

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

Thesis – Lesley Symons

Executive Masters in Consulting and Coaching for Change

INSEAD Fontainebleau Wave 13 Jan 2014

INDEX

ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	2
AIM OF THIS RESEARCH	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Identity, Leader Identity and Invisibility	4
RESEARCH SETTING	11
LEADERSHIP LEARNING AND BUSINESS SCHOOLS	13
RESEARCH	15
Prize-winning Case Papers	15
Methodology and the Research Process	16
The Research Begins	19
Phases 1–2: Data Familiarisation and Coding	20
Phases 3–4: Searching for Themes and Reviewing Themes	21
Student and Alumni Questionnaire.....	23
FINDINGS	25
Few Women in Papers	25
“Pink Topics”	26
Award-winning Case Paper Analysis	27
Cases Featuring Women.....	36
Women’s (In)Visibility Across All Papers	42
Male Protagonist Papers	43
Best-selling Case Papers	44
Questionnaire Analysis.....	48
DISCUSSION	54
Implications from this Research for Women Developing a Leader Identity	54
What surprised me?	58
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	59
IN CONCLUSION	60
SPECIAL THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	62
APPENDIX 1.1	63
APPENDIX 1.2	64
APPENDIX 1.3	65
APPENDIX 1.4	66
APPENDIX 1.5	67
APPENDIX 2	68
APPENDIX 3	69
REFERENCES	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

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

(Papadopoulos, 2006; Young-Eisendrath & Wiedemann, 1987; Jung, 2003). 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,

1989; Devos & Banaji, 2003). 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 &

Singh, 2001; Ely & Rhode, 2010; Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb 2013; Karellaia 2012; Schein, 2001).

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). Karellaia (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.

Karellaia 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 (Karellaia & Guillen, 2012). In these organisations women may often see an incongruity between their work and gender roles. Karellaia and Guillen (2012) also show a direct link between women’s under-representation and the level of their identity conflict (Karellaia & 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” (Karelaia 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

School name	Women faculty (%)	Women students (%)	Women on board (%)
Harvard Business School	24	40	49
Stanford Graduate School of Business	18	35	17
University of Pennsylvania: Wharton	22	42	11
London Business School	24	33	26
Columbia Business School	15	37	11
INSEAD	14	31	22
IESE Business School	21	20	27
Hong Kong UST Business School	22	35	23
MIT: Sloan	21	33	11
University of Chicago: Booth	16	35	13

Table 2: FT Global EMBA Rankings Top Ten Business Schools, 2013

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

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 a, 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 pass 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 were 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)

Award winning and best selling papers (The Case Centre 2009-13)								
	Total papers	Total different papers	Female protagonist papers	Male protagonist papers	Female written in papers	Female presence in papers	Male written in papers	Male presence in papers
Award winning	*50	*49	6	42	17	7	48	48
Best selling	**16	**7	1	6	4	1	7	7
Total	66	56	7	48	21	8	55	55
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

The Symons Test results overview					
	Meets all 3 of the rules 	Meets 2 of the rules 	Meets 1 of the rules 	Meets 0 of the rules 	Total cases
Total award winning cases 2009-13	2	4	7	36	49
Total best selling cases 2009-13	1	0	1	5	7
TOTALS	3	4	8	41	56

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 were 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**Overview of women in award winning cc case papers**

Year	Total papers	Protagonist papers					Organisational (no protagonist)	Present in other papers					Lead writers				
		F	M	Total	%F	%M		F	M	Total	%F	%M	F	M	Total	%F	%M
2009	10	1	9	10	10%	90%		2	10	12	17%	83%	1	9	10	10%	90%
2010	10	0	10	10	0%	100%		2	10	12	17%	83%	2	8	10	20%	80%
2011	10	1	9	10	10%	90%		1	10	11	9%	91%	0	10	10	0%	100%
2012	10	2	8	10	20%	80%		0	10	10	0%	100%	2	8	10	20%	80%
2013	10	2	7	9	20%	70%	1	2	9	11	18%	82%	1	9	10	10%	90%
Total	50	6	43	49	12%	88%	1	7	49	56	13%	87%	6	44	50	12%	88%

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 were 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

Year	Subject area/category award	Title	Author and year of publication	Business school
2009	Finance, Accounting & Control	Infinity Bank (A): Retail Branches and Customer Profitability	Vaysman, I. & Smyth, S. (2006)	INSEAD
2011	Ethics & Sustainability	IKEA’s Global Sourcing Challenge: Indian Rugs and Child Labor (A)	Bartlett, C.A., Dessain, V. & Sjoman, A. (2006)	Harvard Business School
2012	Marketing	United Cereal: Lora Brill’s Eurobrand Challenge	Bartlett, C.A. & Carlson, C. (2011)	Harvard Business School
2012	Marketing	Dove: Evolution of a Brand	Deighton, J. (2008)	Harvard Business School
2013	Finance, Accounting & Control	New Heritage Doll Company: Capital Budgeting	Luehrman, T. & Abelli, H. (2010)	Harvard Business School
2013	Economics, Politics & Business	Levendary Café: The China Challenge	Bartlett, C.A. & Han, A. (2013)	Harvard Business School

All six papers are written about real events. Three are Harvard “brief papers” (disguised but based on actual events) – Levendary Cafe, 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 Levendary 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.

- Levedary Café: The China Challenge

This paper was originally written with a male protagonist. Levedary 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... [Y]et perhaps even more powerful than his ongoing presence were his strongly held values and beliefs... [T]he 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 Leventary 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 ...[G]iven 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

Year	Subject area/Category award	Title	Author and year of publication	Business school
2009	Economics, Politics & Business Environment	MAS Holdings: Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility in the Apparel Industry	Story, J. & Watson, N. (2006)	INSEAD
2009	Human Resources/Organisational Behaviour	Expatriation: An American Working in Japan	Pudelko, M. (2005)	University of Edinburgh Business School
2009	Strategy & General Management	Zara: Responsive, High Speed, Affordable Fashion	Linguri, S. & Kumar, N. (2005)	London Business School
2009	Overall	The Evolution of the Circus Industry (A)	Kim, W.C., Williamson, M., Mauborgne, R. & Bensaou, B.M. (2002)	INSEAD
2009	Marketing	Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand	Kumar, N., Linguri S. & Tavassoli N. (2005)	London Business School
2009	Ethics & Social Responsibility	Procter & Gamble PuR Purifier of Water TM (A): Developing the Product and Taking it to Market	Hanson, M. & Powell, K. (2006)	INSEAD
2010	Production & Operations Management	Ocado: An Alternative Way to Bridge the Last Mile in Grocer Home Delivery	Boyer, K. & Frohlick, M. (2002)	Broad College of Business, Michigan State University & London Business School
2010	Entrepreneurship	The Grameen Bank: Credit as a Human Right	Monteiro, E. V. & Dias, A. J. & (2007)	AESE Escola de Direcção e Negócios
2010	Overall	Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand	Kumar, N., Linguri S. & Tavassoli N. (2005)	London Business School
2011	Marketing	Xiameter: The Past and Future of a “Disruptive Innovation”	Kashani, K. & Francis, I. (2006)	IMD
2011	Human Resources & Organisational Behaviour	Richard Murphy and the Biscuit Company (A)	Jarrett, M. & Ingram, K. (2008)	London Business School
2011	Finance, Accounting & Control	Southwest Airlines 2008	Inkpen, A.C., Degroot, V., Edens, W., Mashru, J., Wagner, A. & Tan, C.W. (2008)	Thunderbird School of Global Management

Year	Subject area/Category award	Title	Author and year of publication	Business school
2012	Entrepreneurship	Louis Vuitton in Japan	Paul, J. & Feroul, C. (2010)	Richard Ivey School of Business, The University of Western Ontario
2012	Ethics & Social Responsibility	Marks & Spencer: The Business Case for Plan (A)	Spitzeck, H. (2009)	Cranfield University School of Management
2012	Ethics & Social Responsibility	Blue Monday	De Bettignies, H.C. & Butler, C. (2009)	CEIBS (China Europe International Business School) & INSEAD
2013	Knowledge & Information Communication Systems Management	M-PESA (Kenya): Mobile Financial Services for the Financially Excluded in Society	Jelassi, T. & Ludwig, S. (2011)	ENPC School of International Management, Paris
2013	Marketing	Ford Fiesta Movement: Using Social Media and Viral Marketing to Launch Ford's Global Car in the United	Stephen, A.T. (2010)	INSEAD

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
(4)

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-intensive 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 8: Roles and titles of women written in and present in case papers

Role/title	Number
CEO	3
European Vice-President	1
COO	1
Senior Operations Manager	1
Vice-President Production	1
Director of Special Events	1
Marketing head/leader/director	6

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

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

Year	Title	Author(s)	Business school
2009			
1 st	Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing Strategies for Low-Income Consumers	Chandon & Guimares, 2003	INSEAD
2 nd	Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand	Kumar, Linguri & Tavassoli, 2005	London
3rd	Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower	Moon & Herman, 2002	Harvard
2010			
1 st	Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing Strategies for Low-Income Consumers	Chandon & Guimares, 2003	INSEAD
2 nd	Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower	Moon & Herman, 2002	Harvard
3rd	Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand	Kumar, Linguri & Tavassoli, 2005	London
2011			
1st	Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing Strategies for Low-Income Consumers	Chandon & Guimares, 2003	INSEAD
2nd	Zara	Ferdows, Machuca & Lewis, 2002	Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick.
3rd	Renova Toilet Paper: Avant-Garde Marketing in a Commoditized Category	De Souza, Bart, Chandon, & Sweldens, 2010	INSEAD
2012			
1st	Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing Strategies for Low-Income Consumers	Chandon & Guimares, 2003	INSEAD
2nd	Zara	Ferdows, Machuca & Lewis, 2002	Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick.
3rd	Strategic Leadership And Innovation at Apple Inc.	Heracleous & Papachroni, 2012	Warwick
2013			
1 st	Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing Strategies for Low-Income Consumers	Chandon & Guimares, 2003	INSEAD
2 nd	Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand	Kumar, Linguri & Tavassoli, 2005	London
3rd	Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a Better Shower	Moon & Herman, 2002	Harvard
Overall best-selling case (Classic Case Collection)	easyJet – the Web’s Favourite Airline	Kumar & Rogers, 2002	IMD

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, J.L. 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.,

2011) 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” (Karellaia, 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; Karelaia, 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” (Karelaia & 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 “invisibility”, 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 be 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).

SPECIAL THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank several people who played a large role in assisting me with this research. First, my tutor and supervisor Elizabeth Florent-Tracey, for being with me and encouraging me during the early and middle part of this research. A special mention must go to the Case Centre for its generosity in allowing me to access all the researched papers and to Vicky Lester for her continued support with this. I owe a deep sense of gratitude to Avivah Wittenberg-Cox for her enthusiasm for this topic and for guiding me to the Bechdel Test. I also thank the friends and fellow colleagues who listened to me the numerous times I was “stuck”, in particular Heather Katz, Laurence Barratt, Nursel Aydintug and Suzanne Mulvihill, who assisted from the beginning to nearly the end in putting this document together and to Michelle Wutzke who was there at the end; Mark Steinkamp, Nursel Aydintug, Heather Katz and Sally Simmons, who all offered constructive feedback on the drafts; Herminia Ibarra, whose initial discursion pushed me onwards and whose subsequent support and enthusiasm, including pointing me to the OPED site and reading a draft, gave me the energy to continue; my clients, who have been so patient with me through this process; Roger Lehman and Eric van de Loo, without whom this project would not have happened; and finally my father John and son Charlie, who in their own way have supported me on this journey.

APPENDIX 1.1

THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS -2009

Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present		No Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	Gender		Secondary Writer Name	Gender		Award Category	University
		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
2009		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
106-016-1	INFINITY BANK (A): RETAIL BRANCHES AND CUSTOMER PROFITABILITY	1		✓	✓		☹️	Igor Vaysman		1	Stephen Smyth		1	Finance, Accounting and Control	INSEAD
206-026-1	MAS HOLDINGS: STRATEGIC CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE APPAREL INDUSTRY		1	✓	✓		☹️	Jonathan Story		1	Noshua Watson		1	Economics, Politics & Business Environment	INSEAD
302-057-1	THE EVOLUTION OF THE CIRCUS INDUSTRY (A)		1		✓	✓	☹️	Professors W Chan Kim		1	Renee Mauborgne, Ben Bensaou, Matt Williamson		1 2	Overall Winner	INSEAD
305-308-1	ZARA: RESPONSIVE, HIGH SPEED, AFFORDABLE FASHION		1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar		1	Sophie Linguri		1	Strategy & General Management	London Business School
405-027-1	EXPATRIATION: AN AMERICAN WORKING IN JAPAN: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE EXPATRIATE, HEADQUARTERS AND THE FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY		1	✓	✓		☹️	Dr Markus Pudelko		1				Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour	University of Edinburgh
505-098-1	RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND		1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar		1	Sophie Linguri & Nader Tavassoli		1 1	Marketing	London Business School
602-029-1	LUFTHANSA CARGO AG: CAPACITY RESERVATION AND DYNAMIC PRICING		1		✓		☹️	Arnd Huchzermeier,		1	R.Hellerman		1	Production and Operations Management	WHU
706-057-1	PROCTER & GAMBLE PUR PURIFIER OF WATER (TM) (A): DEVELOPING THE PRODUCT AND TAKING IT TO MARKET		1		✓		☹️	Professor Margaret Hanson	1		Karen Powell		1	Ethics & Social Responsibility	INSEAD
806-015-1	MARSTON VENTURE MANAGEMENT		1		✓		☹️	John Mullins, Associate Professor		1	Julian Lloyd		1	Entrepreneurship	London Business School
905-033-1	INTERNET ENABLED COLLABORATIVE STORE ORDERING: VEROPOULOS SPAR RETAILER (A)		1		✓		☹️	Theodoros Evgeniou		1	George Doukidis Katerina Pramatari		1 1	Knowledge, Information and Communication Systems Management	INSEAD
10		1	9	3	10				1	9			6	7	

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 1.2

THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2010

Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present		Not Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	Gender		Secondary Writer Name	Gender		Award Category	University	
		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M			
2010		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M			
409-008-1	LEADING ACROSS CULTURES AT MICHELIN (A)		1		✓		☹️	Erin Meyer, Adjunct Professor	1		Sapna Gupta (Case Writer)	1		Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour	INSEAD	
503-082-1	FORD KA: THE MARKET RESEARCH PROBLEM (A)		1		✓		☹️	Markus Christen	1		David Soberman, Seh-Woong Chung, G Cothier	1	2	Marketing	INSEAD & Singapore Management University	
602-057-1	OCADO: AN ALTERNATIVE WAY TO BRIDGE THE LAST MILE IN GROCERY HOME DELIVERY?		1	✓	✓		☹️	Dr Ken K Boyer	1		Dr Mark Frohlick		1	Production & Operations Management	Michigan State University & London Business School	
807-055-1	THE GRAMEEN BANK: CREDIT AS A HUMAN RIGHT		1	✓	✓		☹️	Professor Eugenio Viassa Monteiro	1		Ana Janeiro Dias		1	Entrepreneurship	AESE Escola de Direccao e Negocios	
708-041-1	INNOCENT DRINKS: VALUES AND VALUE		1		✓		☹️	Robert Brown	1		Professor David Grayson		1	Ethics and Social Responsibility	Cranfield School of Management	
IMD-1-0276	DEAL MAKING IN TROUBLED WATERS: THE ABN AMRO TAKEOVER		1		✓	✓	☹️	Professor Didier Cossin	1		Luc Keuleneer		1	Finance, Accounting & Control	IMD International	
IMD-2-0083	TRANSFORMING THE GLOBAL FISHING INDUSTRY: THE MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL AT FULL SAIL?		1		✓		☹️	Professor Ulrich Steger	1		Aileen Ionescu-Somers Alexander Nick, Oliver Salzmann,		1	2	Economics, Politics & Business Environment	IMD International
IMD-3-1334	NESTLE'S GLOBE PROGRAM (A): THE EARLY MONTHS		1		✓		☹️	Professor Peter Killing		1				Strategy & General Management Category Winner	IMD International	
SI-0167-E	APPLE'S iPHONE: CALLING EUROPE OR EUROPE CALLING?		1		✓		☹️	Professor Sandra Sieber	1		Josep Valor, Jordan Mitchell		2	Knowledge, Information Communication Systems Management	IESE Business School	
505-098-1	RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND		1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar	1		Sophie Linguri & Nader Tavassoli	1	1	Overall Winner	London Business School	
10		0	10	2	10				2	8		5	10			

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

Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present		No Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	Gender		Secondary Writer Name	Gender		Award Category	University
		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
2011		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
408-083-1	RICHARD MURPHY AND THE BISCUIT COMPANY (A)	1		✓			☹️	Michael Jarrett	1		Kyle Ingram	1		Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour	London Business School
909-018-1	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES AT IBM	1		✓			☹️	Professor Vivek Gupta	1		Indu Perepu , Sachin Govina	1	1	Knowledge, Information and Communication System Management	ICMR Centre for Management Research
9-710-467	APPLE INC IN 2010	1		✓			☹️	David B Yoffie	1		Renee Kim	1		Overall Winner	Harvard Business School
9-808-128	FACEBOOK	1		✓			☹️	Milolaj Jan Piskorski	1		Thomas R Eisenmann D Chen, B Feinstein, Aaron Smith	4		Entrepreneurship	Harvard Business School
9-906-414	IKEA'S GLOBAL SOURCING CHALLENGE: INDIAN RUGS AND CHILD LABOR (A)	1		✓			☹️	Christopher A Bartlett	1		V Dessain, Anders Sjoman	2		Ethics and Social Responsibility	Harvard Business School
9-910-036	GOOGLE INC	1		✓	✓		☹️	Benjamin Edelman	1		Thomas R Eisenmann	1		Strategy & General Management	Harvard Business School
9-910-410	PHILIPS VERSUS MATSUSHITA: THE COMPETITIVE BATTLE CONTINUES	1		✓			☹️	Christopher A Bartlett	1					Economics, Politics and Business Environment	Harvard Business School
A07-08-0008	SOUTHWEST AIRLINES 2008	1		✓			☹️	Andrew C Inkpen	1		Valerie Degroot, Wes Edens, Jairaj Mashru, Arturo Wagner, Chee Wee Tan	1	4	Finance, Accounting & Control	Thunderbird School of Global Management
IMD-5-0702	XIAMETER: THE PAST AND FUTURE OF A 'DISRUPTIVE INNOVATION'	1		✓	✓		☹️	Kamran Kashani	1		Inna Francis	1		Marketing	IMD Lausanne
IMD-6-0315	LEGO: CONSOLIDATING DISTRIBUTION (A)	1		✓			☹️	Carlos Cordon	1		Ralf W Seifert Edwin Wellian	2		Production & Operations Management	IMD Lausanne
10		1	9	1	10	0			0	10		4	15		

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 1.4

THE CASE CENTRE AWARD WINNING CASE PAPERS - 2012

Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present	Not Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	GENDER		Secondary Writer Name	GENDER		Award Category	University
		F	M					F	M		F	M		
2012		F	M	F	M			F	M		F	M		
4269	UNITED CEREAL: LORA BRILL'S EUROBRAND CHALLENGE	1			✓	☺	Christopher A Bartlett		1	Carole Carlson	1		Economics, Politics & Business Environment	Harvard Business School
109-029-1	MELTDOWN IN ICELAND: BIGGEST CASUALTY OF THE 2008 GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS		1		✓	☹	Vandana Guttal	1		Seshagiri Rao Chaganty		1	Finance, Accounting and Control	IBS Research Center
310-138-1	A GRAND ENTRANCE? LI NING'S EMERGENCE AS A GLOBAL, CHINESE BRAND		1		✓	☹	Johannes Meuer	1		Barbara Krug, Lori DiVito, Tao Yue,		3	Strategy & General Management	RSM
410-029-1	SONY CORPORATION: FUTURE TENSE?		1		✓	☹	Indu Perepu	1		Vivek Gupta		1	Human Resource Management / Organisational Behaviour	ICMR Centre for Manament Research
510-077-1	RENOVA TOILET PAPER: AVANT-GARDE MARKETING IN A COMMODITIZED CATEGORY		1		✓	☹	Yakov Bart		1	Pierre Chandon, Steven Sweldens, Raquel Seabra de Souza		1 2	Overall winner	INSEAD
709-018-1	MARKS & SPENCER: THE BUSINESS CASE FOR PLAN A		1		✓	☹	Heiko Spitzack		1				Ethics & Social Responsibility	Cranfield School of Management
908-024-1	OFFSHORING AND INNOVATION AT GLOBALCO: NEGOTIATING A WIN-WIN STRATEGY FOR THE OUTSOURCING RELATIONSHIP		1		✓	☹	Michael Barrett		1				Knowledge, Information & Communication System Management	Cambridge Judge Business School
9-508-047	DOVE: EVOLUTION OF A BRAND	1		✓	✓	☺	John Deighton		1				Marketing	Harvard Business Publishing
9B10M067	LOUIS VUITTON IN JAPAN		1		✓	☹	Justin Paul		1	Charlotte Feroul		1	Entrepreneurship	University of Western Ontario
GS65	ZAPPOS.COM: DEVELOPING A SUPPLY CHAIN TO DELIVER WOW!		1		✓	☹	Michael Marks		1	Hau Lee, David Hoyt		2	Production & Operations Management	Stanford Graduate School of Business
10		2	8	1	10	0			2	8		6	6	

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

Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present		No Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	Gender		Secondary Writer Name	Gender		Award Category	University
		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
2013		F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M		
309-038-1	STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION AT APPLE INC		1		✓		☹️	Professor Loizos Heracleous	1		Angeliki Papachroni	1		Overall Winner	Warwick Business School
311-020-1	RYANAIR - THE LOW FARES AIRLINE: WHITHER NOW?		1		✓		☹️	Eleanor O'Higgins	1					Strategy & General Management Category Winner	UCD Dublin
4212	NEW HERITAGE DOLL COMPANY: CAPITAL BUDGETING	1		✓			☺️	Professor Timonthy	1		Heide Abelli	1		Finance, Accounting and Control	Harvard Business Publishing
4357	LEVENDARY CAFE: THE CHINA CHALLENGE	1			✓		☺️	Professor Christopher	1		Arar Han		1	Economics, Politics and Business	Harvard Business School
510-015-1	FORD FIESTA MOVEMENT: USING SOCIAL MEDIA AND VIRAL MARKETING TO LAUNCH FORD'S GLOBAL CAR IN THE UNITED STATES			✓	✓	1	☹️	Assistant Professor Andrew T Stephen	1					Marketing	INSEAD
612-006-1	ZARA: STAYING FAST AND FRESH		1		✓		☹️	Professor Filipe Caro	1		Katherine Helfet, Paige Hosler		2	Production and Operations Management	UCLA Anderson School of management
710-030-1	BLUE MONDAY		1	✓	✓		☹️	Distinguished Professor Henri-Claude de Bettignies	1		Charlotte Butler	1		Production and Operations Management	China Europe International Business School and INSEAD
911-012-1	M-PESA (KENYA): MOBILE FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR THE FINANCIALLY EXCLUDED IN SOCIETY		1		✓		☹️	Tawfik Jelassi Professor	1		Stephanie Ludwig	1		Production and Operations Management	ENPC MBA Paris
9-609-066	DESIGN THINKING AND INNOVATION AT APPLE		1		✓		☹️	Professor Stefan Thomke	1		Barbara Feinberg	1		Production and Operations Management	Harvard Business Publishing
ESMT-409-0100-1	'DO YOU REALLY THINK WE ARE SO STUPID?' A LETTER TO THE CEO OF DEUTSCHE TELEKOM (A)		1		✓		☹️	Konstantin Korotov	1		Urs Mueller & Ulf Schaefer		2	Production and Operations Management	ESMT European School of Management and Technology
10		2	7	3	9	1			1	9		7	3		

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
☹️	DOESNT MEET ANY OF THE RULES

APPENDIX 2

THE CASE CENTRE BEST SELLING CASE PAPERS - 2009-2013

Year / Position	Case Paper No	Paper Title	Protagonist		Present		No Clear Protagonist	KEY	Lead Writer Name	Gender		Secondary Writer Name	Gender		University
			F	M	F	M				F	M		F	M	
2009															
1st	504-009-1	UNILEVER IN BRAZIL (1997-2007): MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS	1	✓	✓		☹️	Pierre Chandon	1		Pedro Pacheco Guimaraes	1		1	INSEAD
2nd	505-098-1	RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND	1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar	1		Sophie Linguri & Nader Tavassoli	1	1	1	London Business School
3rd	9-502-030	AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER	1		✓		☹️	Youngme Moon	1		Kerry Herman	1		1	Harvard Business School
2010															
1st	504-009-1	UNILEVER IN BRAZIL (1997-2007): MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS	1	✓	✓		☹️	Pierre Chandon	1		Pedro Pacheco Guimaraes	1		1	INSEAD
2nd	9-502-030	AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER	1		✓		☹️	Youngme Moon	1		Kerry Herman	1		1	Harvard Business School
3rd	505-098-1	RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND	1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar	1		Sophie Linguri & Nader Tavassoli	1	1	1	London Business School
2011															
1st	504-009-1	UNILEVER IN BRAZIL (1997-2007): MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS	1	✓	✓		☹️	Pierre Chandon	1		Pedro Pacheco Guimaraes	1		1	INSEAD
2nd	603-002-1	ZARA	1		✓	✓	😊	Professor Kasra Ferdows	1		Professor Jose AD Machuca & Professor Michael Lewis	2		2	Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick
3rd	510-077-1	RENOVA TOILET PAPER: AVANT-GARDE MARKETING IN A COMMUNITIZED CATEGORY	1		✓		☹️	Yakov Bart	1		Pierre Chandon, Steven Sweldens, Raquel Seabra de Souza	1	2	2	INSEAD
2012															
1st	504-009-1	UNILEVER IN BRAZIL (1997-2007): MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS	1	✓	✓		☹️	Pierre Chandon	1		Pedro Pacheco Guimaraes	1		1	INSEAD
2nd	603-002-1	ZARA	1		✓	✓	😊	Professor Kasra Ferdows	1		Professor Jose AD Machuca & Professor Michael Lewis	2		2	Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick
3rd	309-038-1	STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION AT APPLE INC	1		✓		☹️	Professor Loizos Heracleous	1		Angeliki Papachroni	1		1	Warwick Business School
2013															
1st	504-009-1	UNILEVER IN BRAZIL (1997-2007): MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS	1	✓	✓		☹️	Pierre Chandon	1		Pedro Pacheco Guimaraes	1		1	INSEAD
2nd	505-098-1	RED BULL: THE ANTI-BRAND BRAND	1		✓		☹️	Professor Nirmalya Kumar	1		Sophie Linguri & Nader Tavassoli	1	1	1	London Business School
3rd	9-502-030	AQUALISA QUARTZ: SIMPLY A BETTER SHOWER	1		✓		☹️	Youngme Moon	1		Kerry Herman	1		1	Harvard Business School
15			2	13	7	15	0		3	12		8	14		
Best Ever Selling Paper															
	IMD-3-0873	EASYJET THE WEB'S FAVOURITE AIRLINE *	1		✓		☹️	Nirmalya Kumar	1		Brian Rogers	1		1	IMD International
* This case was the overall winner of the 2002 European Case Awards, granted by ECCH in association with Business Week. This case also won the 2001 European Case Award in the category of Policy & General Management, granted by ECCH in association with Business Week.															

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 3

Questionnaire for Research project
INSEAD EMCCC Wave 13 Fontainebleau

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____ (optional)	Gender: M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> (essential)
Nationality: _____	Country currently living in: _____
When did you complete your degree? Please complete the appropriate box for your answer	
Business School Name _____	
Previous MBA (Year Completed) _____	Current MBA (date started) _____
Previous EMBA (Year Completed) _____	Current EMBA (date started) _____
Other management course – please name course and year completed. _____	

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)?

Male _____ Female _____

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

Male _____ Female _____

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

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

QUESTIONNAIRE

- 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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Underrepresented			Balanced			Overrepresented

- 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?

QUESTIONNAIRE

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

REFERENCES

- Agnoletto, A. (2013). *Voices of women: leadership identity in the coaching practice - EMCCC Thesis INSEAD Fontainebleau.*
- Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill acquisition: compilation of weak-method problem solutions. *Psychological Review*, 94, 192–2.
- Ashforth, B. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20–39.
- Avilio, B. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership-theory building. *American Psychologist* 62, 25–33.
- Barsh, J., Cranston, S., Lewis, G. (2009). *How remarkable women lead: the breakthrough model for work and life* (Kindle Location 397 – 22nd September). Crown Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.
- Bart, Y., Chandon, P. & Sweldens, S, R. S De Souza. (2010). *Renova Toilet Paper: Avant-garde Marketing in a Commoditized Category* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Bartlett, C. A. (2009). *Philips versus Matsushita: The Competitive Battle Continues* – Harvard Business School.
- Bartlett, C. A. (2013). Email to Lesley Symons retrieved on 4/11/2013.
- Bartlett, C. A. & Carlson, C. (2011). *United Cereal: Lora Brill's Eurobrand Challenge* – Harvard Business School.
- Bartlett, C. A., Dessain, V. & Sjoman, A. (2006). *IKEA's Global Sourcing Challenge: Indian Rugs and Child Labor (A)* – Harvard Business School.
- Bartlett, C. A. & Han, A. (2013). *Levendary Cafe: The China Challenge* – Harvard Business School.

- Bartram, S. (2005). What is wrong with current approaches to management development in relation to women in management roles? *Women in Management Review* Vol 20, No 2, 2005, 107–116.
- Bechdel Test. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.bechdeltest.com>
- Bell, M. P., Connerley, M. L. & Cocchiara, F. K. (2009). The Case for Mandatory Diversity Education *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 597–609.
- Biernat, M. & Fuegen, K. (2001). Shifting standards and the evaluation of competence: complexity in gender-based judgment and decision making. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57,707–724.
- Boyer, K. & Frohlick, M. (2002). *Ocado: An Alternative Way to Bridge the Last Mile in Grocer Home Delivery* – Broad College of Business, Michigan State University & London Business School.
- Braun V, & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, 77–101. Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Brennan, R. & Ahmad, S. J. (2005). Using case studies in management: the student perspective –*International Journal of Management Education*.
- Call to Action Report* (2011) retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/redoing/pdf/call_board_en.pdf.
- Cames, I., Vinnicombe, S. & Singh, V. (2001). Profiles of “successful managers” held by male and female banking managers across Europe. *Women in Management Review*, 16(3) 108–117.
- Caro, F. (2011). *Zara: Staying Fast and Fresh* – UCLA Anderson School of Management.

- Catalyst (2007). 2007 Catalyst Census: Fortune 500 Report Research Project
retrieved from <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/2007-catalyst-census-fortune-500>
- Catalyst (2013). *Pipeline report*. Retrieved from
<http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/high-potentials-pipeline-leaders-pay-it-forward>
- Catalyst-a (2013). *Women in the workplace report*. Retrieved from
<http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/statistical-overview-women-workplace>
- Catalyst-b (2013). *Quick take: buying power report*. Retrieved from
<http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/buying-power>
- Chandon, P. & Pacheco Guimaraes, P. (1997–2007). *Unilever in Brazil (1997–2007): Marketing strategies for low-income consumers* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Christensen, C. R. & Hansen, A. J. (1987). *Teaching and the case method*, Harvard Business School, Boston, Morgan Aldrich.
- Cole, P. (1998). “*It does not figure in the plans*”, “*The vice chancellor signed up to Opportunity 2000 but what effect did this have on the business studies department?*” Working paper, University of Cardiff –Employment Research Unit Conference, 17-18 September.
- Crisp, R. (2010). Prejudice and perceiving multiple identities. In J. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. (pp. 508–526). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Day, D. V. & Harrison, M. M. (2007). A multilevel, identity-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(4), 360–373.

- de Beauvoir, S. (1952) (reprinted 1989). *The second sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. Vintage Books (Random House). ISBN 0-679-72451-6.
- De Bettignies, H. & Butler, C. (2009). *Blue Monday* – CEIBS (China Europe International Business School) and INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Deighton, J. (2008). *Dove: Evolution of a Brand* – Harvard Business School.
- DeRue, D. S. & Ashford, S. (2010a). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 627–647.
- Devos, T. & Banaji M. R. (2003). Implicit self and identity. In Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J, P. 2003 *The handbook of self and identity* pp. 153–175. Guildford Press.
- Eagly, A. H. & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(9), 63–71.
- Eagly, A. H. & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233–256.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J. & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 125–145.
- Eccles, R. G., Nohria, N. & Berkley, J. D. (1992). *Beyond the hype: rediscovering the essence of management*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ellet, W. (2007) *The case study handbook*, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA.
- Ely, R, J (2005). The Power In Demography: Women's Social Constructions Of Gender Identity At Work. *The Academy of Management Journal* 1995 vol. 38 no. 3 589-634
- Ely, R. J., Rhode, D. L., (2010). Women and Leadership: Defining the Challenges in N. Nohria & K. Khurana, *Handbook of leadership*

- theory and practice* (Kindle Location 1177). Kindle Edition. Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H. & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy Of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 474-493.
- Ericsson, K. A. & Charness, N. (1994). Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 49, 725–747.
- Erikson, E.H. (1959). *Young man Luther: a study in psychoanalysis and history*, London, Faber.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: youth and crisis*, London, Faber.
- Feminist Frequency (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.feministfrequency.com/2009/12/the-bechdel-test-for-women-in-movies/>.
- Ferdows, K., Machuca, J. & Lewis, M. (2002) *Zara* - Georgetown University, Universidad de Sevilla, The University of Warwick.
- Financial Times Global MBA Rankings (2013). Retrieved from <http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2013>.
- Fitzgerald, N. (2011) Thomson Reuters cited in *Women and the new business leadership* – P. Thomson, & T. Lloyd (2011). Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.
- Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8, 1–33.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.

- Glaser, R. & Chi, M. T. H. (1988). Overview. In M. T. H. Chi, R. Glaser, and M. J. Farr (Eds.), *The nature of expertise* (pp. xv-xxviii). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gloeckler, G. (2008). The case against case studies. *BusinessWeek*, February 4, 2008, pp. 66–67.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging influences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.)*, pp. 115. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 0-7619-2757-3.
- Hanson, M. & Powell, K. (2006). *Procter & Gamble PuR Purifier of Water™ (A): Developing the Product and Taking it to Market* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Harvard Business School a (2013). *MBA academic experience*. Retrieved from <http://www.hbs.edu/mba/academic-experience/Pages/the-hbs-case-method.aspx>.
- Harvard Business School b (2013). Case Method *The HBS difference-learning in practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.hbs.edu/mba/the-hbs-difference/Pages/learning-in-practice.aspx>.
- Heracleous, L. & Papachroni, A. (2012). *Strategic Leadership and Innovation at Apple Inc.* – Warwick Business School.
- Hong Kong Business School (2013). *The business lab*. Retrieved from <http://www.mba.hku.hk/fulltime/academics/business-lab#sthash.yff8KaoS.dpuf>- 30/8/2013.
- Huchzermeier, A. & Hellerman, R. (2002). *Lufthansa Cargo AG: Capacity Reservation and Dynamic Pricing* – WHU, Otto Beisheim Graduate School of Management, Vallendar, Germany.

- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 764–791.
- Ibarra, H. (2003). *Working identity. Unconventional strategies for reinventing your career*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ibarra, H. (2007). Identity transitions: Possible selves, liminality and the dynamics of voluntary career changes. *INSEAD Working Paper 2007/31/OB*.
- Ibarra, H., Ely, R. & Kolb, D. (2013). Women rising: the unseen barriers. *Harvard Business Review* September 2013. Harvard Press.
- Ibarra, H. & Petriglieri, J. (2007). Impossible selves: image strategies and identity threat in professional women's career transitions INSEAD Working Paper.
- Ibarra, H., Snook, S. & Guillen Ramo, L. (2010). Identity-based leader development. In R. Khurana, & N. Noria (Eds.), *Leadership: Advancing an intellectual discipline*: 657–678. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- IMD a (2013). *MBA Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.imd.org/programs/mba/programstructure/index.cfm>.
- IMD b (2013). *Case papers*. Retrieved from <http://www.imd.org/research/publications/Case-Studies.cfm>
- Inkpen, A. C., Degroot, V., Edens, W., Mashru, J., Wagner, A. & Tan, C. W. (2008). *Southwest Airlines 2008* – Thunderbird School of Global Management.
- INSEAD a (2013). *MBA home page*. Retrieved from <http://mba.insead.edu/home/>.
- INSEAD b (2013). *Case method – learning tools webpage*. Retrieved from http://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/learning_tools/index.cfm.
- Irigaray, L. (2007). *Je, Tu, Nous*. Routledge Classics, Routledge NYNY.
- Jarrett, M. & Ingram, K. (2008). *Richard Murphy and the Biscuit Company (A)* – London Business School.

- Jelassi, T. & Ludwig, S. (2011). *M-PESA (Kenya): Mobile Financial Services for the Financially Excluded in Society* – ENPC School of International Management, Paris.
- Jennings, D. (1996) Strategic management and the case method. *Journal of Management Development*, 15(9) 4–12.
- Jung C. G. (2003). *Aspects of the feminine*. Routledge Classics, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN England.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic.
- Kantor, J. (2013). *Harvard Business School case study: gender equity* – The New York Times Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/08/education/harvard-case-study-gender-equity.html?>
- Karelaiia, N (2012) Identity challenges of women leaders: Antecedents and consequences of identity interference- *INSEAD EMCCC Thesis*
- Karelaiia, N. & Guillen, L. (2012). Me, a woman and a leader: antecedents and consequences of identity conflict for women leaders. *INSEAD Working Paper 2011*.
- Kashani, K. & Francis, I. (2006). *Xiameter: The past and future of a “disruptive innovation”* – IMD, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Kerfoot, D. & Knights, D. (1993). Management, masculinity and manipulation: From paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain. *Journal of Management Studies* 30(4), 659–678.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1974). In J. A. Smith, P. Flowers, M. Larkin, (2012) *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research* (Kindle Locations 4351-4352). SAGE Publications. Kindle Edition.

- Kim, C. & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481–498.
- Kim, W. C., Williamson, M., Mauborgne, R. & Bensaou, B. M. (2002). The Evolution of the Circus Industry (A) – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A. & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137, 616–642.
- Korotov, K., Muller, U. & Schafer, U. (2013). *Do you really think we are so stupid? A letter to the CEO of Deutsche Telekom (A)* – ESMT European School of Management and Technology, Berlin, Germany.
- Kumar, N. & Linguri, S. (2005). *Zara: Responsive, High Speed, Affordable Fashion* – London Business School.
- Kumar, N., Linguri S. & Tavassoli N. (2005). *Red Bull: The Anti-Brand Brand* – London Business School.
- Kumar, N. & Rogers, B. (2002). *easyJet the web's favourite airline* IMD, Lausanne Switzerland.
- Lester, V. (2013). Email to Lesley Symons retrieved on 28/10/2013.
- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 591–615.
- Luehrman, T. & Abelli, H. (2010). *New Heritage Doll Company: Capital Budgeting* – Harvard Business School.
- Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41 (9), 954–969.
- Mavin, S. & Bryans, P. (1999). Gender on the agenda in management education? *Women In Management Review*, 14 (3) 99–104.

- Mavin, S., Bryans, P. & Waring, T. (2004). Gender on the agenda 2: unlearning gender blindness in management education. *Women In Management Review*, 19 (6) 293–303.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. In C. McGregor & W. Bennis (Eds.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moon, Y. & Herman, K. (2006). *Aqualisa Quartz: Simply a better shower* – Harvard Business School.
- Monteiro, E. V., & Dias, A. J. (2007). *The Grameen Bank: Credit as a Human Right* – AESE Escola de Direcção e Negócios.
- Nohria, N., & Khurana, R. (2010). Advancing leadership theory and practice. In *The handbook of leadership theory and practice*. An HBS centennial colloquium on advancing leadership (Kindle Location 1). Kindle Edition.
- O'Higgins, E. (2011). *RyanAir – The Low Fares Airline: Whither Now?* – University College Dublin.
- Papadopoulous, R. K. (2006). *The handbook of Jungian psychology – Theory, practice and applications*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN England.
- Patel, V. L. & Groen, G. J. (1991). The general and specific nature of medical expertise: A critical look. In K.A. Ericsson & J. Smith (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of expertise: prospects and limits* (pp. 93-125). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul, J. & Feroul, C. (2010). *Louis Vuitton in Japan* – Richard Ivey School of Business, The University of Western Ontario.
- Petriglieri, G. (2011). Identity workspaces for leadership development. In S. Snook, N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.) *The handbook for teaching leadership*. Thousand Oaks. CA. S. E. Sage.

- Petriglieri, G. & Petriglieri, J. L. (2010). Identity workspaces: The case of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9: 44 – 60.
- Petriglieri, G. & Stein, M. (2012). The unwanted self: Projective identification in leaders' identity work. *INSEAD Working Papers Collection*, 40, 1–39.
- Petriglieri, G., Wood, J. & Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Up close and personal: Building foundations for leaders development through the personalisation of management learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10 (3) 430–450.
- Quinn, R. E. (2004). *Building the bridge as you walk on it: A guide for leading change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reding, V. (2011). Speech made at Meeting of European Business Schools and Executive Women on Boards Brussels, 26 September 2011.
- Reinhardz, S. (1997). “Who am I? The need for variety of selves in the field” In R. Hertz, *Reflexivity and Voice* (p. 3–20).
- Schein, V. E. (1978). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: Prior research and new directions. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(2), 259–268.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women’s progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57 (4), 675–688.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry, third edition print* ISBN: 9781412909273 – Online ISBN: 9781412986281.
- Simpson, R. & Lewis, P. (2005). An investigation of silence and a scrutiny of transparency: Re-examining gender in organization literature through the concepts of voice and visibility. *Human Relations* 58 (10), 1253–1275.
- Simpson, R. & Lewis, P. (2007). *Voice, Visibility and the Gendering of Organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sinclair, A. (1995). Sex and the MBA. *Organization* 2, 295–317 Sage Publications.

- Smith, C. R. (1997). Gender issues in management education: a new teaching resource. *Women in Management Review*, 12 (3) 100–104.
- Snook, S., Nohria, N. & Khurana, R. (2012). *The handbook for teaching leadership: knowing, doing, and being*. Sage Publications. Kindle Edition.
- Spitzeck, H. (2009). *Marks & Spencer: The Business Case for Plan A* – Cranfield University, School of Management.
- Stephen, A.T. (2010). *Ford Fiesta Movement: Using Social Media and Viral Marketing to Launch Ford's Global Car in the United States* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Stevens, R. (2008). *Erik H. Erikson: Explorer of identity and the life cycle (mind shapers)* (p. 135). Palgrave Macmillan. Kindle Edition.
- Stonham, P. (1995), 'For and against the case method', *European Management Journal*, 13, 2, 230-232.
- Story, J. & Watson, N. (2006). *MAS Holdings: Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility in the Apparel Industry* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Street, S., Kimmel, E. B. & Kromrey, J. D. (1995). Revisiting university student gender role perceptions. *Sex Roles*, 33, 183–201.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- The Case Centre (2013). *Case Method Benefits*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecasecentre.org/educators/casemethod/introduction/benefits>.
- The OPED Project (2012). *The OPED byline report*. Retrieved August 2013 from http://www.theopedproject.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=817&Itemid=149.

- The University of Hong Kong (2013). *Case papers*. Retrieved from <http://poetsandquants.com/school-profile/the-university-of-hong-kong-2/>.
- Tønberg, T. (2013). Blocks and breakthroughs. Identity dynamics in leadership development *EMCCC Executive Master Thesis*.
- van Deurzen, E. & Adams, M. (2011). *Skills in existential counselling & psychotherapy (skills in counselling & psychotherapy series)* Sage Publications London England.
- van Knippenberg, D., Knippenberg, B., de Cremer, D. & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 825–856.
- van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., de Cremer, D. & Hogg, M. A. (2005). Research in leadership, self, and identity: A sample of the present and a glimpse of the future. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 495–499.
- Vaysman, I. & Smyth, S. (2006). *Infinity Bank (A): Retail Branches and Customer Profitability* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Weil, S., Oyelere, P., Yeoh, J., & Firer, C. (2001). 'A study of students' perceptions of the usefulness of case studies for the development of finance and accounting-related skills and knowledge', *Accounting Education*, 10, 2, 123-146
- Wittenberg-Cox, A. (2010). *How women mean business - a step by step guide to profiting from gender balanced business*. Wiley, West Sussex, England.
- Yoder, J. D. (2001). Making leadership work more effectively for women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 815–828.
- Young-Eisendrath, P. & Wiedermann, F. (1987). *Female authority- empowering women through psychotherapy*. The Guildford Press, Guildford Publications, NY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, M. (2008). *Offshoring and Innovation at Globalco: Negotiating a Win-Win Strategy for the Outsourcing Relationship* – Cambridge Judge Business School.
- Brown, R. & Grayson, D. (2008). *innocent Drinks: Values and Value* – Cranfield University, School of Management.
- Christen, M. Soberman, D. & Cothier, G., (2003). *Ford Ka: The Market Research Problem (A)* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World[®].
- Cordon, C., Seifert, R. W., & Wellian, E. (2008). *Lego: Consolidating Distribution (A)* – IMD, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Cossin, D., & Keuleneer, L. (2008). *Deal Making in Troubled Waters: The ABN Amro Takeover* – IMD International, Institute for Management Development, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Edelman, B. & Eisenmann, T. R. (2011). *Google Inc.* – Harvard Business School.
- Evgeniou, T., Doukidis, G., & Pramataris, K. (2005). *Internet-Enabled Collaborative Store Ordering: Veropoulos Spar Retailer (A)* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World[®].
- Gupta, V., Indu, P., & Govina, S. (2009). *Knowledge Management Initiatives at IBM* – ICMR Centre for Management Research.
- Guttal, V. & Changanty, S. R. (2009). *Meltdown in Iceland: Biggest Casualty of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis* – IBS Research Centre.
- Indu, P. & Gupta, V. (2010). *Sony Corporation – Future Tense?* – ICMR Centre For Management Research.
- Killing, P. (2003). *Nestlé's Globe Program (A): The Early Months* – IMD International, Institute for Management Development, Lausanne, Switzerland.

- Marks, M., Lee, H. & Hoyt, D. (2011) *Zappos.com: Developing a Supply Chain to Deliver WOW!* – Stanford Graduate School of Business.
- Meuer, J., DiVito, L., Krug, B., Yue, T. & Liu, J. (2012). *A Grand Entrance? Li Ning's Emergence as a Global, Chinese Brand* – Rotterdam School of Management Erasmus University.
- Meyer, E. & Gupta, S. (2009). *Leading Across Cultures at Michelin (A)* – INSEAD, The Business School for the World®.
- Mullins, J., & Lloyd, J. (2003). *Marston Venture Management* – London Business School.
- Piskorski, M. J., Eisenmann, T. R., Chen, D., Feinstein, B. & Smith, A. (2010). *Facebook* – Harvard Business School.
- Pudelko, M. (2005). *Expatriation: An American Working in Japan* – University of Edinburgh Business School.
- Sieber, S., Valor, J. & Mitchell, J., (2008). *Apple's iPhone: Calling Europe or Europe Calling?* IESE Business School, University of Navarra.
- Steger, U., Ionescu-Somers, A., Nick, A., & Salzmann, O., (2006). *Transforming the Global Fishing Industry: The Marine Stewardship Council at Full Sail?* – IMD International, Institute for Management Development, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Thomke, S. & Feinberg, B. (2010). *Design Thinking and Innovation at Apple* – Harvard Business School.
- Yoffie, D. B. & Kim, R. (2011). *Apple Inc. In 2010* – Harvard Business School.