Our Teaching Case was Rejected. What was Missing?

Nosso Caso para Ensino foi Rejeitado. O que Faltou?

Maria Salete Batista Freitag
Fernanda Paula Arantes
Lourival Ribeiro Chaves Júnior

ABSTRACT

This article aims at showing, reviewing and discussing the elements that led to the rejection of a teaching case in administration, in order to contribute toward improving the elaboration and publication of this type of text. There are many roadmaps in literature as to construct acceptable cases. This article follows a different path, by pointing out flaws that resulted in the rejection of a case. Reviewers are invited to the debate with their positions about flaws, data source for this paper, and an analysis is made, based on literature. The broadening of the evidence of failures that motivate the rejection of cases, resulting from this discussion, may clarify crucial issues for this type of creation. The contribution of this article is to collaborate with beginners in this modality of production, highlighting flaws that may be avoided, and the possibilities of learning through reviewers.
Keywords: Teaching Cases; Flaws in Teaching Case Production; Learning from Reviewers.

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como objetivo evidenciar, analisar e discutir os elementos que motivaram a rejeição de um caso para ensino em administração, no intuito de poder contribuir para o aprimoramento da elaboração e da publicação dessa modalidade de texto. Há uma predominância na literatura no apontamento de caminhos para a construção de casos aceitáveis. Neste artigo, busca-se outra via, ao indicar falhas que resultaram na rejeição de um caso. São chamados para o debate os revisores, com seus posicionamentos sobre as falhas, fonte de dados deste trabalho, procedendo-se a uma análise, com base na literatura. A ampliação das evidências de falhas que motivam a rejeição de casos, resultante dessa discussão, poderá aclarar pontos que são fundamentais nesse tipo de criação. Assim sendo, a contribuição deste artigo é colaborar com os iniciantes nessa modalidade de produção, salientando falhas que podem ser evitadas e ressaltando as possibilidades de aprendizagem por meio dos revisores.
Palavras-chave: Casos para Ensino; Falhas na Produção de Casos para Ensino; Aprendendo com os Revisores.

Submitted: 29/10/2021
Accepted: 29/12/2021

Maria Salete Batista Freitag
msalete@ufg.br
PhD – Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte – UFRN
Doutora – Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte – UFRN
Goiânia / Goiás – Brazil

Fernanda Paula Arantes
arantes.fp@ufg.br
MSc – Universidade Federal de Goiás
Mestra – Universidade Federal de Goiás
Goiânia / Goiás – Brazil

Lourival Ribeiro Chaves Júnior
lourival.ribeiro7@gmail.com
MSc – Universidade Federal de Goiás
Mestre – Universidade Federal de Goiás
Imperatriz / Maranhão – Brazil

Introduction

To answer the question above, this article aims to highlight and discuss the elements that motivated the rejection of a teaching case, comprising components related to different aspects of both the case itself, and the teaching notes. Unlike the prevailing proposals in literature, which point the ways to write acceptable cases, this paper follows a different path by pointing out the errors in the production of a rejected case (RC). Those more experienced in this type of production may raise questions such as: how could they make mistakes in such simple aspects? However, it may be that for beginners in case writing, the contact with the reasons for rejection may serve as a warning, motivating greater proximity to literature on the subject, in an attempt to be more assertive.

The discussion presented herein is based on the reviewers' positioning regarding the failures that motivated rejection, seeking a dialog with the literature. In this sense, this material also shows the lessons learned by the authors of the case in question through the reviewers and peer review, making the process an environment with great possibilities of learning. The article is intended to collaborate in improving the production of cases, reducing errors that culminate in rejection, in submissions both to events and to journals.

The authors' fondness for the case modality has intensified due to reflective experiences, which lead to questioning about which educational methods could provide more cognitive and behavioral stimuli in students (INKPEN; CROSSAN, 1995). Also, for sharing with Chimenti (2020, p. 376), when considering that "cases are perhaps where the teacher and the researcher meet with more synergy" (*free translation)*.

When participating in disciplines focused on teaching in administration, in a graduate program of a public HEI, one of the challenges posed to professors and students is the production of teaching cases. This type of stimulus is in line with Kruel and Santos (2008), when they emphasize the importance of graduate students' engagement in the production of teaching cases. That because learning may be sharper for the students who produce the case than for those who review it, because it is an experience that requires an in-depth analysis of a situation (ROESCH, 2007).

There is a consensus among the aforementioned professors and students that the teaching case enables administration undergraduates to develop a set of useful skills for a managerial career, especially those of analytical and decision-making nature (MAUFFETTE-LEENDERS; ERSKINE; LEENDERS, 2005). This experience not only contributes integrate graduate and undergraduate students, but also allows the latter to be placed in experiential circumstances when facing problem-situations, being encouraged to make decisions with dynamics facilitated by the former. The experience of case analysis would allow graduate students to experience situations similar to those that occur in the everyday life of organizations, not being subjected to the risks inherent to decision-making in the real world (FARIA; FIGUEIREDO, 2013).

This production, in the context of the aforementioned discipline, comprises some phases, which involve all students. These are: a) studies on how to produce teaching cases; b) preparation of an initial version; c) presentation and discussion of the case in plenary to get comments and feedback; d) improvement of the version, and in-class application for graduate course; e) incorporation of suggestions from students and professors of the disciplines in which the case was tested; f) preparation of the final version and submission to the program's refereed teachers, before submission to events or journals. The phases adopted as main references Alberton and Silva (2018), Roesch (2007), Faria and Figueiredo (2013), and Chimenti (2020).

In order to contribute with those interested in avoiding errors in the production of cases, the objective of this article, following text the most representative points indicated by the reviewers in the rejection, both those related to the narrative of the case and those of the teaching notes, accompanied by analysis, based on the literature, will be stated, in addition to the recognition of flaws prior to the submission of the case. Based on the authors' experiences discussed throughout the text regarding the RC elaboration, after the analysis section some guidelines for case writing, found in literature, are reinforced.

Recognizing Pre-Submission Flaws

PRE-SUBMISSION FLAWS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Before beginning the analysis of the points that resulted in the rejection of the case, a situation that is considered highly impacting on the unfolding of different aspects of both the case and the teaching notes is presented. Alberton and Silva (2018) suggest to authors to the first steps to develop a teaching case: define the topic, context, protagonists, dilemma, and underlying theories. To this end, *Berte et al*. (2018) recommend that authors to first go through the "ideation" that will help the case planning process, and to define the other elements mentioned by Alberton and Silva (2018).

These elements can consist of ideation sources, personal experiences of the researchers, lectures delivered by professionals, student experiences reported in the classroom, and interdisciplinary collaborations, for example (BERTE et al., 2018). The idea for the case elaboration came from the experience of one of the researchers, who knew and followed the history of the company in which the study was conducted. However, only the context and protagonists were pre-defined, so there was no moment of properly planning the case.

Moreover, even considering Alberton and Silva's (2018) arguments that the purpose of a case is to contribute to the learning of a specific discipline's content, and that one should seek to work with specific instances rather than generalizations and theories (ROESCH, 2007), the lack of clarity of the RC regarding the theme and the underlying theories, was a serious flaw in data search. This event was influenced by the authors' inadequate choices, opting for a wide range of themes and theories, weakening the unfolding.

The most appropriate would have been to focus on a specific theory, relevant and useful to real-life scenarios (BERTE et al., 2018). As it did not occur, the negative trigger in the script definition, and the application of the wide-range interview led to subsequent problems, such as the generation of a large volume of information related to the themes and theories mentioned. This situation had some implications:

a. The diversity of information and facts driving to different themes and underlying theories resulted in an extensive case, contradicting Corey's (1998) arguments that cases should be short, comprising essential facts, as this helps shortening reading time. The dilution of information ensuing from lack of focus on a specific theme and theory, made unfeasible supporting the analyst in making decisions in face of problem situations.
b. The dilemma was obscure as the problematic was related to different themes, thus impairing the understanding. This made difficult for readers

to get involved in the search for alternatives for the analysis and discussion of the case.

c. The excessive amount of information contributed to make the text confusing and full of information related to different theories.
d. The development of the aforementioned situations negatively affected the quality of the elements making up the teaching notes, notably the case objectives and questions that should comply with different themes and theories.

TEST NOT APPLIED

The rejected case (RC) under discussion here was prepared in the first half of 2020. The first submission was in August of the same year, before the test application. This fact is considered to be the most damaging for the advancement of the case, due to the lack of feedbacks from students and professors of the discipline in the test phase, and also of the observations of the case developers during the experiment. Roesch (2007) warns about this type of problem, arguing that cases must be tested in the classroom, using the same conditions suggested in the case application. The author adds that this phase may bring about not only changes in the teaching notes, but also changes to the information in case.

For Berte *et al*. (2018), testing the case in the classroom helps improving particularly the teaching notes, when adjusting the proposed teaching plan. According to the authors, students' reflection on the experience has the potential to guide instructors regarding what to expect when teaching supported by the case. In addition to applying the test in the classroom, it should be submitted to scientific events for peer events (BERTE *et al*., 2018).

The recognition and considerations regarding flaws prior to the RC submission resulted in learning for the case's authors, and contributed with those interested in this type of production. In this sense we strongly suggest preparing a plan with previous guidance based on literature in order to prevent errors that could damage the acceptance of cases.

Discussing Unaccuracies in the Case Narrative

The case structures and teaching notes are presented in literature, notably Alberton & Silva (2018) and Roesch (2007). The issues discussed throughout this article are related to the structures proposed by the authors.

INTRODUCTION

In the introduction of the RC, and throughout much of the text, two characters appear. At the end of the narrative, a third one is included as a decision-maker. One of the reviewers advises that *"it is recommended that the characters be introduced at the opening of the case*". This guidance is compatible with the position of Alberton and Silva (2018), who suggest presenting the protagonists right at the introduction. Also, it failed highlighting the characteristics of the protagonists to foster students' identification with them, as recommended by Chimenti (2020), bringing information about their life stories, and denoting what motivates given attitudes and behaviors in face of situations of dilemma (ROESCH, 2007).

Besides the protagonists, other elements have a place in the introduction, as guided by Alberton and Silva (2018). They are: the time and place in which the case developed, the aspects present in the case, and the introduction of the dilemma, which was presented in a broad way, as mentioned below.

DILEMMA FORMULATION

- Reviewer: "Ideally, one should be clear and objective about the dilemma in the introduction [...] redeeming it in the closing of the body of the case", comment from one of the reviewers. Although the RC problematizes the situations of dilemma throughout the narrative, the dilemma appeared only at the end of the case. The reviewer's suggestion is in line with Alberton and Silva (2018) and Corey (1998), in recommending the insertion of the dilemma in the introduction, proceeding to detail the sections of the narrative, and the resumption in the closing of the case.

It should be noted that the RC was drafted in line with the guidelines of problem-solving type cases, i.e., the dilemma (problem) "is clearly defined in the case and students are invited to come up with solutions; or choose between, or analyze alternative solutions already implemented" (BRUNSTEIN; WALVOORD; CUNLIFF, 2021, p. 485, our translation). Another possibility would be to elaborate the case in a problem-posing perspective, in which no explicit statement of the dilemma is made, and students are responsible for identifying it and proposing the solution (BRUNSTEIN; WALVOORD; CUNLIFF, 2021). Although it has the potential to give rise to "social connection and mutual responsibility for the learning process," the problem-posing perspective is still little used in writing teaching cases (REED; SAUNDERS; PFADENHAUER-SIMONDS, 2015, p. 56 [*free translation*]; BRUNSTEIN; WALVOORD; CUNLIFF, 2021), escaping the publication guidelines established by most journals.

Therefore, the RC assumed that the discovery of the dilemma should result from the information obtained about the case, both through interviews with the protagonists, and through other sources that would help deepen the information about the organization, and context of the case, being presented explicitly in the text (CHIMENTI, 2020).

As for the definition of the dilemma in the RC, given the diversity of information related to different themes and theories, it was largely immersed when comprising different problems. This aspect contradicts Corey's (1998) positioning, when defending a strict definition of the dilemma, focusing on problems that must be faced and solved.

LONG PASSAGES, AND LITTLE LONG DIALOGUES

- Reviewer: "Short passages with dialogues and lines are very useful to help the narrative"". In the RC, there was a predominance of long passages, which makes the interpretations of the problem situations difficult. This fact was observed by one of the reviewers, who pointed out: *"Short passages with dialogues and lines are very useful to help the narrative""*. This helps the reader in clearly delineating the dilemma (ALBERTON; SILVA, 2018). The reviewer also draws attention that "when passages get long the fluidity of the text is compromised."

THE CASE SHOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO SEVERAL THEORIES

- Reviewer: "One case does not have the role of reviewing several theories." In RC, the writing of the narrative explored situations that led to different theories,

as already mentioned. This aspect was influenced by an extensive description of organizational processes by means of the theories. It would have been appropriate to choose a focus theory beforehand, and then proceed to the teaching notes, as recommended by Chimenti (2020), when arguing that, even before starting to write, it is essential that the case writer has in mind what theory they intend to teach with the case. The existence of a theory or a theoretical concept underlying the case is what supports its analysis, through the connection with specific knowledge of an area (ALBERTON; SILVA, 2018).

Based on the reviewer position regarding the inaccuracies of the narrative led the RC authors to resort to literature regarding the issues pointed out. This fact constitutes a learning opportunity on how to avoid the flaws. It is suggested that case producers establish a dialogue between reviewers and the literature, with an evolving case as a point of reflection, aiming at publication.

Where we went wrong and what not to do in the teaching notes

Teaching notes are presented immediately after the narrative as a separate section directed to the teacher/instructor. According to Berte *et al*. (2018, p. 238, free translation), this section is of paramount relevance to the case because it "authenticates the academic rigor of the publication by explaining how the case is grounded in theory." The teaching notes may contain the summary of the teaching case; the indication of the knowledge area suggested for application; the description of the educational objectives; the proposed teaching plan; the questions for discussion of the theory and theoretical concept in focus, with the respective answers, aiming at the resolution of the dilemma presented in the narrative; information about the way of obtaining the data from the organization studied; recommended bibliography; and details about the actual outcome of the story presented (ROESCH, 2007; ALBERTON; SILVA, 2018).

Austin (1993) summarizes this structure in five main elements: synopsis, positioning, objectives, analysis, and teaching process. The synopsis is responsible for presenting a brief but general overview of the case. The positioning informs the discipline for which the application of that case is intended. The objectives represent the central column, i.e. the reason why the case was formulated, and what it is intended to teach. The analysis, in turn, will show the reflection about the dilemma presented in the narrative, and its connection with the theoretical concept chosen to support the case. The elucidation of the strategy to apply the case in the classroom is the detailing of the teaching process.

The main purpose of the teaching notes is to provide enough guidance so that the professor, after reading them, is able to understand the proposed educational objectives, as well as the theory and approaches outlined, and feels confident enough to apply the case in the classroom (SHEEHAN, et al., 2017). As they are a kind of guide for applying the case, the better they are structured and the higher their quality, the greater also the chances that the notes will provide good discussions and, consequently, a good lesson (AUSTIN, 1993; CHIMENTI, 2020).

In this sense, the main flaws in the case submitted were found in the teaching notes. This fact supports the results presented in the bibliometric research by Faria and Figueiredo (2013), and in the study by Valdevino et al. (2017), which suggest that the major problems occur in this section of the case.

Next, we present the problems pointed out by the reviewers of the case, and the lessons that the authors of this case learned. They concern the outlining of a theory and core concepts, the clarity of the proposed educational goal, the design of questions that provide inductive teaching, and the appropriate provision of information to students.

ABSTRACT. CASE POSITIONING

Reviewer: "What concept does it [the case] intends to teach?"

The abstract represents one of the faculty member's first points of contact with the case. It should provide a brief account of the content that will be found ahead (ROESCH, 2007). Therefore, it should bring pertinent information about the teaching objectives, theory, and the concept to be applied in order to support the teacher's decision on the choice of the case for application in classroom. The reviewer questioning makes it clear that these elements were not explained in the abstract. In the case submitted, the abstract presented the contextualization of the problem situation, the presentation of the objective (in a broad way), the indication of the area of application, and the suggested disciplines. However, theory and concept were not mentioned.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS THESE SHOULD BE CLEAR, DELIMITED, AND PROVIDE INDUCTIVE TEACHING

- *Reviewer:* "*A teaching case cannot be a platform for teaching so many themes*."

The educational level for which the application of the case is indicated is pointed out in the statement of educational goals. Through these, knowledge and skills expected to be built by the students with support from the professor are described (ROESCH, 2007). Moreover, the whole narrative is built based on these objectives, in order to provide the necessary elements for the discussion of the proposed questions (FARIA; FIGUEIREDO, 2013). Remember, the case needs to have "pedagogical usefulness" (HERREID, 1998, p. 164).

The RC suggests as core educational goal the teaching of six sub-themes related to the knowledge areas of the case. Although data collected through the interview with the company CEO, whose problem-situation was presented in the dilemma, could support discussions about all six sub-themes, this would not fit into just one teaching case. Our proposal to provide a teaching case that could support the review of concepts of a discipline as a whole was ambitious and inadequate. The lack of focus on a central theory and concept made the proposed analysis of the six sub-themes shallow. Furthermore, the reviewer pointed out the importance of tailoring the case to provide inductive teaching of the theoretical concepts presented. Although we had proposed "reflective learning", the way we drafted the narrative and the proposed questions made such a teaching format impossible. The ideal would be "inductive learning" (ASSIS et al., 2013).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK. DEFINITION OF THE CORE THEORY

- Reviewer: "I suggest choosing one of these theories and adapting the case for inductive teaching from it."

As mentioned, six sub-themes related to the knowledge areas of the case with theoretical relationship with each other were selected for grounding. However, the reviewer suggestion reveals the importance of delimiting the choice to a central theory and the related concept. The teaching case should not be written in a way that promotes the analysis of a theory, as argumentative scientific text does. However, considering its role as a complement to the lectures, based on the deductive teaching method, the case should exemplify in a practical way the theory and the theoretical concept chosen, in order to provide the student with their assimilation in a gradual and inductive way (ROESCH, 2007). This is an inductive teaching-learning method, which persuades students to discussions and considerations (ASSIS, et al, 2013), as we will further describe.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS. SCRIPT FOR CONCEPT BUILDING AND INDUCTIVE LEARNING

According to the *reviewers*: *"the way the case is presented does not allow students to chart their own path in learning theoretical concepts".* "A case should lead students, through discussion, to reach a theoretical concept...and not directly demand them to interpret this theoretical concept."".

Teaching may be considered teaching methodology that aims to generate student's leadership in the classroom learning process, through real situations that require decision making (VALDEVINO, *et al*., 2017). They provide student-centered learning (REED; BRUNSON, 2018).

Therefore, both narrative and teaching notes should be produced following an inductive logic, which requires deep engagement and challenge (REED; BRUNSON, 2018). This means that students need not have prior knowledge of the chosen theoretical concept, which will be "attained" over the course of classroom application. The reviewer's comments are indicative that the case missed dialogues that could direct students' reflection toward learning the concepts related to the problematic. Adapting the narrative and teaching notes in this direction contributes to *"the student being able to come to their own conclusions about the situation and thus learn the theory inductively,", as* one of the reviewers put it.

According to Austin (1993) and Sheehan *et al.* (2017), questions are the primary instruments of a debate, as they guide the collective discovery process and deserve close attention. As discussed earlier, the narrative should be designed to enable inductive learning, and teaching notes, especially the questions, need to follow the same logic. **It is like climbing a ladder**: there are the first steps, the middle steps, and the last steps. To reach the top, that is, to reach the goal of climbing the ladder, you have to go all the way up the first, the second, the third rung, until you reach the end. With each step climbed, one gains confidence. At the end of the case, the student is expected to have learned the theoretical concept, thus achieving the objectives of the case.

In the RC version, six questions were proposed for class discussion. Although we followed the current movement of inserting transition questions in teaching cases, aiming to connect the issues discussed in each question, the questions presented were not able to lead students to an inductive reflection. As an example, we would mention the following question, present in the teaching notes of the submitted case: "What is vertical integration strategy? At what points has [fictitious company name omitted] adopted the verticalization strategy?" As one of the reviewers pointed out, the question resembles a test question, asking about the concept rather than supporting students' construction of it. *Reviewer: "The discussion questions are formulated in a structure close to a proof structure."*

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposed discussion questions should not have a prescriptive character, as if there is only one possible solution. They should be structured as a script, a guide that will support the teacher in leading students to their own conclusions, and to the joint construction of the theoretical concept through the classroom debate (AUSTIN, 1993). As recommended by Berte *et al*. (2018), a sound question set starts with broader questions, followed by more detailed questions that require specific analyses.

These recommendations reinforce the relevance of having a single core concept that will underpin the entire construction of the teaching case. In Chart 1, below, we present the questions that originally appeared in the RC, in comparison to a writing with an inductive proposal.

Chart 1 Prescriptive questions versus inductive questions

Rejected case question plan	Question plan for inductive learning
What is vertical integration strategy? At what points has [fictitious company name omitted] adopted the verticalization strategy?	How did [fictitious company name omitted] expand its range of activities toward the source of supply and end users to cope with the Covid-19 crisis?
What are emerging strategies?	What strategies did [fictitious company name omitted] build in the course of its actions in the face of the situations imposed by Covid-19?
Which challenges faced by [fictitious company name omitted] originated from changes on the macro-environment?	What challenges faced by [fictitious company name omitted] stemmed from relevant factors and influences outside the company's boundaries in face of the Covid-19 crisis.
What is a strategic resource and what are the characteristics that make it difficult for competitors to imitate it?	How did [fictitious company name omitted] use resources to address the crisis emerging from Covid-19, and how did this make it difficult for other competing companies to emulate these strategies?

Source: prepared by the authors.

On the left side of Chart 1, “Rejected case question plan”, questions related to various theories and concepts have been inserted. Moreover, they were not designed in an inductive way. To answer the questions, students would need to have studied the theories. *Reviewer: “The proposed questions make it clear that the student should master the concept before participating in this activity.”* After receiving the reviewers’ assessments and reviewing literature, we built a new set of questions. On the right-hand side, “Plan for inductive learning”, questions enable learning from this perspective.

Still in the analogy of a ladder, the ideal is to start with general or “easier” questions and then insert more direct questions to the theoretical concept. The questions should be open-ended and non-directive at the beginning, followed by more directional questions (SHEEHAN *et al*., 2017). For example: what were the main dilemmas faced by [fictitious company name omitted] before the Covid-19 crisis, and how did the company respond? These initial questions will serve for the student to gradually build a framework of information to advance the knowledge and learning that the case sets out to teach. The case for inductive teaching naturally instigates students toward analysis and explanation (ASSIS *et al*., 2013).

With each question they review - each step up - the student will put together the pieces of the inductively elaborated concept, until they get the last piece at the end of the case. It is in this process that inductive learning takes place, going up step by step, reviewing question by question. It is important to think about the type of question and each word used, because they may lead to different types of discussions (AUSTIN, 1993), which do not make inductive learning possible. Reviews of the issues need to be clear and connected to the objectives of the case (AUSTIN, 1993).

ADDITIONAL DATA AND INFORMATION. SHOULD BE ACCESSIBLE TO THE STUDENTS

- Reviewer: "This information should be in the body of the case in an adapted form, students need to have access to this data."; "The attached photos should be mentioned throughout the body of the case."; "I also think it would be important to present the competition of [fictitious company name omitted]."

Another mistake made was to limit access to some information, from secondary sources, to the professor. Considering the recommendations of Roesch (2007) and Alberton and Silva (2018) and the guidelines of different national journals about not inserting references in the narrative text, data and information about the market segment of the company in focus in the teaching case were inserted only in the teaching notes.

However, they were considered relevant by the reviewers for the students to inform their decision making about the dilemma. Therefore, this data would have to be adapted and inserted into the narrative. One option that we considered, and verified with the editorial team of the journal was the insertion of this data and information in an appendix of the narrative. On the other hand, the photos provided by the company were initially inserted in the annexes of the narrative; however, the same reviewer pointed out that it would be more appropriate to present them in the body of the narrative.

Another recommendation was to present information about the competition of the organization under study. This information could either be in the case narrative or in the appendix. Alberton and Silva (2018) consider it acceptable to insert annexes and appendices before the teaching notes, as long as they present information that will subsidize the analysis of the case in class. It is worth noting that it is considered appropriate to keep this additional information in the teaching notes, as long as its purpose is to exclusively provide the teacher with greater understanding of the context or specific issues in the case, or when one of the exercises suggested in the notes is for students to conduct supplemental research (SHEEHAN et al., 2017).

Did we do Something Right After all?

Our teaching case did not consist only of flaws. In this sense, we reinforce that our flaws also consisted of learning moments. Positive points mentioned by the reviewers and highlighted in the literature as good practices, which were adopted by us, are described in this section. The first point of emphasis concerns the interdisciplinary collaboration between faculty members from different areas of Administration in the drafting of the case, which resulted in interesting ideas for the case, something recommended by *Berte et al.* (2018). In addition, the choice of the context of the Covid-19 pandemic proved promising.

- Reviewers: "I would like to congratulate you on the [case name omitted] case on the COVID-19 crisis, which deals with a very relevant topic for management education."; "Congratulations to the authors for their initiative to write a case exploring impacts of COVID on an organization."

The case reported the actual situation faced by a company that had its production and sales directly affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. With the decrees ordering the closure of the establishments of the company's main customers throughout the country, the company found itself in a complicated situation: the accumulation of perishable produce. Furthermore, there were many questions about the safety of the employees and the duration of the lockdown period and the pandemic in general. This was not an isolated situation faced by the company portrayed in the RC. With this, we conclude that choosing contexts that portray current situations and that are not limited to the organization mentioned in the narrative may broaden the potential applicability of the teaching case. This statement is in line with Abell's

(1997) recommendation that a teaching case, although it is written based on a specific organization in a particular context, should be written in a way that enables the generalization of concepts. To this end, Herreid (1998) proposes that the case should relate situations experienced no more than five years ago. Timeliness, authenticity, and complexity of the case are factors that directly impact its relevance (WILLEMS, et al., 2021).

Reviewers: "*Overall, the structure of the case is well organized*."

Even though in terms of content our teaching case presented different flaws, its organization (narrative and teaching notes) proved to be adequate in order to provide understanding by students and teacher and successful application of the case in the classroom. Thus, structuring the case in the right way will make its reading easier. According to Abell (1997), to achieve this, the case text should go through several revisions, especially after it has been applied in the classroom more than once. It is, therefore, an interactive and creative process, which should focus on the students' needs (SHEEHAN *et al.*, 2017).

Another point that we consider positive in our teaching case is the transition questions, which are intermediate questions, between a main question and a subsequent question, that assist the teacher in leading the classroom discussion. These questions should promote debate by the students, causing them to gradually reach consensus and develop the theoretical concept that supported the entire development of the case (ABELL, 1997).

The reflective discussion presented in this paper regarding pre-submission failures, inaccuracies in the CR narrative, and what not to do in the teaching notes offers a set of elements with potential failure-preventive potential. This set could be adopted by other authors during the process of producing cases for teaching.

Of the situations listed in the text, it is especially important to plan with previous guidelines, based on the literature and on information obtained from teachers about the pedagogical and content spaces for the adoption of the case. This may favor the quality of the text, avoiding flaws that could compromise its acceptance. It is also recommended to apply it in the classroom, pursuing feedback of the subject's professor and students, adjusting before submission. If the case is rejected, the authors should think over the reviewers' comments. This is a learning moment and an opportunity to improve the case toward a new direction.

In addition to presenting a number of flaws that culminated in the rejection of a teaching case, an additional contribution of this article is to suggest that case-making should be understood by stakeholders not only as a commitment to get to a text. It should also be understood as a learning experience involving creativity for writing an attractive and encouraging essay to take students to active positions, seizing the reviewers' contributions; and willingness to refine the text, aiming at its publication and application in the classroom.

Basic Guidelines

After the author's experience in the process of construction and publication of the teaching case approached in this article, reflections regarding flaws committed lead us to reinforce the following guidelines that already exist in literature about drafting teaching cases:

1. Organize a case ideation moment.
2. Perform case planning for teaching.
3. Adopt a central theory.
4. Present all the characters contained in the teaching case in the introduction.
5. Present the dilemma of the case in the introduction, and resume it at the end of the narrative
6. Develop concise dialogues between the characters.
7. Produce the discussion questions following an inductive logic.
8. Place all the relevant information for the students' reflection in the narrative.
9. Conduct test application of the case and/or submit it to scientific events for peer review and refinement.

In addition to these guidelines, we advocate that cross-disciplinary of the authors' specialties positively contributed to the elaboration of the case, providing a wider range of ideas and making the case richer. The decision for constructing was made within the research topics of one of the authors, in which this author is a reference. The view of other authors was significant, since it allowed the construction of a readable and understandable case for those who are not researchers in the area. Another recommendation is that authors should adopt a checklist comprising all the elements and steps necessary for the elaboration of the case. The checklist by Berte et al. (2018), composed of the steps of ideation, creation, application, and publication, may be a good option.

Final Considerations

Based on an experience regarding the rejection of a case, this article aimed to highlight, review, and discuss the elements that boosted the reviewers' decision comprising aspects related to both the case narrative and the teaching notes. We highlight here the motivation of the authors in the production of cases, in the context of a discipline of a graduate program in administration at a public HEI. In addition, the impact on the training for management education of the students of the program and the benefits for the undergraduates, as well as the gains inherent in the integration between case producers and reviewers, are evidenced.

From contact with the position of the reviewers, the authors' feelings were that they wanted to learn from them. This atmosphere opened up space for us to continue working on case improvement. We suggest that teaching case authors have a position of gratitude to the reviewers, and see the review process as a learning potential. Before we made changes based on the comments, some thoughts emerged about the shortcomings before the case was submitted. The first, due to the lack of prior definitions of the theme and the theory underlying the case showed how this type of failure leads to negative developments. These starts with the inadequate search for data, diversity of information, formulation of confusing dilemma, having negative consequences also in the elements of the teaching notes, since they need to be aligned with the case. The second, the non-application of the test, which prevented the contact with the feedback of student analysts and professors regarding the experience, without the observations of the case worker, important elements for the improvement of the text.

In the comments of the reviewers regarding the inaccuracies of the narrative, a set of elements stand out, whose contact with them contributed to the learning of the RC authors. It's hoped that it can also collaborate with the experiences of those interested in this modality of production: a) the formulation of the dilemma, b) the conception of the excerpts, the characterization of the dialogues, and c) the targeting of theories. The position of the reviewers regarding aspect "a" contributes to the understanding that the failures mentioned above, concerning the delimitation of the theme and the theory, harmed the formulation of the dilemma, not making clear the problems that should be faced and solved by the analysts. In relation to aspect "b", the comments helped to reflect about how the narrative was loaded with information that referred to several theories and, moreover, with few dialogues, resulting in an uninteresting text for the analysts, besides making it difficult to delimit the dilemma. The vagueness of which theory should be taught with the case, aspect "c", is considered one of the most significant flaws in this rejection story. A relevant learning from one of the reviewers is that "one case does not have the role of reviewing several theories".

According to the reviewers, the main flaws in the case under review were in the teaching notes, comprising a) the summary: place to position the case, delimitation of a central theory and concept, b) the clarity of the proposed educational objective, c) the elaboration of questions that provide inductive teaching, and d) the definition of a central theory.

Think about the question posed by the reviewer regarding the aspect a) *What concept does it (the case) propose to teach*? ... generated a question about why this information was not included in the summary, since it is this information that will lead the teacher to choose or not the case to apply. Therefore, it was a very striking point of reflection for the authors. The indication of six sub-themes related to the educational objectives aspect b) constitutes an ambitious and inappropriate decision for the analysis of a case, being another reason for reflection and learning. The nature of the RC questions stands out in the position of the reviewers, aspect c) presenting a test question that requires the analyst to have prior knowledge of the question, which is contrary to the proposal of the teaching case, the learning is inductive. For this type of learning, it becomes necessary the clear definition of the central theory, aspect d) being this theory that exemplifies in a practical way the way to facilitate the assimilation by the student in a gradual and inductive way (ROESCH, 2007).

The discussion in this article on the recognition of pre-submission laws, as well as the reflections on inaccuracies in the narrative and teaching notes of the RC, is expected to collaborate to avoid flaws in future productions by other authors. The reviewers' contributions are considered by the case producers as an opportunity for learning the modality of production, contributing to inductive teaching-learning. Many lessons have been learned by authors and reviewers throughout the evaluation process. The ladder analogy we created about the inductive learning that students build in case participation may also be applied to the authors of this case, given that each evaluation we received from reviewers and improved, we moved up a rung, put the pieces together. The difference is that for authors of teaching case it is not just a ladder that you climb, you climb one, then there is another, because, as Austin (1993) and Corey (1998) state, cases for teaching, especially teaching notes, are living materials. In this sense, it demands from the authors a constant process of improvement, change and creativity in their production for the advancement of knowledge about the topic, following the changing organizational environments (COREY, 1998).

References

ABELL, D. What Makes a Good Case? **Eccho: The Newsletter of The European Case Clearing House**. Originalmente Publicado por Institute for Management Development - Technical note, Reference nº. IMD-3-0731, 1997. Disponível em: http://www2.econ.iastate.edu/classes/econ362/hallam/CaseStudies/WhatMakesAGoodCase.pdf. Acesso em: 28 nov. 2021.

ALBERTON, A.; SILVA, A. B. da. Como escrever um bom caso para ensino? Reflexões sobre o método. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, v. 22, p. 745-761, 2018. DOI: 10.1590/1982-7849rac2018180212

ASSIS, L. B. *et al*. Estudos de caso no ensino da administração: o erro construtivo libertador como caminho para inserção da pedagogia crítica. **RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie**, v. 14, p. 44-73, 2013. DOI: 10.1590/S1678-69712013000500003

AUSTIN, J. E. Teaching Notes: Communicating the Teacher's Wisdom. **Harvard Business School Background Note**, folheto nº 5, p. 793-105, fev. 1993.

BERTE, E. *et al.* Crafting a teaching case study: ideation to publication. **The CASE Journal**, v. 14, n. 2, p. 232-248, 2018. DOI: 10.1108/TCJ-05-2017-0042

BRUNSTEIN, J.; WALVOORD, M. E.; CUNLIFF, E. Problem-posing in management classrooms for collective sustainability transformation. **International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education**, v. 22, n. 3, p. 477-496, 2021. DOI: 10.1108/IJSHE-05-2020-0141

CHIMENTI, P. C. P. Reflexões sobre Casos de Ensino Memoráveis. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, v. 24, n. 5, p. 376-379, 2020. DOI: 10.1590/1982-7849rac2020200102

COREY, E. Raymond. **Writing cases and teaching notes**. Boston: Harvard Business School Pub., 1998.

FARIA, M.; FIGUEIREDO, K. Casos de ensino no Brasil: Análise bibliométrica e orientações para autores. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea,** v. 17, n. 2, p. 176-197. 2013. DOI: 10.1590/S1415-65552013000200004

HERREID, C. F. What Makes a Good Case? Some Basic Rules of Good Storytelling Help Teachers Generate Student Excitement in the Classroom. **Journal of College Science Teaching**, v. 27, n. 3, 1998.

INKPEN, A. C.; CROSSAN, M. M. Believing is seeing: Joint ventures and organization learning. **Journal of Management Studies**, v. 32, n. 5, p. 595-618, 1995. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1995.tb00790.x

KRUEL, A.; SANTOS, C. Estudo de caso ou caso para ensino? Uma análise de casos produzidos em um curso de especialização no Sul do Brasil. *In*: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DA ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO E PESQUISA EM ADMINISTRAÇÃO, 32. **Anais...** Rio de Janeiro, set. 2008.

MAUFFETTE-LEENDERS, L. A.; ERSKINE, J. A.; LEENDERS, M. R. **Learning with Cases**. 3. ed. London: Ivey Publishing, 2005.

REED, M. M.; BRUNSON, R. R. Exploration of the efficacy of the case method of teaching. **The CASE Journal**, v. 14, n. 3, p. 362-371, 2018. DOI: 10.1108/TCJ-01-2018-0009

REED, J.; SAUNDERS, K.; PFADENHAUER-SIMONDS, S. Problem-posing in a primary grade classroom: utilizing Freire's methods to break the culture of silence. **Multicultural Education**, v. 23, n. 1, p. 56-58, 2015.

ROESCH, S. M. Notas sobre a construção de casos para ensino. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, v. 11, n. 2, p. 213-234, 2007. DOI: 10.1590/S1415-65552007000200012

SHEEHAN, N. T. *et al*. Using Design Thinking to Write and Publish Novel Teaching Cases: Tips From Experienced Case Authors. **Journal of Management Education***,* v. 1, n. 26, 2017. DOI: 10.1177/1052562917741179

VALDEVINO, A. M. *et al.* Caso Para Ensino como Metodologia Ativa em Administração. **Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração**, v. 11, n. 3, p. 1-12, 2017. DOI: 10.12712/rpca.v11i3.1006

WILLEMS, P. P. *et al*. The role of authentic teaching cases and mastery approach goals in online pre-service teachers' self-regulated learning. **Educational Technology Research and Development**, v. 69, n. 2, p. 1003–1023, 2021. DOI:10.1007/s11423-021-09972-9