of female role models in case papers used on teaching programmes. Women are still “invisible” in the business school arena (Simpson & Lewis, 2007) and thus critical discussion and debate that are so important to the business school learning environment omits consideration of the value of both women’s and men’s leadership styles (Mavin et al., 2004). Added to this, women’s converse visibility as a minority group could undermine their own motivation to experiment with a new leader identity (Karelaia & Guillen, 2012). This continues consciously and unconsciously to support stereotypes and bias about how to lead. The impact of this for women developing or envisioning a
leadership identity must be confusing; it perpetrates first- and second-degree gender bias and could create identity conflict for women between their role as a “leader” and as a “woman”. Business schools need to oversee the totality of case papers used on business programmes and the gender message they are transmitting across their courses and institutions. If it is their genuine intention to help women “shatter the glass ceiling” and “build awareness of men to gender issues” (Call To Action Report 2011), then there is still much to do. From their leadership down, business schools need to analyse and understand the explicit and implicit messages about gender and leadership that all parts of their organisation and programmes send out to students and what role the institution plays in maintaining this status quo. These case papers do not show any of the changes requested in the joint Call to Action report (2011) of concerned business schools and the European Commission to break the glass ceiling; further, they do not prepare women and men for leadership in the 21st century (Sinclair, 1995; Wittenberg-Cox, 2010).
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### APPENDIX 1.1

#### THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Protagonist</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>No Clear Protagonist</th>
<th>KEY Lead Writer Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Secondary Writer Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Award Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106-016-1</td>
<td>INFINITY BANK (A): RETAIL BRANCHES AND CUSTOMER PROFITABILITY</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Igor Vaysman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stephen Smyth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finance, Accounting and Control</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-026-1</td>
<td>MAS HOLDINGS: STRATEGIC CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE APPAREL INDUSTRY</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jonathan Story</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noshua Watson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economics, Politics &amp; Business Environment</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-057-1</td>
<td>THE EVOLUTION OF THE CIRCUS INDUSTRY (A)</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professors W Chan Kim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renee Mauborgne, Ben Bensaou, Matt Williamson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305-308-1</td>
<td>ZARA: RESPONSIVE, HIGH SPEED, AFFORDABLE FASHION</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professor Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sophie Linguri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; General Management</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505-098-1</td>
<td>RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professor Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sophie Linguri &amp; Nader Tavassoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602-029-1</td>
<td>LUFTHANSA CARGO AG: CAPACITY RESERVATION AND DYNAMIC PRICING</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Arnd Huchzermeier,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R.Hellerman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>WHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-057-1</td>
<td>PROCTER &amp; GAMBLE PUR PURIFIER OF WATER (TM) (A): DEVELOPING THE PRODUCT AND TAKING IT TO MARKET</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professor Margaret Hanson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Karen Powell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethics &amp; Social Responsibility</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806-015-1</td>
<td>MARSTON VENTURE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>John Mullins, Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Julian Lloyd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905-033-1</td>
<td>INTERNET ENABLED COLLABORATIVE STORE ORDERING: VEROPOULOS SPAR RETAILER (A)</td>
<td>1 ✓ ✓</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Theodoros Evgeniou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Doukidis Katerina Pramatari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge, Information and Communication Systems Management</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The SYMONS TEST LEGEND**

1) It has to have 1 women in it (at least);
2) In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3) Who speaks to another women about the business

- MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES
- MEETS TWO OF THE RULES
- MEETS ONE OF THE RULES
- DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES

---
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### APPENDIX 1.2

THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Award Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>409-008-1</td>
<td>LEADING ACROSS CULTURES AT MICHELIN (A)</td>
<td>Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503-082-1</td>
<td>FORD KA: THE MARKET RESEARCH PROBLEM (A)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>INSEAD &amp; Singapore Management University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602-057-1</td>
<td>OCADO: AN ALTERNATIVE WAY TO BRIDGE THE LAST MILE IN GROCERY HOME DELIVERY?</td>
<td>Production &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>Michigan State University &amp; London Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807-055-1</td>
<td>THE Grameen Bank: CREDIT AS A HUMAN RIGHT</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>AESE Escola de Direccao e Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708-041-1</td>
<td>INNOCENT DRINKS: VALUES AND VALUE</td>
<td>Ethics and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Cranfield School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-1-0276</td>
<td>DEAL MAKING IN TROUBLED WATERS: THE ABN AMRO TAKEOVER</td>
<td>Finance, Accounting &amp; Control</td>
<td>IMD International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-3-1334</td>
<td>NESTLE'S GLOBE PROGRAM (A): THE EARLY MONTHS</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; General Management Category Winner</td>
<td>IMD International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505-098-1</td>
<td>RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND</td>
<td>Overall Winner</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SYMONS TEST LEGEND

1) It has to have 1 women in it (at least);
2) In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3) Who speaks to another women about the business

😊 MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES
😊 MEETS TWO OF THE RULES
😊 MEETS ONE OF THE RULES
😊 DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES
### APPENDIX 1.3

#### THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Protagonist</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>No Clear</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Lead Writer Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Secondary Writer Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Award Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408-083-1</td>
<td>RICHARD MURPHY AND THE BISCUIT COMPANY (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Jarrett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kyle Ingram</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909-018-1</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES AT IBM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Vivek Gupta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indu Perepu, Sachin Govina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge, Information and Communication System Management</td>
<td>ICMR Centre for Management Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-710-467</td>
<td>APPLE INC IN 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David B Yoffie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renee Kim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall Winner</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-808-128</td>
<td>FACEBOOK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milojaj Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thomas R Eisenmann D Chen, B Feinstein, Aaron Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-906-414</td>
<td>IKEA'S GLOBAL SOURCING CHALLENGE; INDIAN RUGS AND CHILD LABOR (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher A Bartlett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V Dessain, Anders Sjorman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ethics and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-910-036</td>
<td>GOOGLE INC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Edelman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thomas R Eisenmann</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; General Management</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-910-410</td>
<td>PHILIPS VERSUS MATSUSHITA: THE COMPETITIVE BATTLE CONTINUES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher A Bartlett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A07-08-0008</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST AIRLINES 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew C Inkpen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Valerie Degroot, Wes Edens, Jairaj Mashru, Arturo Wagner, Chee Wee Tan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finance, Accounting &amp; Control</td>
<td>Thunderbird School of Global Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-5-0702</td>
<td>XIAMETER: THE PAST AND FUTURE OF A 'DISRUPTIVE INNOVATION'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamran Kashani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inna Francis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>IMD Lausanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-6-0315</td>
<td>LEGO: CONSOLIDATING DISTRIBUTION (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Cordon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ralf W Seifert, Edwin Wellian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Production &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>IMD Lausanne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The SYMONS TEST LEGEND

1) It has to have 1 women in it (at least);
2) In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3) Who speaks to another women about the business

- MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES
- MEETS TWO OF THE RULES
- MEETS ONE OF THE RULES
- DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES
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## THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Protagonist</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>Lead Writer Name</th>
<th>Secondary Writer Name</th>
<th>Award Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4269</td>
<td>UNITED CEREAL: LORA BRILL’S EUROBRAND CHALLENGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Christopher A Bartlett 1</td>
<td>Carole Carlson 1</td>
<td>Economics, Politics &amp; Business Environment</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109-029-1</td>
<td>MELTDOWN IN ICELAND: BIGGEST CASUALTY OF THE 2008 GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vandana Guttal 1</td>
<td>Seshagiri Rao Chaganty</td>
<td>Finance, Accounting and Control</td>
<td>IBS Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-138-1</td>
<td>A GRAND ENTRANCE? LI NING’S EMERGENCE AS A GLOBAL, CHINESE BRAND</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes Meuer 1</td>
<td>Barbara Krug, Lori DiVito, Tao Yue. 3</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; General Management</td>
<td>RSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-029-1</td>
<td>SONY CORPORATION: FUTURE TENSE?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indu Perepu 1</td>
<td>Vivek Gupta 1</td>
<td>Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour</td>
<td>ICMR Centre for Management Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510-077-1</td>
<td>RENOVA TOILET PAPER: AVANT-GARDE MARKETING IN A COMMODITIZED CATEGORY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yakov Bart 1</td>
<td>Pierre Chandon, Steven Sweldens, Raquel Seabra de Souza 1</td>
<td>Overall winner</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709-018-1</td>
<td>MARKS &amp; SPENCER: THE BUSINESS CASE FOR PLAN A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heiko Spitzeck 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics &amp; Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Cranfield School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908-024-1</td>
<td>OFFSHORING AND INNOVATION AT GLOBALCO: NEGOTIATING A WIN-WIN STRATEGY FOR THE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Barrett 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, Information &amp; Communication System Management</td>
<td>Cambridge Judge Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B10M067</td>
<td>LOUIS VUITTON IN JAPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justin Paul 1</td>
<td>Charlotte Fenouil 1</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS65</td>
<td>ZAPPOS.COM: DEVELOPING A SUPPLY CHAIN TO DELIVER WOW!</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Marks 1</td>
<td>Hau Lee, David Hoyt 2</td>
<td>Production &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>Stanford Graduate School of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The SYMONS TEST LEGEND

1) It has to have 1 women in it (at least);
2) In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3) Who speaks to another women about the business

- MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES
- MEETS TWO OF THE RULES
- MEETS ONE OF THE RULES
- DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES
## APPENDIX 1.5

### THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Lead Writer Name</th>
<th>Secondary Writer Name</th>
<th>Award Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>309-038-1</td>
<td>STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION AT APPLE INC</td>
<td>Professor Loizos Heracleous</td>
<td>Angeliki Papachroni</td>
<td>Overall Winner</td>
<td>Warwick Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-020-1</td>
<td>RYANAIR - THE LOW FARES AIRLINE: WHITHER NOW?</td>
<td>Eleanor O'Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy &amp; General Management Category Winner</td>
<td>UCD Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212</td>
<td>NEW HERITAGE DOLL COMPANY: CAPITAL BUDGETING</td>
<td>Professor Timothy</td>
<td>Heide Abelli</td>
<td>Finance, Accounting and Control</td>
<td>Harvard Business Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4357</td>
<td>LEVENDARY CAFE: THE CHINA CHALLENGE</td>
<td>Professor Christopher</td>
<td>Arar Han</td>
<td>Economics, Politics and Business</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510-015-1</td>
<td>FORD FIESTA MOVEMENT: USING SOCIAL MEDIA AND VIRAL MARKETING TO LAUNCH FORD’S GLOBAL CAR IN THE UNITED STATES</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Andrew T Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612-006-1</td>
<td>ZARA: STAYING FAST AND FRESH</td>
<td>Professor Filip Caro</td>
<td>Katherine Helfet, Paige Hosler</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>UCLA Anderson School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710-030-1</td>
<td>BLUE MONDAY</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor Henri-Claude de Bettignies</td>
<td>Charlotte Butler</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>China Europe International Business School and INSEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911-012-1</td>
<td>M-PESA (KENYA): MOBILE FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR THE FINANCIALLY EXCLUDED IN SOCIETY</td>
<td>Professor Tawfik Jelassi</td>
<td>Stephanie Ludwig</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>ENPC MBA Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-609-066</td>
<td>DESIGN THINKING AND INNOVATION AT APPLE</td>
<td>Professor Stefan Thomke</td>
<td>Barbara Feinberg</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>Harvard Business Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMT-409-0100-1</td>
<td>'DO YOU REALLY THINK WE ARE SO STUPID? A LETTER TO THE CEO OF DEUTSCHE TELEKOM (A)</td>
<td>Konstantin Konitsky</td>
<td>Urs Mueller &amp; Ulf Schaefer</td>
<td>Production and Operations Management</td>
<td>ESMT European School of Management and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SYMONS TEST LEGEND

1) It has to have 1 women in it (at least);
2) In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3) Who speaks to another women about the business

- MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES
- MEETS TWO OF THE RULES
- MEETS ONE OF THE RULES
- DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES
## APPENDIX 2

### THE CASE CENTRE BEST SELLING CASE PAPERS - 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year / Position</th>
<th>Case Paper No</th>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Protagonist</th>
<th>Lead Writer Name</th>
<th>Secondary Writer Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>505-098-1</td>
<td>RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND</td>
<td>Professor Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>Sophie Linguri &amp; Nader Tavassoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>9-502-030</td>
<td>AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER</td>
<td>Youngme Moon</td>
<td>Kerry Herman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>9-502-030</td>
<td>AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER</td>
<td>Youngme Moon</td>
<td>Kerry Herman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>505-098-1</td>
<td>RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND</td>
<td>Professor Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>Sophie Linguri &amp; Nader Tavassoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>603-002-1</td>
<td>ZARA</td>
<td>Professor Kasra Ferdows</td>
<td>Professor Jose AD Machuca &amp; Professor Michael Lewis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>510-077-1</td>
<td>RENOVA TOILET PAPER: AVANT-GARDE MARKETING IN A COMMODITIZED CATEGORY</td>
<td>Yakov Bart</td>
<td>Pierre Chandon, Steven Sweldens, Harriet Seabra de Souza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INSEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>603-002-1</td>
<td>ZARA</td>
<td>Professor Kasra Ferdows</td>
<td>Professor Jose AD Machuca &amp; Professor Michael Lewis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>399-038-1</td>
<td>STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION AT APPLE INC</td>
<td>Professor Loizos Heracleous</td>
<td>Angeliki Papachroni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warwick Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>505-098-1</td>
<td>RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND</td>
<td>Professor Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>Sophie Linguri &amp; Nader Tavassoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>9-502-030</td>
<td>AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER</td>
<td>Youngme Moon</td>
<td>Kerry Herman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Ever Selling Paper</td>
<td>IMD-3-0873</td>
<td>EASYJET THE WEB'S FAVOURITE AIRLINE</td>
<td>Nirmalya Kumar</td>
<td>Brian Rogers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IMD International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE SYMONS TEST LEGEND

1. It has to have 1 woman in it (at least);
2. In a leadership position (the protagonist role in this instance);
3. Who speaks to another women about the business;
4. MEETS ALL THREE OF THE RULES;
5. MEETS TWO OF THE RULES;
6. MEETS ONE OF THE RULES;
7. DOESN'T MEET ANY OF THE RULES.
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**APPENDIX 3**

Questionnaire for Research project
INSEAD EMCCC Wave 13 Fontainebleau

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>(optional)</th>
<th>Gender: M F (essential)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country currently living in:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When did you complete your degree? Please complete the appropriate box for your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business School Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous MBA (Year Completed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current MBA (date started)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous EMBA (Year Completed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current EMBA (date started)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other management course – please name course and year completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This questionnaire will be used as part of research for my thesis in the Executive Masters in Consulting and Coaching for Change Program wave 13. In the thesis I am exploring the topic of gender in the case papers presented as part of business education programs.

If you have given your name in the document it will not be divulged and your individual information will be kept private. The completed results will be presented in total as part of the thesis. I may however use some of your comments in the thesis. No names though will be divulged with these comments. Unless I hear from you I will assume that I have your permission to do this.

**If you require more space to answer the questions we have left a blank page at the back of the document.**

On completion please email your reply to lesley.symons@insead.edu. If you require a copy of the research please let me know when you email back your questionnaire. In advance I thank you for your valuable input to this project.

1) How many male and female students attended your course (approximately but as accurately as possible)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) How many male and female lecturers (professors) approximately did you have teaching throughout the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) What percentage of case papers (an approximation will be sufficient) did you read on the course that had a man as the protagonist (the lead character)? Please select the appropriate % range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-5%</th>
<th>5-10%</th>
<th>10-15%</th>
<th>15-25%</th>
<th>25-50%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>75-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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4) How would you describe him/them? Please list some adjectives:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5) What percentage of case papers (an approximation will be sufficient) did you read on the course that had a woman as the protagonist (the lead character)? Please select the appropriate % range:

0% □ 1-5% □ 5-10% □ 10-15% □ 15-25% □ 25-50% □ 50-75% □ 75-100% □

6) How would you describe her / them? Please list some adjectives:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7) Please rate how you viewed the representation of women across all the case papers? Please mark a point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Overrepresented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Could you recommend or describe what you would prefer (if anything) to see in case papers on the course

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9) Please describe your overall experience of gender on the course including participants, lecturers and course work?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10) How would you describe your business schools position on gender and work?

________________________________________________________________________
11) Do you think that gender balance across the course has had any impact on your learning?

Yes ☐  Maybe ☐  No ☐

Please explain / your comments

12) Has gender balance on your course had any impact (if any) on how you manage in the workplace? Please explain

Yes ☐  Maybe ☐  No ☐

Please explain / your comments

13) During the course did you recognise the lack of women protagonists (lead) in the case papers?

13a) No ☐  Go to 14a  13b) Yes ☐  Go to 14b

14a) Having had this topic now raised is there anything else you would like to say (if at all) about the gender balance of the protagonists (lead) in the case papers?

________________________________________________________________________________________

14b) Is there anything else you would like to share about what you noticed?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire

If you are interested in a copy of my findings please let me know when you email back this questionnaire

Lesley Symons INSEAD EMCC Wave 13
Questionnaire for Research project
INSEAD EMCCC Wave 13 Fontainebleau

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please add any extra comments here

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
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