



George Washington University

May 23, 2017

The Women and Leadership Theory Think Tank Report 2015

Dr. Julia Storberg-Walker, George Washington University
Prof./Dr. Susan R. Madsen, Utah Valley University

Acknowledgements

The George Washington University (GWU) Women and Leadership Theory Think Tank was funded by the Research Fellowship Program of the GWU Global Women's Institute. GWU's Graduate School of Education and Human Development provided research resources and graduate student support. Additional support was provided from the Woodbury School of Business at Utah Valley University.

Women and Leadership Theory Think Tank Report 2015

Overview

On July 26–28, 2015, at George Washington University, 25 senior scholars from multiple disciplines gathered to attend a path-breaking event on women and leadership theory. The event, named The Women and Leadership Theory Think Tank (hereafter “Think Tank”), was a part of a targeted and comprehensive effort to “move the needle” forward on women and leadership theory. Beginning in 2013, Drs. Susan R. Madsen and Julia Storberg-Walker (with others) designed and delivered a series of related events, and women from all over the world have participated. The Think Tank was one strategy to scale up the impact on women and leadership theory and leverage the combined knowledge and experience of 25 senior women scholars.

The scholars who attended the Think Tank represented multiple cultures, countries, disciplines, and research paradigms. Collectively, these scholars demonstrated the passion and intellect needed to enrich leadership scholarship for women. Combining these accomplished and recognized voices at the Think Tank was a movement towards catalyzing new directions and possibilities for enhancing women and leadership theory, scholarship, research, and practice. See Appendix 1 for Think Tank participants.

Participants received three questions before the Think Tank convened, to allow for maximum conversation, creativity, and innovation. The guiding questions were as follows:

1. What is the current status of women and leadership theory?
2. What are the gaps and research priorities for advancing women and leadership theory?
3. Given the multiplicity of contexts, cultures, and social norms relating to leadership, how should leadership theories for women be developed?

A key outcome of the Think Tank is this report, a public document that reflects the diversity of views presented at the event. Specifically, this document describes the current status of women and leadership theory, identifies future theory building research priorities, and highlights the challenges and opportunities for women leaders in diverse contexts and cultures. Perhaps not surprisingly, given the depth of diverse experiences represented by the participants, a plurality of views was represented and there was no real need for consensus. The event introduced participants to new disciplinary perspectives, new potential collaborators, and new ideas for future women and leadership research. Finally, the Think Tank seemed to catalyze innovative conversations, spark new relationships, and provide a sense of urgency for theorizing for action and social change.

The Think Tank opened with an evening dinner and an activity afterward designed to engage the participants in theoretical and practical discussion. For the next two days, the scholars participated in large group presentations and small group discussions. The three small groups, comprising of approximately 7–8 scholars each, were tasked with answering each question and then report their “findings” to the full group.

The small group discussions are the primary source of this report. The discussions were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using Atlas TI qualitative data analysis software. The small group discussions were wide ranging, and often a discussion would contribute towards all three questions, even though the intent was for each discussion to focus on one question. The findings illustrate the complexity of the subject as well as the connections between each of the three questions. It is also important to note that the findings below are not given in any way as a consensus, as not all participants had the same or even similar views. The findings are a summary of points that arose in the discussions.

Both narrative analysis and code counts contributed to the development of the findings below. Narrative analysis was the primary mode of data interpretation; it consisted of listening to recordings, reviewing transcriptions, implementing two types of coding processes (in-vivo and a-priori), relating codes to each other, reviewing Atlas-TI generated reports, and writing and re-writing the findings.

The findings in this report are presented by the guiding questions and are structured to organize related ideas and issues. Note that some findings are supplemented by direct quotations from Think Tank participants as a way to illuminate the ideas being communicated: direct quotations are most often offered in italics. The findings to questions 1 and 3 are offered in a more narrative format, while the findings of question 2 are presented in a list. In addition, some parts of a discussion, for example a comment from the primary group of question 1, may be listed as a gap in question 2 and supplement an idea in question 3. It was clear very early on in the analysis that points from all of the discussion recordings were relevant to each of the research questions.

We hope that you find the findings as provocative, interesting, and energizing as we do. We offer a sincere “Thank You” to all of the participants of the Think Tank who gave so generously their time and talents.

Responses to Guiding Questions

Question #1: What is the current status of women and leadership theory?

There were several deep discussions surrounding this question, including a discussion about the question itself. Groups wrestled with identifying what “current status” could mean, and segments of the conversations contributed to all three guiding questions. The central ideas about the current status include the following:

A. Patriarchy is impacting the current status of women and leadership theory.

1. Current women and leadership theories use male-normed/male-defined concepts. This norming of concepts is one of several consequences of patriarchy that hinder theorizing leadership for women. Leadership theory is embedded with masculinity.
2. Current women and leadership theories do not uniformly apply or use gender theory. This is problematic because gender is one of the systems used to allocate power in society. Uneven application means that theories on women and leadership may be bifurcated—

one set of theories plays within the existing rules of the leadership literature with all of the related norms and privileges allocated to men; and another set of theories seeks to destabilize the norms and privileges, and in some way to change the way leadership is conceptualized and understood. Gender theory is the key to re-imagining leadership theory for women because, as one participant noted,

Once gendered norms become infiltrated into our way of thinking, it is common sense that this is how life is structured and divided. It makes perfect sense to us. Whereas actually, if we stop and think about it critically, it's nonsense because leadership is a system of power, and men have power in society. Gender theory then clearly transposes into leadership because it theorizes how power is given to some groups rather than others.

3. The phrase “concept trashing” was introduced to signify taking a stand against words and ideas that enable, support, and perpetuate social and structural inequities:

- This trashing included women leaders as a false category.
- The idea that women lack confidence is unhelpful.
- Interestingly, current women and leadership theory may be contributing to the problem. One participant noted,

We have a tendency to theorize about women in a way which creates false dichotomies and false categories.

- Concepts and labels have systemic and historical attributes of male-dominated systems. In entrepreneurship especially, a participant lamented,

Discrimination these days is overt, not covert. . . . I get incensed when people talk about mompreneurs. . . . It drives me wild!

4. The metaphors used to understand the uneven status between men and women leaders are male-normed and do not work for women. The pipeline image does not fit. For example, one participant stated:

We've been trying to solve the problem of getting women into leadership by, for 30 years, blaming it on the pipeline problem. We try to get as many women as possible into the pipeline and moving through the pipeline, and they'll squirt out the other end in leadership. But women don't necessarily want that and don't value the focus on ambition and moving ahead. They're not necessarily in it to get more money or to get higher status.

5. We do not reflect structural dimensions in theories of leadership; for example, consider the types of structures that shape what women can and cannot do in different societies and cultures. Should we be theorizing for individual leaders or theorizing for structural changes needed for women leaders? Participants noted:

There are structural constraints upon women's engagement with leadership roles that can be demonstrated empirically.

Inequities start way before people enter an organization. And it's just so invisible that we're not aware of them.

B. Simply theorizing about issues, practices, and contemporary narratives distracts us from contributing more and better theories.

1. Theorizing leadership and theorizing entrepreneurship have co-evolved in parallel universes. As one participant noted,

In both of these areas, and taking a historical, theoretical perspective, we see it was a masculine assumption about what entrepreneur and leader traits look like.

Likewise, theorizing entrepreneurship and leadership has begun to look at gender—the social construction of gender rather than difference.

2. As described by one participant, theorizing leadership is “embedded in a neoliberal stream of thought.”
3. The narratives around difference contribute to and detract from women and leadership theorizing. On the one hand, the difference argument has been used to get more women into leadership positions because, as one participant noted,

It shores up what women bring that they don't actually acknowledge, appreciate, or get paid for.

But on the other hand, “Lean-In,” for example, does not suggest women bring something different to the table.

4. Current theorizing is not making a difference because we are focused on increasing numbers of women leaders rather than looking substantively how women ascend the ladder and what they do once they get there. One Think Tank attendee stated,

When women leaders get there, and eventually a few women do get there—who are they? And is there any evidence that they actually help other women? I think we have this myth that the numbers matter. And I think what really matters is who got there and how they got there. If they got there by leaning in that's all they know how to do. They don't know how to do things differently. So do they make a big difference? I'm not sure they do.

5. Current theorizing is limited because many women do not identify with leader as currently defined/understood:
 - Many women do not see themselves as a leader.
 - Women see leaders and say, “I don't what to be a part of that.”
 - Women are not promoted because men promote, and women are not PLUs (people like us).
 - Cultural differences and intersecting identities are not accurately theorized in contemporary leadership theories.
6. Current theorizing does not challenge gender-neutral or gender-blind notions of leadership.
7. Current theorizing is “looking down the wrong end of a telescope” by looking at women's experiences rather than the notion of a gendered society and socialization.

8. Current theorizing has not figured out how to conceptualize leadership for women. Two examples of participant statements are shared below:

I find it very troubling that we don't have, yet, alternative paradigms. We don't reflect structural dimensions within theories of leadership. We really seem to have the sense that there's one type of leadership. And then if you do it, you do it, and if you don't, you don't. And if you're a woman, even if you do it, that's not really very useful always to you. So it just seems to me to be a very uniform understanding of leadership. If women are going to do it at all, they need to adapt themselves to the way it is done. And I find that quite troubling, to be honest.

I don't know how it is possible to achieve the kind of complex understanding of leading if we are attached to concepts that don't travel.

9. Current theorizing has a narrow conceptualization of leadership that is dominated by the western idea of advancement. An example of one statement made in a small group discussion includes the following:

I think the way we talk about leadership in theory and in practice, even in everyday conversations, assumes a very hierarchical conceptualization of leadership. This view is a very careerist conceptualization.

10. Current theorizing is based on normative assumptions of empowerment in a neoliberal sense. Empowerment is viewed as an individual process, and becoming a leader or entrepreneur is a pathway towards empowerment:
 - Empowerment in a different context may not be at the individual level.
 - Individual attainment is a neoliberal value.

C. The discussion question is not a helpful guide.

1. Determining the current status is challenging because of the breadth of the disciplines within the leadership field, the breadth of publications publishing leadership research, and the number of different disciplines connected to leadership. Theorists are not likely to be familiar with all work being done.
 - The current status of women and leadership theory varies by discipline.
 - The use of concepts and what they mean vary by discipline.
 - Disciplines get siloed.
 - Disciplines enter into the conversation at different points.
2. Groups discussed the lack of clarity represented in the discussion question: a leadership theory field for women could offer an empirical contribution; a gender theory about leadership could offer theoretical contributions.
3. Popular narratives inform contemporary theorizing:
 - Some discussions were focused on feminism and feminism's role in theorizing leadership. Of note, concern was expressed about the fact that many younger women do not identify as feminist. If not identifying as a feminist were to continue, what would that mean for theorizing leadership for women?

- Popular books are influencing the narratives relevant to women leaders and consequently shape how theorizing women and leadership is done:
 - A number of participants discussed the *Lean-In* phenomenon and that it is distracting younger women from the real issue of male-normed leadership models and theories. The narrative of *Lean-In*, as described by one participant, is “Fix yourself. There is a game. Play it.”
 - One participant stated that “young women love *Lean-In*” and consequently do not create an agenda for change or a radical movement. They do not see alternative structures and approaches.
 - The *Confidence Code* phenomenon suggests women do not necessarily want to be leaders; instead, they want to benefit an institution they love or admire through their work. *The Confidence Code*, as described by a participant, suggests women should “change the language from ‘me’ to ‘we.’ Women will have confidence around ‘we,’ but we don’t have confidence around ‘me.’”
4. Many discussions generated ideas connected to politics, policy, and social movements. In terms of moving forward on another attempt at the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), one participant noted,

We don’t have a movement that is strong enough, funded enough, or diverse enough to move something that would be good for all of us.

Some participants also mentioned that the continued failure of the ERA effort negatively impacts all aspects of women’s leadership, including theory.

Question #2: What are the gaps and research priorities for advancing women and leadership theory?

After analyzing the transcriptions, it became clear that research priorities blended in to the discussions surrounding question 3. Consequently, the research priorities are presented as future-oriented theorizing in the next question. For question 2, the key gaps in research, theory, and/or practice were identified as follows:

- Changing the narrative
- Conducting more empirical research
- Contextual relevance
- Creating new tools for feminist theorizing
- Critiquing leadership stereotypes
- Dismantling the “master’s house with the master’s tools”
- Facilitators of leadership for women
- How ideology matters to theorizing
- How tacit knowledge of “the rules” is passed on
- How the changing understanding of gender impacts future theorizing efforts
- How to bring men on board
- How to make meaningful descriptions of women’s leadership without essentializing

How women can have cross-cultural shared meaning with speakers of different languages
How women get ready for leadership
How women lead at the intersections
Identifying a unifying force that can help mobilize all stakeholders at the same time to advance women leaders
Identity development of and for girls and women
Indigenizing concepts
Influence of context on the relationship between evidence and theory
Innovative ways to understand leadership (e.g., arts, humanities)
Intersectionality
Journals publishing gender work
Lack of influence on practitioners and policy makers
Leadership as a situated and contextual activity
Leadership being more than career
Leadership for what
Learning leadership
Leveraging professional associations to disseminate research findings
Looking beyond leader context to include follower
Media training for researchers
Mindful attention to argumentation of research
Mindful attention to rhetoric of research
More publications by women of color on women of color leaders
Moving beyond deficit model
Moving beyond measuring
Multi-level theorizing and research
Multiplicity with concepts that don't travel
Non-positional leadership research
Non-Western journals being willing to publish Non-Western research
Non-Western research articles
Positive metaphors
Quality longitudinal research
Recognizing researchers' broader responsibilities to society
Research implications to the public at large
Research on all dimensions of women in leadership
Research on tacit knowledge sharing
Research on women at the margins
Research on women, not just women compared to men
Research-to-policy efforts
Talent management and succession planning
Theories, strategies, and politics of change
Theorizing complexity
Theorizing in non-Western contexts
Theorizing on majority populations
Theorizing women leader development
Using research to legitimize alternative leadership roles
Women-centered case studies

Women's questioning their desire to be leaders
Working with and understanding each other as we theorize for different things in
different contexts

Question #3: Given the multiplicity of contexts, cultures, and social norms relating to leadership, how should leadership theories for women be developed?

As described above, the research priorities are blended into the answers presented below. The ideas are not presented in a prioritized order for two reasons. First, the lead author believed that prioritizing would add a false layer of objectivity to this messy project. Second, determining a priority would necessarily result in some type of hegemonic decision privileging some ideas over others. Instead, the answers are presented in no particular order; however, answers that seem to be related to each other are clustered.

Like with question #1, direct quotes from Think Tank participants are offered in italics to illuminate or explain many of the elements.

1. Future theorizing must be generated from women's experience. One participant stated,

It is important to put women's experiences out there. . . . A lot of our research is based on research science of male managers and male leaders that informs the theories, frameworks, and ideas that we use.

2. Future theorizing has the responsibility to change streams of ideas and ideologies.

3. Future theorizing must recognize intersectional and contextual differences. Samples of statements from participants include the following:

We need a lot more from the African, Asian, other indigenous research. We need to focus on the indigenization of the leadership epistemological project, so to speak.

I think we need black women writing about black leaders and Asian women writing about Asian leaders and so on. I think that that's important in terms of theory building for women. And then I think there has to be a coming together of these theories to look at commonalities, look at patterns, to look at things that are consistent and things that are inconsistent.

4. Future theorizing must attend to the cultural and historical context and implications of the words, concepts, and metaphors used during the process of theorizing. For example, does feminism carry across cultures? Participants stated,

Not that other women in other parts of the world do not embrace many of the ideas that Western women have labeled as feminism, but they don't call it feminism.

I come from the U.K., which is a very class-conscious society, and it's very interesting to think about class and feminism, especially when people may lose their class position due to things like displacement or refugee status. How feminism gets conceptualized in different societies and across different class segments is important.

In the U.K., how working class people would perceive the feminist movement as very different from how middle-class people would perceive it.

You have to conceptually argue how you are using a particular conception of a construct because constructs cannot be understood unless they're contextualized.

I am able to get around the resistance to feminism in classes I teach by talking about gender justice, because somehow people can connect with gender justice in a way that they've had a problem with feminism.

Some participants stated that these neoliberal theories of individual attainment through entrepreneurial activity or leadership activity are not universal across cultures. For example, one explained,

If you try to conceptualize individual attainment in the context of developing societies—it's a little bit like men with very little hair who try and scrape that little bit of hair across their bald patch to cover it up, . . . and you look at them and you think, 'do you know that's really not working? That's not working.'

5. Future theorizing must consider structure and agency in multiple ways. One participant made the following observation:

You need look at where people are positioned in society structurally because of their gender and see where they are in certain strata. Then from the agency perspective, you ask how do they navigate those particular positions in society? We have to look at the navigation, the agent, and the navigation process to understand how women become leaders despite the masculinized discourse of what it is to be a leader.

Others focused on men, women, and structure, as one stated, “It is no good training women and then throwing them back into the abyss.” Another topic discussed was how structure and agency meld, theoretically, in the diverse contexts within which women lead. A final was a focus on structure may diminish the focus on women’s experience. One participant noted,

I think there's a real tension in the literature at the moment: how do we move discussions forward that enable social change and looking at structural conditions, but don't lose those kind of experiences that women have?

6. Future theorizing needs to recognize that men want different things from life and work in today’s world.

7. Future theorizing may need to start from zero. One attendee noted,

Barbara Kellerman says, in today's world, leadership is more complex, and there are more contradictory demands on leaders from different perspectives. How much of leadership theory is relevant for where we need to go? I don't know. Maybe we need to start fresh, given the complexities.

8. Future theorizing needs to adopt an egalitarian or feminist rationale for studying women leaders rather than arguing that women leaders are better or they must be good for something different from men.
9. Future theorizing needs to take politics and policy into account. Samples of participant statements on this topic include the following:

There's so much consensus around the things that need to change. And where we're really stuck is the politics of pushing it.

I think we just need to know so much more about what works in the world. We have a pretty good sense of what needs to change to enable more women to get to leadership positions. But why is it that we're so powerless to actually implement change? The politics of progress is inadequately theorized.

What kind of structures do we need, or mechanisms, for linking the research that's done in academia to policy leaders?

We need some kind of a new publication, like a newsletter, that isn't written for other academics, that's written for policy-makers, that takes them very little time to read.

When talking about getting research that matters out there, you don't get it out anymore unless you know how to do social media.

I think as long as we are divided—regardless of what the divisions are about, as long as we're divided, we will never have impact.

10. Future theorizing should consider identity as “identifying with” in order to help the diverse universe of women see themselves in the words, concepts, and logic of the theory. If this is not done, women may continue to say, “I don't what to be a part of that,” as they have with the narrative surrounding masculinized entrepreneurship.”
11. Theorists may want to consider focusing on publishing theoretical articles in a select number of journals. Participants noted that so many disciplines and so many journals publish articles related to women and leadership that it is difficult to see the full picture of women and leadership theory.
12. Future theorizing should have the concept of gender be at the center of theorizing; it is much more powerful than the category of women. Related to gender at the center, future theorizing needs to have women's experience as the foundation—and realize that women represent a large diversity of experiences and identities, with differential relationships to power and oppression.
13. Future theorizing should say, “There are women in leadership roles. There are women who take on leadership roles in diverse contexts. And this is what happens to those women.” From that, we need to see the complexity and diversity of the experience and not compare women to each other. One woman stated,

We need to also be hugely cognizant of what happens to women once they go into their workplace. They have likely been successful in education and gotten the higher

grades all the way up to post-graduate level. But after five, six, seven, eight years in the workforce, during their twenties, their ambition levels just plummet. Their ambition doesn't need to be to be the CEO, but they need to be ambitious to further their development of some kind.

There was a focus on changing demographic trends that impact some women, as one participant said,

I think it was a million women in America in their 50s who were jumping out of the workforce to look after their parents while recognizing that this is not a change for some women I think, for women of color in the United States, taking care of elder care has always been something they did on top of everything else. So, again—there are two different patterns.

14. Future theorizing must change narratives. A sample of statements made by the participants are included here:

The narrative around power needs to shift. Instead of stories of sacrifice and guilt, powerful women need to speak up about the rewards that power's afforded them to encourage more women to reach for the top.

We've got to come up with some more positive metaphors of women's leadership.

Simple shifts in language actually don't lead to simplistic thinking.

15. Future research must be reflexive. Participants made the following statements:

Theorizing must explicitly address why you are doing this and who is it for.

We have this assumption of a normative ontology, for example, that leadership is an empowering process. Is it?

Maybe it's our urge to categorize things and people that we need to attack. Do we then need to make a theory about the categories? Do we deconstruct categories and theorize them? Yes, this is the iterative process of research.

Categories become the categories of choice based on the researcher's world view—the ontological view of how the world works.

Categories are temporal things.

16. Future theorizing must re-legitimize (or legitimize) alternative conceptualizations of leadership. One participant stated,

If you specify leading for a particular end, you start to legitimize leading for individual change, or leading for community development. All of these different ends for leadership that are worthy in and of themselves.

Not only do we need theorists to be understanding of their own tribe or group, we also need theorists who can be advocates to be helping find those voices too.

17. Future research should focus on “leading” rather than “the leader.” For example, two women noted,

Focus on the processes of the way things are done rather than the people who are doing them.

We see leading as being a relational co-constructed activity.

18. Future research should, as one participant said, “involve consumers in the research process and research development, from conception of the research on through to data-gathering and beyond. For example, engage men with daughters.”

19. Future research should develop innovative methodologies that advance multiplicity. For example, two participants stated,

We need to bring diverse methodologies together in some way that we can speak to broader audiences, and somehow—and I think this is the point—to understand where the methodologies have come from.

We need to be able to use multiple new methodologies in ways that are actually useful for advancing multiplicity. Because, in some ways, it’s the very notion of the methodologies and their theoretical underpinnings that can limit theorizing and researching women leaders.

Summary and Next Steps

The 25 senior scholars who participated in this intensive, path-breaking Think Tank held at George Washington University in 2015 agreed that this engaging and innovative gathering was a rare opportunity for all. Convening a face-to-face group of individuals who were from multiple cultures, countries, disciplines, and research paradigms is often not possible. Yet, it was critical for the overarching conversations and discussions that took place. And, as facilitators of the gathering, we believe that the event accomplished its goal, as part of the targeted and comprehensive effort, to “move the needle” forward on women and leadership theory. Combining the knowledge and experience of senior women and leadership scholars and theorists has propelled this work forward and has scaled-up the impact on women and leadership theory.

We hope that this report will now benefit others who did not attend the actual Think Tank event. It can be utilized in many ways. First, this report describes the current status of women and leadership theory, identifies future theory building research priorities, and highlights the challenges and opportunities for women leaders in diverse contexts and cultures. These can be foundation to students and academics who want to understand the current gaps both research and theory. We have been concerned that some of our research this past decade has focused on topics already well understood. It is critical that future research answer new questions that have not been explored. We must move the field forward. Second, we believe that it is critical to have scholars work together across cultures, disciplinary perspectives, and generations. Our attempts to convene such a group appeared to result in added richness that may not have been present without this diversity. Third, at least for the participants, the Think Tank seemed to catalyze

innovative conversations, spark new relationships, and provide a sense of urgency for theorizing for action and social change. Our hope is that this report will do this for readers as well.

Overall, we hope readers of this report rely on these findings to catalyze new directions and possibilities for enhancing women and leadership theory, scholarship, research, and practice. It is clear that we need more women leaders in our organizations, communities, and countries. This report offers a diverse array of ideas for readers to consider and incorporate into their teaching, research, and practice that in turn will contribute to the critical need to advance women's leadership around the world.

Appendix 1: Photo of Think Thank Participants



Appendix 2: List of Participants

Participant Facilitators:

- Julia Storberg-Walker Associate Professor of the Executive Leadership Program of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development and Affiliate Faculty of the Global Women’s Institute, George Washington University, U.S.
- Susan R. Madsen Orin R. Woodbury Professor of Leadership and Ethics, Woodbury School of Business at Utah Valley University, U.S.

Participants:

- Helene Ahl School of Education and Communication, Jönköping University, Sweden
- Ann M. Berghout Austin Professor of Child Development of the Department of Family and Human Development; Director of the Center for Women and Gender, Utah State University, U.S.
- Laura L. Bierema Associate Dean and Professor in Adult Education, Learning, and Organization Development, College of Education, University of Georgia, U.S.

Diana Bilimoria	KeyBank Professor and Chair and Professor of Organizational Behavior, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Ohio, U.S.
Marilyn Y. Byrd	Assistant Professor of Human Relations, the University of Oklahoma, U.S.
Gelaye Debebe	Associate Professor and Program Director of Organizational Sciences, George Washington University; Faculty Affiliate at the Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons Graduate School of Management, Massachusetts, U.S.
Lynne E. Devnew	Associate Faculty, Doctoral Program the Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research, University of Phoenix, U.S.
Carole Elliott	Senior Lecturer, Durham University Business School, U.K.
Rita A. Gardiner	Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, The University of Western Ontario, Canada.
Mary Gergen	Professor Emerita of Psychology and Women's Studies at Penn State University, Brandywine; Division Head for Social Science and Education, Commonwealth College of Penn State University, U.S.
Paige Haber-Curran	Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator, Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) Master's Program, Texas State University, U.S.
Eleanor Hamilton	Professor of Entrepreneurship, Lancaster University Management School; Associate Dean for Enterprise, Engagement and Impact, Director of the Wave2 Growth Hub Programme and Director of Regional Affairs, U.K.
Savita Kumra	Senior Lecturer, Middlesex University, Dubai.
Jean Lipman-Blumen	Thornton F. Bradshaw Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Organizational Behavior, Claremont Graduate University's Peter F. Drucker and Masatoshi Ito Graduate School of Management, California, U.S.
Karen A. Longman	Program Director and Professor of Doctoral Higher Education, Azusa Pacific University, California, U.S.
Susan Marlow	Professor of Entrepreneurship, University of Nottingham Haydn Greene Institute of Enterprise, U.K.
Maura McAdam	Associate Professor of Management, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland.
Faith Wambura Ngunjiri	Director of the Lorentzen Center for Faith and Work; Associate Professor of Ethics and Leadership at the Offutt School of Business, Concordia College, Minnesota, U.S.

Deborah L. Rhode	Ernest W. McFarland Professor of Law, Director of the Center on the Legal Profession, Director of the Program in Law and Social Entrepreneurship, Stanford University, U.S.
Jill Robinson	Associate Professor and Department Chair, University of Redlands, Business Administration and Accounting Department, California, U.S.
Janis Sanchez-Hucles	Professor Emerita of Psychology, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, U.S.
Ruth Sealy	Senior Lecturer (Associate Professor) and Deputy Programme Director in Organizational Psychology, City University London, U.K.
Valerie Stead	Lecturer in Management Learning and Leadership, Lancaster University Management School, U.K.
Susan Vinnicombe	Professor of Women and Leadership, Changing the World of Work, Cranfield School of Management, U.K.
Marie Wilson	Feminist Leader and Social Entrepreneur, Creator and Leader of Women's Organizations; Founder and President Emerita of The White House Project and the Ms. Foundation for Women.

Copyright © 2017 Julia Storberg-Walker & Susan R. Madsen