CHAPTER - II

MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT

2.1 B-Schools in the Global Context

Management denotes the professional administration of business concerns, public undertakings, institutions and organization of all kinds and efficient utilization of resources for optimizing benefits to all the stakeholders. This is a broad-based definition of ‘Management’ as we understand the term today. As such, ‘Management’ is a relatively new concept. The term in English lexicon evolved sometime in the 16th-17th century taking cue from Latin ‘Manus’, Italian ‘Manegiare’ and French ‘Mesnagement’/‘Mangement’. All the terms those preceded ‘Management’ implied control over others, especially manual workers, in order to get things done or decide about how to use available resources. Management, if performed with personal modesty and a sense of service to the community, can be one of the noblest professions. It creates growth, wealth and development in society, provides jobs, fosters innovation and improves living conditions (Onzonol, 2010).

Indeed, ‘Management’ is modern construct that gained significance during the most eventful centuries in Europe marked by renaissance, reforms, scientific revolution, industrial revolution, mercantilism and above all, entrepreneurial spirit. Gradually, a body of knowledge developed around the concept of ‘Management’ although the contributions came from diverse academic disciplines such as sociology, psychology, economics, accounting, mathematics, and law. Thus, when Management education began in the early 20th century, there was already a corpus of literature for education, training and further research. Management education, which was originally conceived as an elite educational track dedicated exclusively to business (and more precisely to big
corporations), found itself confronted with an ever growing demand from millions of
individuals seduced by the promise of a better future, or forced into entrepreneurship
and management by evolution of the markets (Kozminski, 2010).

Lyon Chamber of Commerce & Industry established the first B-School called
EMLYON Business School in Lyon (France) in 1872. Pioneering American
entrepreneur and industrialist Joseph Wharton established the world’s first collegiate
school of business – Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881.
University of Chicago promoted Booth School of Business in 1898. Tuck School of
Business at Dartmouth College was set-up in 1900. Later, Harvard Business School was
established in 1908 by Harvard University. Same year, North-western University
established Kellogg School of Management in Chicago offering part-time evening
programme in Management. In the following years several B-Schools were established
viz. MIT Sloan (1914), Columbia Business School (1916), Stanford Graduate School of
Business (1925), etc.

Progressively, other universities in USA, Europe, and Asia started B-Schools to
catch on the bandwagon of Management education in the latter half of 20th century. For
example, INSEAD was established in 1957, IESE Business School came in 1958,
Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad came in 1961, London Business School
was set up in 1964, National University of Singapore School of Business was founded
in 1965, I E Business School was founded in 1973, Yale School of Management came
in 1976 among others. All these are leading B-schools of the world.

However, Management education gained real impetus in the last decade of 20th
century marked by globalization and liberalization and rise of good number of
transnational corporations. Internationalization of labour market, commodity market and
capital market created incredible opportunities for all by offering choices at the
competitive prices, raising quality of life and aspirations, expanding service sector and providing decent employment to millions of youth. Information and communication technologies revolutionized the way we conduct business.

These developments ensured a great demand for professionals. B-Schools turned up in a big way across the globe to enable a cadre of business leaders and managers with appropriate knowledge, skills and attitude. Business education helped in developing intelligent strategic planning and action, long-term perspective, corporate culture, standards of excellence, effective leadership across the organization, team spirit, objective decision making, standardization of processes and systems. Notable entrants in Management education include IMD Switzerland (1990), Hong Kong UST Business School (1991), China Europe International Business School (1994), Saïd Business School at Oxford University (1996) and Indian School of Business (1996).

However, Management education sector faces greater scrutiny from a wider group of stakeholders than at any time in its history (Onzonol, 2010). True, Management education has now entered a phase of profound transition driven by globalization, technology demographics and pressing social imperatives (Global Foundation for Management Education, 2008). No other academic discipline has accomplished this feat in less than 150 years of existence. B-schools of the world symbolize professionalism, flexibility in learning, innovations in curriculum design and pedagogy, and above all –value for money. No wonder, getting into an MBA is the foremost aspiration of youth across the globe today.

Despite phenomenal expansion of Management education across the globe during last few decades, the B-schools of the world need to focus on eight unmet needs of the MBA programme as espoused by Datar, Garvin & Cullen (2010) in the following framework so that they remain relevant in the times to come:
(i) **Gaining a global perspective**

Identifying, analyzing and practicing how best to manage when faced with economic, institutional and cultural differences across the countries.

(ii) **Developing leadership skills**

Understanding the responsibilities of leadership, developing alternative approaches to inspiring, influencing and guiding others; learning such skills as conducting a performance review and giving critical feedback; and recognizing the impact of one’s actions and behaviours on others.

(iii) **Honing integration skills**

Thinking about issues from diverse, shifting angles to frame problems holistically; learning to make decisions based on multiples, often conflicting, functional perspectives; and building judgment and intuition into messy, unstructured situations.

(iv) **Recognizing organizational realities and implementing effectively**

Influencing others and getting things done in the context of hidden agenda, unwritten rules, political coalitions, and competing points of views.

(v) **Acting creatively and innovatively**

Finding and framing problems; collecting, synthesizing and distilling large volumes of ambiguous data: engaging in generative and lateral thinking; and constantly experimenting and learning.

(vi) **Thinking critically and communicating clearly**

Developing and articulating logical, coherent, and persuasive arguments; marshalling supportive evidences,; and distinguishing facts from opinion
(vii) **Understanding the role, responsibilities and purpose of business**

Balancing financial and non-financial objectives while simultaneously juggling the demands of diverse constituencies such as shareholders, employees, customers, regulators and society

(viii) **Understanding the limits of models and markets**

Asking tough questions about risk by questioning underlying assumptions and emerging patterns; seeking to understand what might go wrong; learning about the sources of errors that lead to flawed decision making and the organizational safeguards that reduce their occurrence; and understanding the tension between regulatory activities aimed at preventing social harm and market-based incentives designed to encourage innovation and efficiency.

Indeed, it is time to reflect on the future of Management education in the global context. Business schools today find themselves in a position to make a very significant and very socially valuable contribution to society, inasmuch as they can improve the efficiency of markets and the confidence of the public in markets and organizations (Patry, 2010). However, they are reeling under institutional crises at the same time. There is a gap or imbalance between theory and practice in both management research and management teaching (Thomas, 2010). Business schools may need a renewed focus and engagement with the needs of practitioners. A 2007 report of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) observed: The rapid change in the size and stature of research in Business schools has engendered passionate dialogue and debate. For example, Business schools have recently been criticized for placing too much emphasis on research relative to teaching and for producing research that is too narrow, irrelevant, and impractical’. As observed by Thomas (2010), there are many
instances of management research in Business schools which are of limited relevance to management practice and that efforts to engage with practitioners are essential.

It goes without saying that the Business schools today have a responsibility to critically assess the models and representations that are central to business education and practice. It is also their responsibility to critically assess the ‘knowledge’ and the ‘models’ that are developed by industry and civil society. This is particularly important during a period of rapid innovation (Patry, 2010). Through international business school alliances and global initiatives to improve the quality of Management education, Business schools might just be one of the major contributors to enhanced quality of life throughout the world (Fernandes, 2010).

Comuel (2010) has rightly observed: ‘In the context of a free economy, Business schools have a crucial role to play in optimizing the way institutions private as well as public –are managed, with the objective of ensuring the best possible level of growth, and thereby ensuring a dramatic improvement in the people’s lives. All in all, management education institutions should declare themselves willing to undergo a very in-depth change –one that without a doubt will force them to redefine the research they conduct and the educational content of the programmes they teach’.

Business schools and Management education institutions are mushrooming not only in affluent areas, equipped with advanced academic institutions of international repute, but also in poor, developing countries, quite often under corrupt and authoritarian regimes (Kozminski, 2010). Mushrooming of Business schools has raised new issues and challenges. Scope of activities in a modern Business school is highly heterogeneous and has to change constantly with the market (Kozminski, 2010). But this is possible only if the Business schools are free to operate their activities. Considerable degree of academic and business autonomy is a pre-requisite for the
development of institutions of higher learning in Management (Kozminski, 2010). Autonomy results directly from the pre-dominantly market driven character of Business schools’ activities, and its dependence upon external, outsourced resources. Autonomy is also needed to maintain a boundaryless and flexible character of the schools’ operations (Kozminski, 2010).

A major refrain of the critics of Management education is lack of academic-industry interface having a bearing on the emerging body of knowledge on Management. Since the activities of business schools focus not on a speculative but a clinical subject i.e. Management, a substantial proportion of academic research should deal with real business problems, jointly with top managers. Investment banks created in the past years true in-house universities that developed huge research on markets and companies but lacked the soundness and independence of academic research. On the other hand, academics have sometimes neglected the practical relevance of their research (Ozonol, 2010). Business schools should act as bridges between academia and the real business world (Ozonol, 2010). By becoming knowledge hubs instead of reservoirs, business schools may better contribute to the advance of Management theory and practice (Ozonol, 2010).

Already a number of premier B-schools in the world such as Harvard Business School, INSEAD, Yale School of Management, Indian Institute of Management (IIMs) etc. have begun a series of change initiatives in order that the MBA courses remain grounded to the emerging realities of business and society. A larger number of B-schools have heeded the emergent need to change lest they lose students’ appeal. It is heartening to note that the institutions are now enthusiastic about the balancing act so that the students have a fair mix of managerial skills and right attitudes alongside domain knowledge. Practice orientation in Management education has truly become a
norm. Routine exercises to redesign curriculum in B-schools are now being used as opportunities to address deficiencies in skills, attitudes, belief-systems, world-views, domain knowledge etc. required to be successful in contemporary organizations. However, stakeholders’ involvement in curriculum redesign is abysmally low.

Besides curriculum redesign and practice orientation in sync with the changing realities in the world of business, the institutions need to focus on developing worthy faculty to meet the ensuing global shortage of educators. Datar, Garvin & Cullen (2010) have vehemently advocated the staffing model of medical schools for B-schools as well so as to ensure a steady supply of skilled instructors. In the medical schools, all the doctors of the attached hospitals serve as faculty. For example, Harvard Medical School with an entering class of 165 students had a total faculty of 10,884 in 2008-2009 that included doctors working in seventeen affiliated hospitals while the core faculty numbered 668 as per the website of the said institution. The doctors served as faculty as they led occasional clerkship, clinical rotation or small-group tutorials. The suggested model provides for meaningful and optimum involvement of practicing managers in Management education. Indeed, faculty members from practice bring a wealth of business experience that enriches both faculty research and classroom learning (Datar, Garvin & Cullen, 2010).

2.2 Management Education in India: An Overview

Management education in India formally began in 1953 at the Indian Institute of Social Welfare and Business Management (IISWBM) –the first B-School established by Government of West Bengal and Kolkata University. However, a few institutions like Tata Institute of Social Sciences (1936) and Xavier Labour Research Institute (1949) had already started training programmes for managers in personnel function well before the formal launch of first MBA programme at IISWBM. IISWBM experiment of
offering two-year, full-time MBA programme was followed by Delhi University (1955), Madras University (1955), Bombay University (1955) and Andhra University (1957). A few other institutions like Administrative Staff College of India Hyderabad (1956), All India Management Association (1957), and National Productivity Council (1958) were established to promote excellence in management practices, research and education.

The Government of India launched Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) as centres of excellence in Management education in early 1960s. The first Indian Institute of Management was set up in Kolkata in 1961 and second in Ahmedabad in 1962. Elite club of IIMs added new members in 1973 (Bangalore), 1984 (Lucknow) and 1997-98 (Khozhikode and Indore). Currently there are 12 IIMs in the country. Over the years, IIMs have evolved as great brand in Management education across the globe and an enviable benchmark for other institutions in terms of quality of faculty, students, curriculum and placement.

Responding to huge demand for managers, many universities started MBA programmes in 1960s and 1970s. Notable entrants in the Management education were Cochin University of Science and Technology (1964), Osmania University (1964), Allahabad University (1965), Punjab University (1968), Banaras Hindu University (1968), University of Pune (1971), Kurukshetra University (1976) etc. By 1980, several state universities across the country started offering MBA programmes. Initially, MBA programmes were part of the Commerce Departments. However, most of the universities have now created Faculty of Management Studies, thus giving due credence to Management education.

Regulation of Management education began in 1987 when All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) was formed and management education was taken as part of the technical education. AICTE helped in regulating the B-Schools in terms of
governance, accountability, transparency in admission and programme administration, infrastructure, students-faculty ratio, curriculum, library, laboratories, grant-in-aid for organizing seminars, conferences, faculty development programmes, setting up of entrepreneurship development cell, institute-industry interface cell etc.

Private sector entered the Management education domain after liberalization of economy in 1991. Despite stringent regulatory framework, there was a spurt of private B-schools in the country offering Post Graduate Diploma in Management. A number of industrial/corporate houses floated their trusts or educational societies to launch B-Schools. According to statistics available on the website of AICTE, there were 1608 MBA programmes and 391 PGDM programme in the country by 2009. The phenomenal growth story of B-Schools continues albeit with lessor sparkle. While the number of B-Schools is said to be about 4000, number of MBA aspirants has declined quite significantly over last three years. As a result, many B-schools have failed to constitute full class in 2011 whereas there has been dismal response for sectoral programmes like International Business, Insurance, Banking & Finance, etc. A number of B-schools, especially those located in remote areas, are likely to close down their shops in the near future due to poor response from students for admission and corporates for placement. Even aspiring faculty members are reluctant to join such institutions.

2.3 Emerging Change Management Issues in B-Schools

B-schools in India are facing multiple issues. However, proliferation of B-Schools, quality of education, faculty shortage, poor regulatory mechanism and governance and accountability are major concerns that merit thorough critical appraisal.
(i) Quality of Education

An important function of Business schools is to develop relevant knowledge, serve as a source of critical thought and inquiry about organizations and management, and thus advance the general public interest as well as the profession of management (Mulla, 2007). Unfortunately, most of the B-schools have thrived on marketing gimmicks and advertising budget rather than intellectual endeavours. The Government of India (GOI) formed the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE), a statutory body under the Ministry of Human Resources to regulate the functioning of technical institutes in India. AICTE has given full autonomy to the B-Schools vis-à-vis curriculum development, assessment of students, conduct of examination, recruitment of faculty, tuition fee etc. However, there are no checks and balances on these matters.

While the AICTE ensures compliance regarding infrastructure, library and laboratory facilities and student-faculty ratio, it overlooks the indicators of quality education. Although AICTE has laid down standards which are not difficult to follow, many institutes do not comply with the prescribed standards once they get approval (Jagadeesh, 2000). Unfortunately, this statutory regulatory body plays merely advisory and supervisory roles. It has no authority to penalize the institutes not adhering to the set standards. It can, at the most, cancel or withdraw the approval of the erring institute. It has been observed that obtaining extension of approval every year is taken as ritual by institutes.

Working Group on Management Education of National Knowledge Commission (2006-07) rightly observes: ‘The materials used for teaching are also not of relevance to the student background or living experiences in India. The focus on campus interviews, careers and jobs further detracts students from gaining a disciplinary understanding of the specializations and society in which they have to innovate and be influential
leaders’. Report of the working Group also draws attention towards negligible debate on curriculum, pedagogy and innovation in Management education as well as lack of inherent capabilities of the institutions to address the evolving needs of various stakeholders by upgrading and refining their courses. The scenario has spiraling impact which is reflected in the low employability of Management graduates.

Indian B-Schools are not exhibiting any significant initiative to improve the quality of education. There has hardly been any conference on quality of Management education in last several years. There is no public forum where the faculty members or deans/directors can meet and discuss the issues pertaining to Management education in general and quality of Management education in particular. Government sponsored committees appointed recently to improve quality of Management education have focused mainly on IIMs, thus leaving out large number of B-Schools managed by public trusts and educational societies. Contribution of institutions like IIMs, All India Management Association (AIMA), Association of Indian Management Schools etc. have been trivial so far as improvement of quality of education in B-Schools is concerned.

(ii) Faculty Shortage

Shortage of qualified faculty in Indian B-Schools is major concern. Currently the institutions are facing 30% shortage of faculty and it might rise up to 50% by 2020 if the scenario does not improve (Dave, 2011). Deans and directors of business schools observe that the key challenges faced by any institute in EQUIS accreditation are international issues (71 per cent concluded that it is most challenging) and faculty shortage (54 per cent). Additionally, management graduates are generally not inclined to enter teaching profession due to lower pay packages as compared to industry offerings.
AACSB International (2002) report states that students who complete their MBA programme find entering job market more lucrative than pursuing doctoral programme. The report also concluded that only 40 per cent of Ph Ds opted for a career in industry. Besides, not many of them have the competency to become good faculty in B-schools. There has been no significant effort on the part of the government or other agencies in the last five decades so far as faculty development is concerned. A few IIMs run short-term Faculty Development Programmes for incumbent faculty members. However, there are fewer programmes to prepare young professionals for career in teaching and research.

Unfortunately, we do not have good number of doctoral research programmes in Management except the Fellow Programme in Management of IIMs and Ph Ds programmes of IITs. According to AACSB report (2003), even in the developed country like the United States which produces largest number of doctorates in business management programmes, the number of business doctorates declined from 1,327 in 1995 to 1,071 in 2000. The trend is expected to continue in the future. It is estimated that by 2015, the US shortage of business Ph Ds will increase to 2,500. Similar trend is expected to exist in other countries as well.

National Knowledge Commission’s Working Group on Management Education advocates a greater role of industry in promoting research programmes in B-schools as they are the major beneficiaries in terms of steady supply of efficient manpower. Indeed, the industry can sponsor research programmes, set up dedicated research chair professorships in specific domains, grant fellowships to doctoral candidates and open their gates for collaborative research projects. Besides, the corporate houses may also encourage some of their senior professionals to participate in research programmes and pursue higher education. B-Schools are unlikely to handle the shortage of faculty
without active support from industry. The Government of India as well as state
governments should also strengthen doctoral research in Management by increasing
intake of students in Ph D programmes in central as well as state universities and
increasing the number of Junior Research Fellowships besides increasing fellowship
grants.

(iii) Poor Regulatory Mechanism

All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) regulates Management
education in India. However, AICTE is better known for corrupt practices rather than
regulation which happens to be its statutory role. Even the National Knowledge
Commission has truthfully observed: ‘…there are several instances where an
engineering college or a Business school is approved, promptly, in a small house of a
metropolitan suburb without the requisite teachers, infrastructure or facilities, but
established universities experience difficulties in obtaining similar approvals.’ (NKC:
Report to the Nation, 2006: 54).

Of late, the AICTE has started cleansing its regulatory mechanism by using a
transparent online disclosure system. However, the regulatory mechanism remains
inadequate due to misplaced focus on infrastructure and faculty-student ratio. Besides,
AICTE does not have wherewithal to check the veracity of the mandatory disclosures
although its team visits a few institutions in different regions randomly. A number of B-
Schools especially in the muffosil bypass the regulatory norms regarding faculty and
infrastructure. In the name of autonomy, many B-Schools overlook the dictates of
AICTE. Hence, matters like fee, quality of faculty, quality of books and journals in the
library etc. are at best at the discretion of the Trusts or Societies that run the B-Schools.
(iv) Governance and Accountability

Most of the private B-Schools in India offering Post Graduate Diploma in Management are managed by charitable trusts registered under Indian Trust Act 1908 or educational societies registered under Societies Registration Act 1860. In case of charitable trusts, the trustees are generally from the same family having absolute powers to manage the affairs of the institutions. As a result, misappropriation of funds is not uncommon. The trustees hold the office for the whole life and hence cannot be removed for their indulgences or mis-governance or incompetence. So is the case of educational societies where majority of founding members belong to the same family. Thus the governing bodies of B-Schools have unlimited power and authority without concomitant responsibility.

AICTE is concerned about compliance of the regulatory norms and hence governance and accountability do not feature in its relations with the B-Schools. Of course, the AICTE has introduced the norms regarding formation of governing body of B-Schools. But over-emphasis on compliance makes room for manipulation by the trustees. A closer look at the mandatory disclosure of B-Schools reveal that they hold only bare minimum number of meetings of Governing Councils or Academic Councils. The institutions fulfil their duties just by mentioning the numbers of meetings as the norms are silent on the quality of output of such meetings.

2.4 Major Stakeholders in B-Schools

(i) Student

The student’s role and relationship with a university is complex. Students are both consumers and products of education (Conway and Yorke, 1991). For a student of a B-school, the following factors are relevant—admissions process, course fee, teaching-learning approach—andragogy/pedagogy, infrastructure,
placement record, brand communications and industry interface. The role of student feedback is important to the student.

(ii) Faculty

Faculty’s role in a B-school is becoming increasingly important today. As quality of teaching, research potential, scope for consultancy and over-all success of the B-school depends largely on the faculty. According to a joint survey conducted by COSMODE Management Research Center and Business World – India, in 2002, Indian B-schools have 3,600 PhDs, the requirement is 11,000 (Joshi, 2006). For a faculty of a B-school, the following parameters are relevant-recruitment and selection process, salary, performance appraisal and reward system, personal vs organizational goals, focus on research, consultancy, and impetus for management development programs, faculty development programs, seminars, conferences, etc.

(iii) Corporate

Corporate recruiters complain that MBAs lack creativity, people skills, global thinking, an aptitude for teamwork, and the ability to speak and write clearly and cogently (Hasan Jameel, 1993). Factors considered as important by the corporate are: skill sets of students-managerial perspective, self-awareness and self-direction, respect for the individual, and value for diversity.

(iv) Minor stakeholders

The minor stakeholders considered are society and government, administrative staff, and media. The conceptual model proposes that the B-school brand is created by top management philosophy and brand management activities, the major and minor stakeholders perceive the B-school brand, the feedback and
inputs given by stakeholders influence and are influenced by the final B-school brand. The model proposes to look at stakeholders – mainly students, faculty, and corporate as co-creators of the service.

2.5 Sustainability in Business Education

It is without doubt to say that business education adds value:

i. To people (as individuals that gain knowledge and skills to sustain the corporate economy);

ii. To organizations, as Longenecker and Ariss (2002) suggest, since it helps them achieve competitive advantage through exposing managers to new ideas, training and development opportunities, practices that may be applied in the corporate context; and

iii. To society by emphasizing on the development of mature and capable citizens in order to lead fulfilling lives and help sustain democratic and learned culture.

A basic element for successful managerial activity is business education whose quality has a major impact on what managers perceive and understand regarding business activity, on their ability to analyze, evaluate and bring together management theory, experience and practice, on using management techniques and making decisions by taking into account hard and soft issues in order to produce wealth. The essence of business education, for more than a century, is perceived by managers and global academic leaders as being synonymous to the provision of a certain knowledge corpus that will enable individuals to acquire a global mindset and act to achieve high self and corporate performance levels.
Despite the fact that the business education model has incorporated all the major changes regarding structure and curriculum that were considered necessary during the 1980s and 1990s (such as emphasizing international dimension, training in soft skills and converging educational content with real business situation) (Paucar-Caceres, 2008), a significant number of researchers and renowned management gurus point out the need for restructuring and improving business education (Minztberg and Gosling, 2002; Pfeffer and Fong, 2002; Ghoshal, 2003, 2005; Bennis and O’Toole, 2005; Holstein, 2005; Tsurumi, 2005; Ferraro et al., 2005).

While there is no empirical evidence to support the view that business schools should undertake fully responsibility for the current crisis (Neubaum et al., 2009) (as education is not the only enabler of human behaviour), business schools must see this crisis as an opportunity to provide their students with an alternative perspective on management (by encouraging their students understand and think upon corporate responsibility and business ethics issues, equipping them with all necessary knowledge and skills to understand and critically approach management practice, managing problems of ethics and involving them at the individual level in learning ethics through the analysis of actual cases (Anninos and Chytiris, 2011).

Sustainability (in management practice), innovation (in all business school processes) and integrated management approach (science, theory and ethics) are presented as key factors for excellence in the future. In the last three to four years the issue of sustainability is gaining momentum in the field of education (Holliday, 2010) due to the intensification of the aforementioned sustainability forces (Charan, 2009; Friedman, 2008). Business education is in a state of necessary transformation in order to meet the needs of a sustainable management vision of the future, something that as Marschall et al. (2010) report, seems to be progressing at a slow pace. To avoid losing
ground in competitiveness and become marginalized and outdated, business schools should quickly adjust the curricula and operation model to prepare graduates to respond to the new emerging sustainability paradigm. The development of the Principles for Responsible Education in 2007 by leading business schools and institutions is helping towards that direction (Principles for Responsible Management Education PRME, 2007). In addition, the leading MBA programs that have incorporated the social and environmental perspective into their curricula are ranked by the Beyond Grey Pinstripes survey (Kurland et al., 2010).

Sustainability should be integrated at the conceptual, theoretical and practical level of business education. In the case of the conceptual level, future managers must be able to understand the connection and interaction of basic principles and acquire a broad perspective of management through the study of philosophy, logic, ethics, metaphorical literature works and arts. This contributes to the development of meddlesome and inquisitive minds and personalities that critically approach and creatively doubt management models and theories. At the theoretical level, students participate and learn the scientific foundation of management and develop technocratic abilities through the study of the traditional business education curriculum from a multidisciplinary perspective. Finally, at the practical level, students engage in business-academia hybrid experiential learning activities and knowledge exchange systems and become aware of the interactions between the economic, social and environmental parameters and business decisions.

Between the two approaches of incorporating sustainability into the curriculum, namely the one suggesting that sustainability should be a distinct course (Gruenewald, 2004; Carrithers and Peterson, 2006) and the other suggesting that it should be diffused in all courses (Ghoshal, 2005; Stubbs and Cocklin, 2008; Audenbrand, 2010), the
second is most suitable as it allows for broadening and challenging students' worldviews, better opportunities for “knowing thyself” and seeing the sustainability dimensions in every area of business activity.

There are certain literature findings that document an increasing trend in business schools regarding the incorporation of sustainability courses into their curricula, the use of experiential learning and immersion techniques and the integration of the sustainability logic in business thinking (Matten and Moon, 2004; Christensen et al., 2007; Wu et al., 2010). However, Benn and Martin (2010) and Gray and Collison (2002) refer to a serious obstacle, namely the tendency of faculty to teach and research sustainability from their own discipline specific perspective. This is further complicated by the inherent obscurity of the meaning and content of sustainability in the business world. Thomas and Benn (2009) also refer to the issue of institutionalization of change and the management of complexities both inside institutions and among universities and communities. To effectively overcome the above barriers, sustainability should be approached as a strategic issue for business schools, embedded initially in the institutional organizational model, something that was noted in a relevant issue of the Journal of Management Education (Rusinko and Sama, 2009). Deans and faculty should show commitment to the sustainable management vision and practice. Transformative leadership, cultural web, use of resources, emphasis on satisfying the stakeholders' demand as well as institutional accountability constitute organizational parameters that display the sustainability orientation of a business school.

With regard to the educational functions, namely teaching, research and social contribution, business schools should become cells of extended physical and web based networks for facilitating knowledge, experience and best practice exchange in which private, social and state actors participate. This is also highlighted in the works of
Bartunek (2007) and Brydon-Miller et al. (2003). Teaching and research should be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and multithematic since business education is primarily university/higher education. It is based on (at least at the university level) mental, methodological and scientific processes that should help students acquire a holistic perspective of the world. The more holistic approach is implemented in business education, the more possible it is for future managers to proceed towards knowing themselves which leads to the revision of personal goals, the acquisition of empathy, the undertaking of company-wide sustainability initiatives, the rejection of the ego/corporate centered mentality and the conscious and influential practice of ethics for the sake of ethics and not due to deceptive stimuli that wear out the foundations of a corporate economy. As Stubbs and Cocklin (2008) admit, the presentation of sustainability issues from a business education perspective is a challenge.

2.6 Core Competence, Competitive Advantage and Organizational performance

Studies on the core competencies offer a wide array of explanations about the concept of core competencies and their role in enhancing the competitive advantage of the firm (Srivastava, 2005). Bogner et al. (1999) expect that academics, business executives and consultants will be able to further develop normative and theoretical propositions that will enrich the understanding of competence and dynamic competitive advantage. Therefore, competitive advantage and core competency are not necessarily the same, but can be (and should be) closely related because a successful competitive strategy is built on the firm’s core competencies and competitive advantages (Javidan, 1998). Core competence is the knowledge set that distinguishes a firm and provides a competitive advantage over others (Leonard-Barton, 1992). Core competencies when viewed as unique knowledge for problem definition and problem solving can form the basis of a firm’s competitive advantage and can also be leveraged in a wide variety of
markets for future products (Srivastava, 2005). Calantone et al. (2002) found that shared vision has a positive effect on an organization’s innovativeness, which in turn affects organizational performance. Bani-Hani & AL-Hawary (2009) indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between core competences and competitive advantage.

2.7 The utility of student feedback

Elemental to establishing and maintaining systems of quality assurance in third level is the collection and analyses of student opinion. Harvey (2003, p. 3) states that feedback “refers to the expressed opinions of students about the services they receive as students, which may include perceptions about the learning and teaching, the learning support facilities, the learning environment, support facilities and (other) external aspects.” He further points to the functions of student feedback as serving both an internal guide for educational improvement and externally as a source of information to other stakeholders (Harvey, 2003). Similarly, Richardson (2005) asserts that feedback can provide diagnostic evidence for all stakeholders associated with the institution and its collection and evaluation contributes to educational quality management (Rowley, 2003).

Student feedback can be measured by means of informal, qualitative methods such as general conversations or formalized through specific focus groups; and structured survey instruments via questionnaires (Harvey, 2003; Rowley, 2003; Richardson, 2005) with the latter being the most common survey medium. Aldridge and Rowley (1998) note that student satisfaction evaluation methods can be generalized into two types: methods that focus on assessing teaching and learning; and methods that assess the total student experience. Harvey (2003) identified five levels of student satisfaction feedback: institutional-level; faculty/departmental-level; degree/educational
Programme - level; module/subject-level and teacher/lecturer evaluation. Similarly, in a review of the literature, Richardson (2005) identified students’ evaluation of teaching, evaluation of course modules, perceptions of academic quality and general/global student satisfaction experiences as typical measurement foci. Each approach attends to a certain aspect of the quality and satisfaction measurement of student experiences; however Richardson (2005) highlights the utility of taking a “holistic” institutional perspective to student satisfaction in that the student’s “total experience” is appraised. Such an orientation he contends generates a rich tapestry of data for institutional information by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of institution-wide service delivery systems (Harvey, 2003; O’ Neill and Palmer, 2004; Richardson, 2005). This can then be used to identify the underlying factors constituting student satisfaction. Consequently, the current study reflects an institutional level analysis concerning students’ overall college experience rather than a micro-evaluation of teaching and module quality.

2.8 Commitment of Top Management

Since leaderships is the predecessor of process improvement (Flumerfelt and Banachowski, 2011), many studies used this dimension, using similar terminologies, as one of main quality dimensions. This is included commitment of top management and leadership (Sakthivel, 2007); leadership (Bayraktar et al., 2008); and top management’s commitment and support (Sayeda et al., 2010).

Commitment of top management is the prerequisite to implement TQM successfully (Sureshchandar et al., 2001). It is generally known that without continuous support of top management, effective TQM implementation cannot be achieved (Sakthivel and Raju, 2006). Therefore, this study treated “Commitment of top management” as the main determinant of all quality dimensions in HE institutions.
There is a need that all hierarchical segments in HE share the same vision of excellence to achieve effectiveness (Sakthivel, 2007). The hierarchy in the HE management include faculty level and department level (Srikanthan and Dalrymple, 2003). Effective implementation of strong leadership has come from the top of the organization (Rowley, 1997). At the same time, as has been note by Kleijnen et al. (2011), “the department is still the primary activity system in higher education”. It is unclear what the effect of faculty’s commitment and the department’s commitment is in implementing quality initiatives. Thus, in this study the “Commitment of top management” was based on the hierarchical level in HE namely “Faculty’s commitment” and “Department’s commitment”.

2.9 Course delivery

There are several terminologies used in previous studies that have been adopted, including: teaching standard (Thakkar, 2006); educational quality (Duque and Weeks, 2010); course organization (Nguyen and Nguyen, 2010).

2.10 Campus facilities

Some similar terminologies have been used to exhibit the importance of this dimension, such as: infrastructure (Sayeda, 2010); learning facilities (Ndirangu and Udoto, 2011); and facilities (Sirvanci, 2004).

Campus facilities are prerequisite for any educational institution to carry out its various activities in a smooth fashion (Sayeda, 2010). So, the “Campus” Facilities dimension was treated as the influencer, after the commitment of top management, for other quality dimensions.

2.11 Courtesy

Courtesy is defined as “an emotive and positive attitude toward students” (Sakthivel et al., 2005). This term was included as one of Parasuraman (1985)’s
determinants of service quality that involve some attitudes, i.e. politeness, respect, consideration and friendliness. The works of Harman (2003), Sahney et al. (2004), Hasan (2008), Sayeda et al. (2010) were taken into account to complete this dimension.

2.12 Customer feedback and improvement

The importance of this dimension has been promoted in several studies (Reid, 2010; and Law and Meyer, 2011). This study considered the works of Aldridge and Rowley (1998), Joseph et al. (1999) and Lagrosen et al. (2004) to complete this dimension.

As stated by Douglas (2008), “student satisfaction has become an extremely important issue for universities and their management”. HEs institution now try to capture the students’ opinion about all of HE’s aspects in order to measure how satisfied the students are (Douglas et al., 2006). Consequently, this study will use “Students’ satisfaction” as the predictor of successful TQM implementation.
CHAPTER - III

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Change Management Overview

In general, management change strategies that (1) enhance perceptions of‘ ease of use’ and perceived usefulness’; (2) provide sufficient information to enable comparison of the before and after processes; (3) introduce new interfaces; and (4) create an empowering vision of the desired end will illuminate the need for change (Davis, et al., 1989, Kotter 1995). Additionally, adjustment of cognitive assessment of the change can be important and should include both clear descriptions of advantages offered by the changes and the expected system improvements to be gained. Cognitive adjustment prepares current system users by communicating the need for change prior to change process initiation (Armendakis, 1993). These strategies must include elements of communication, training, and management support.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is a relevant organizational behavior research stream that addresses change in the workplace, and its acceptance (Deci 1972, Deci and Ryan 1985, Deci and Ryan 1989). SDT research explores the consequences of work climates that enhance intrinsic motivation as well as the integration of extrinsic motivation, which contributes to important work outcomes (Gagne and Deci, 2005). Baard, et al. (2004) focused on workplace factors that support autonomy and facilitate internalization of extrinsic motivation. A workplace exhibiting such factors with timely, effective communications and training can serve to internalize the external motivation for IS implementation (Baard et al., 2004; Kirner, 2006). Understanding and applying this theory of motivation helps the manager access and use strategies to assist in the implementation of change (Armendakis, 1993).