



INSPIRING THROUGH SELF CONTRIBUTION – AN ANALYSIS ON HOW ACTIVE THE INDIAN TOP BUSINESS SCHOOL DIRECTORS IN RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS

Dr. P. S. Aithal

Srinivas Institute of Management Studies, Mangalore, Karnataka

Abstract:

People serving in higher education institutions at an executive level are expected to be a role model for youngsters and have a responsibility in increasing institutional research performance by their active involvement in Research and Publications. Organizational performance depends on individual & team performance. Recently introduced ABC model by Aithal P.S. & Suresh Kumar P.M., has facilitated to calculate individual and institutional annual research index. It is well known that directors in top business schools are reputed, eminent researchers capable of leading the institution through their ability to inspire individuals and teams in the entire institution and capable of enhancing the overall research productivity of the organization. In this paper, we have studied the research contribution of the directors of 33 top Indian business schools by studying their average research productivity for last five years for 2012-2016. The research productivity of the directors/Deans of these 33 top Indian business schools are studied by identifying the number of research papers published, a number of books/edited books published, and the number of book chapters published in an ISBN number books, and a number of business cases published. The research performance of the directors is compared with the annual research performance of their respective institution for the year 2015. The effect of director's research performance as a role model on institutional performance is also discussed using the postulates of Theory A. It is observed that many directors fail to act as role model due to their failure to reach higher research grade.

Index Terms: Research Role models, Inspiring through Self-Contribution, ABC research performance model for individuals & Theory A on Organizational Performance.

1. Introduction:

Inspiring and motivating people resource through creating a role model is one of the strategies to increase the people performance in organizations. The role models with exceptional performance can play a major role in deciding the performance of the people because they can learn from the role model and be inspired by his/her qualities, traits, lifestyle, strategies, dedication, hard work, performance, and challenges. To overcome any challenges and weakness, the people in organizations need to know all the strengths that they have to possess like commitment, determination, persistence, responsibility, resilience, courage, and a positive mental attitude. Role models usually have better plan and control on their plan, responsibility, high ethical or moral values, and are typically hard and smart workers so that other people love to follow them. In an organization, when the employees have ethical/motivational leaders who contribute exceptionally to the development of their organization through their positive way of contribution to the organization, employees learn for improving their performance from the leader. Hence, it's to everyone's advantage to have supervisors who are positive role models. The Brown and Treviño study [1] shown that having institutional role models directly impacts not only on how the employee perceives but, just as importantly, how his/her role model perceive him in his performance.

Researchers have discovered that aspiring to role models can be a resource to surge motivation to the people in organizations. Role models have the power to guide the followers with inspiration to aspiring people to achieve higher. Inspiration from role models typically comes from seeing that particular person obtaining or having a particular attribute or status that one desires [2]. There are two types of role models as positive role models and negative role models [3]. Positive role models are individuals who have achieved outstanding success in their area and are widely expected to inspire others to pursue similar excellence. Accordingly, the accomplishments of many star athletes, musicians, engineers, and award-winning scientists are often showcased in an attempt to enhance people's goals and aspirations. The negative role models are the individuals who have experienced misfortune due to their lack of self-control and indulged in unwanted things which have spoiled their life.

It is found that the positive role models can inspire others by illustrating ideal, desired self, highlighting possible achievements that one can strive for, and demonstrating the route for achieving them [4-5]. The negative role models can inspire one by illustrating a feared, to-be-avoided self, pointing to possible future disasters, and highlighting mistakes that must be avoided so as to prevent them [6]. At different times, people may be differentially receptive to positive and negative role models [7].

Recently published 'Theory A' and its analysis [8-11] on organizational performance has considered the presence of role model in an organization as an affecting factor in organizational individual and group performance. The role model's performance is an essential component to motivate the employees so that they set their target high and capable of taking more challenges through enhanced confidence and ability to do hard work. In this paper, we have used role model - one of the components of theory A and its effect on organizational research performance using ABC model. With an intention to study how the institutional leader can inspire his employees through self-contribution to organizational objectives, an analysis is carried out on how active the Indian top business schools directors in research & publications by collecting last five years data on their research productivity using ABC model. The study also compares the organizational research performance and the director's research performance and discusses the importance of the role models contribution in improving organizational performance. This study also becomes an eye-opener to the directors or people who wants to become directors/deans in higher education and research organizations.

2. About ABC Model of Individual Research Productivity:

According to ABC model of Institutional/individual research productivity developed by Aithal P. S. and Suresh Kumar [12], the success of higher education and research institutions which have objectives of creating new knowledge through research involving all faculty members and students, depends on how much new knowledge they have created during a given observation period, conveniently calculated/measured annually. As per the model, the annual research performance can be determined by knowing the research index (R.I.) of the institution or the individuals and is calculated by considering the total number of research publications during that period. Accordingly, the institutional research productivity is calculated using a metric which consists of three institutional variables and one parameter. The three variables are identified as (A) Number of Articles published in peer-reviewed journals, (B) Number of Books published, and (C) Number of Case studies and/or Book Chapters published during a given time of observation. The parameter used is a number of full-

time Faculty members (F) which remains constant during the given period of observation.

ABC model for measuring institutional performance [12-17] is based on following postulates (1). The Quality of higher education depends on the ability of the institution in new knowledge creation. (2) The ability of new knowledge creation of the institution depends on the institutional research and publications by both faculty members and students. (3) The institutional publication is measured by calculating its annual average publications. (4) The institutional publication ability is measured by its annual publications in terms of the number of Articles published in Journals (A), the number of Books published in the subjects/Edited volumes (B), and the number of Business cases and Book chapters (C) published. (5) The Research productivity (P) of the institution can be measured by knowing research index (α) and weighted research index (β), which shall be calculated using average publications in Journals, average publications of books and an average number of publications of Business cases. The research index per year (α) is calculated using the formula $\alpha = (2A + 5B + C)/F$, and the weighted research index (β), per year, is calculated using the formula $\beta = (2A + 5B + C)/8F$, where A = No. of publications in Journals in that year, B = No. books published in that year, C = No. of Publications of Business Cases published in that year, and F = No. of full-time Faculty members in that institution during that year. In the above formula, the weight age for a research article A is two and that of book B is five and the case study is one, based on a quantified assumption of the relative significance & efforts involved in generating it arrived at through a summated scaling technique. (6) The annual research productivity (research index α) of the organization decides institutional ranking.

Research index is calculated using following formulae: Research productivity index of the Higher Education Institution, $\alpha = (2A + 5B + 1C) / F$, where A is number of papers published in reviewed & indexed Journals with ISSN number during a given year, B is number of books published with ISBN number during a given year, and C is sum of number of business cases and book chapters published during a given year. F is number full-time faculty members of the institution during a given year.

$$\text{Institutional Research productivity index } \alpha = [(2A + 5B + 1C) / F] \text{ ---- (1)}$$

The weighted average is an average in which each quantity to be averaged is assigned a weight age. These weight ages determine the relative importance of each quantity on the average. Weight ages are the equivalent of having that many like items with the same value involved in the average. Weighted Research productivity index of the Higher Education Institution are calculated using following formula:

$$\text{Weighted Research Productivity index, } \beta = [(2A + 5B + 1C) / 8] / F \text{ --- (2)}$$

Where A is the number of papers published in reviewed & indexed Journals with ISSN number during a given year, B is the number of books published with ISBN number during a given year, and C is the sum of the number of business cases and book chapters published during a given year. F is number full-time faculty members during a given year [12].

For individual researcher or faculty who has the responsibility of contributing to the new knowledge, the ABC model can be used to calculate the individual research productivity. Accordingly, the individual annual research productivity index = $(2A + 5B + 1C)/8$ ----- (3)

Average research productivity index for a given period $\beta = (2A + 5B + 1C)/8T$ --- -- (4), where T is the number of years of observation.

An individual research faculty, to be considered as competitive, should maintain annual research index and averaged annual research index at least 2. Table 1, which is

developed using Focus group method [18-36] gives an idea of placing an individual researcher in a different category based on his/her expected annual research index.

Table 1: Annual Performance Indicator Chart of individual researcher grade based on expected annual research index [12]

S.No	Annual Research Index	Annual Weighted Research Index	Individual Annual/Average Researcher Grade
1	24 & above	3.0 & Above	Super Performer
2	16 - 24	2.0 - 3.0	Optimum Performer
3	8 - 16	1.0 - 2.0	Best Performer
4	4 - 8	0.5 - 1.0	Better Performer
5	3 - 4	0.375 - 0.5	Good Performer
6	2 - 3	0.25 - 0.375	Satisfactory Performer
7	1 - 2	0.125 - 0.25	Poor Performer
8	0 - 1	0 - 0.125	Non-Performer

3. ABC Model using Theory A:

Theory A on organizational performance challenges the existing propositions on human behaviour and motivation. It is founded in the context of changed employee mindset of the modern day employee which has undergone enormous change due to changes in technology and means of production, production relations, customer and societal perception and ones own expectations. Quest for creativity, propels the employee to contribute to the organization drawing positive energy from his innate potential and tuned to best performance models around him through self-exploration. This is a management strategy which believes in delivering targets as responsibility, feeling of creativity and contribution for motivation, identifying with the organization as commitment and accountability as a hallmark of efficiency. Essential elements of Theory of Accountability (Theory A) are: (1) Planning, (2) Target setting, (3) Motivation, (4) Work Strategies, (5) Responsibility, (6) Role model, (7) Monitoring & Guiding, and (8) Accountability. These elements are explained as follows:

I. Planning:

- ✓ Either individually or jointly head of the organization reflects the institutional strength and weaknesses. This is a periodic function to keep the relevance of the organization updated and face newer challenges that emerge.
- ✓ As a consequence, various problems may surface, but using ingenuity and discretion, the pressing problem is zeroed in. This is collectively done.
- ✓ A candid policy is essential for backing managerial actions. This is formulated involving section heads.
- ✓ The policy spells out in clear terms the broad direction the organization will be heading for.

II. Target Setting:

- ✓ The problem that has been identified and the policy formulated has to be communicated to everyone in the organization.
- ✓ This stimulates a process of mutual consultation and dialog among members of the organization.
- ✓ As a result, the members realize what has been ailing them and how to overcome that.
- ✓ They become prepared to devote their effort towards better performance.

III. Motivation:

- ✓ Following the realization and preparedness to perform desirably, their interest is aroused through group process by which the group adopts the idea.

- ✓ This group process also helps members discover their potential through self-exploration.
- ✓ They are also influenced by their reference group namely ideal performers [37-42].
- ✓ As a result of this ideas become translated into performance.

IV. Work Strategies:

- ✓ The strategy is important for success. First and foremost, it is important that the members of the organizations set their individual goals in consonance with the organizational goal. This comes in the form of a desire.
- ✓ Identical goals transform into sharing of group goals and generate team spirit.
- ✓ Materialising creative talents gives the individual a feeling of empowerment.
- ✓ The organization also extend support as an enabling strategy.

V. Responsibility:

- ✓ Assuming responsibility is owing responsibility, rather the manifestation of commitment.
- ✓ This gives speed and certainty of actions in delivering responsibility.
- ✓ Then comes task execution which is a crucial part of all.
- ✓ This is done for goal attainment that helps target fulfilment.

VI. Role Model:

- ✓ Good performance is highlighted.
- ✓ Best performers become role models which influence other members in performance.
- ✓ This results in a change of attitude from somewhat positive to highly positive from the mediocre performance.
- ✓ Develops redness to change.

VII. Monitoring:

- ✓ There would be periodic re-visits to the targets set, its execution, and lack if any.
- ✓ This gives an opportunity for everyone to appraise their work/actions/task.
- ✓ As a consequence, timeframe is set for the lag.
- ✓ Members accomplish the task.

VIII. Accountability:

- ✓ Individual commitment is evaluated during performance assessment. Performance is measured against group goal, individual goal, and organizational support.
- ✓ That organizational influence application of knowledge and skill into effective performance is reiterated. Performance is enhanced in a conducive environment of expediency created by necessity.
- ✓ Organization strives to foster inherent creativity to transform it and integrate it into the organizational goal.
- ✓ Acknowledgment of contribution is shared between individual and organization. Poor performers undergo recycling.

In higher education and research organizations, Theory A plays an important role in all the stages of organizational performance. Adopting Theory A by intensifying all its constructs on organizational dynamic resources (people) enhance research productivity. Organizational director/leader has multi-role in implementing Theory A in his/her organization effectively. The director, being the role model in an organization, expected to be involved in setting up the goal of individual researcher, planning in their annual research, supports acquiring required resources, building up their responsibility towards hard work through successful working strategy and innovative thinking, be

role model for every researcher through their exceptional personal contribution, monitoring each and every researchers performance through conducting meetings and interaction with individual researcher, and by fixing accountability on individuals and groups for better performance as well as poor performance. It is the strategy and the smartness of individual administrator who is appointed as the director of the organization to develop a healthy competitive environment in the organization for enhancing and optimizing organizational research productivity through publications. Thus the effective implementation of Theory A by an administrator who can also be a role model for researchers through his personal contribution can increase organizational research index to be calculated using ABC model.

4. Top Business Schools in India:

Recently, National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), Dept. of HRD, Govt. of India announced 50 top business schools in India based on five criterion of evaluation. The top 30 Business schools from NIRF ranking list with number of faculty members, number of research students, number of Journal articles publications (A) and the institutional weighted annual research index for the year 2015[12] are given in table 2.

Table 2: Human Resources and Journal Publications of year 2015 in some top Business schools in India

B-School	Rank	No. of Faculty	No. of Research Scholars	No. of Publications in Journals	Weighted Annual Research Index for 2015 (β)
IIM, Bangalore	1	97	72	49	0.166
IIM, Ahmedabad	2	143	55	61	0.174
IIM, Calcutta	3	89	53	40	0.129
IIM, Lucknow	4	81	74	62	0.180
IIM, Udaipur	5	29	0	06	0.051
IIM, Kozhikode	6	89	33	49	0.144
International Management Institute-New Delhi	7	44	24	44	0.235
Indian Institute of Forest Management, Bhopal	8	33	0	-	-
Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur	9	20	0	10	0.125
IIM, Indore	10	86	46	53	0.196
Management Development Institute, Gurgaon	11	80	64	19	0.053
International Management Institute, Kolkata	12	19	0	03	0.073
Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI), Jemshedpur	13	82	20	55	0.223
IIM, Tiruchirappalli	14	30	14	10	0.074
Thiagarajar School of Management, T. N.	15	29	0	15	0.154
S. P. Jain Institute of Management & Research, Mumbai	16	44	0	13	0.117
Vellore Institute of Technology	17	26	24	8	0.050
IIM, Raipur	18	20	37	03	0.025
IIM, Rohtak	19	18	15	40	0.489
Indian Institute of Management, Meghalaya	20	28	11	11	0.113

IIM, Kashipur	21	29	28	15	0.143
IIT&M, Gwalior	22	10	40	06	0.075
Fore School of Management-New Delhi	23	41	0	24	0.161
Lal Bahadur Shastri Institute of Management, Delhi	24	34	0	13	0.180
Birla Institute of Technology Business School	25	19	2	15	0.188
Jaipuria Institute of Management, Noida	26	36	21	10	0.073
Department of Business Administration - Tezpur University	27	13	18	9	0.204
IIM, Ranchi	28	19	14	10	0.109
Institute of Management, Nirma University	29	37	20	24	0.253
Xavier Institute of Management & Entrepreneurship, Bangalore	30	25	0	5	0.125
Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai	31	32	0	4	0.028
Institute of Management Technology, Nagpur	39	41	0	18	0.144
Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad	-	69	0	48	0.306
T.A. Pai Management Institute(TAPMI), Manipal	-	32	0	07	0.058
Indian School of Business (ISB), Hyderabad	-	45	11	30	0.266
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT) New Delhi	-	56	10	21	0.143
SDM IMD, Mysore		18	0	22	0.305
XIM, Bhubaneswar		57	30	34	0.130

5. ABC Model using Theory A:

As per theory A, the research institution should have confined objective on research contribution by using resources in the institution. Based on the research objectives developed in the board meeting, the director has a responsibility of implementing the research objectives by fixing the goal of researchers and allocating the resources as per the requirement. The institutional director has a great responsibility of managing and directing the researchers by setting their target as per the institutional objectives. Accordingly, individual researcher (both faculty members and students) should plan their research and identify their working papers. Based on such plan and presentation of such plan in organizational meetings, the director can set the individual and collective target for every year. The next stage of theory A is the motivation of researchers by encouraging them to work hard and continuous follow-up in the research activities. In this stage, the individual and the departmental work strategies should be studied and supported. By arranging conferences and meetings with experts the researcher's morale and confidence on thinking innovatively can be boosted. The institution should have policies to promote research and publications by providing supporting services to the researchers so that there should not be any constraints to the researchers to publish their results. Based on theory A, there should

be stated policy annually to publish papers in journals (A), publish books on subjects (B), and the case studies and book chapters (C) so that institution can plan for high annual research index. The institution should share the responsibility to each and every researcher to fulfill the objective of reaching the planned research index. In this responsibility, the director and some senior professors should act as role model for young researchers by showing their super-researcher ability. The institutional director has a responsibility to promote himself as a super researcher so that every other researcher will get inspiration to follow their path. The director of the institution has a dual role as super-researcher-role-model and as a super-guide by monitoring everybody's progress and supporting them to reach their goal. This can be achieved by arranging faculty/researchers meeting every week to follow-up the progress. Based on such continuous monitoring, by the director of the organization, the institution can achieve its goal of improving research performance. Finally, the review on research performance and publications of all the researchers/faculty members should be carried out including director of the institution based on stated metric to calculate individual annual research index and institutional annual research index. The annual research index of individual faculty can be compared with the standard grading table, for example, as given table 1 and individual faculty grading can be determined. Depending on the grading level achieved by the faculty members and their contribution to the research, increments, and promotions or demotion or relieving from the job should be decided so that each and every faculty including the director will be made accountable for the organizational research performance according to 'Theory A'. To support the role model construct factor of theory A, which inspires the performance of employees in an organization, we have calculated the average annual weighted research index (β) of 33 Indian top business school Directors/Deans for last 5 years (2012-2016) and is listed in table 3. Based on weighted research index (β) value of these directors/deans, the ranking of of Directors/Deans for their individual research output is listed in table 4.

Table 3: Average Annual Research index of Indian top business school Directors/Deans for last 5 years (2012-2016)

S.No	Institute	Director/Dean (2016)	Google Scholar Citations since 2011	A	B	C	Average Annual Research index, β
1	IIM, Bangalore	Raghavan Srinivasan	-	0	3	1	0.40
2	IIM, Ahmedabad	Ashish Nanda	-	0	0	6	0.15
3	IIM, Indore	Rishiksha T Krishnan	263	8	1	4	0.625
4	IIM, Calcutta	Saibal Chattopadhyay	-	0	0	0	0.0
5	IIM, Lucknow	Ajit Prasad	-	0	0	0	0.0
6	IIM, Kozhikode	Kulbushan Balooni	296	6	0	0	0.30
7	IIM, Raipur	B. S. Sahay	1,762	3	1	5	0.40
8	IIM, Udaipur	Janat Shah	-	11	0	1	0.575
9	International Management Institute-New Delhi	Pradip K Bhaumik	-	04	0	0	0.20

10	Indian Institute of Forest Management, Bhopal	G. A. Kinhal (2013)	-	0	0	0	0
11	Management Development Institute, Gurgaon	C.P. Shrimali (2011-Present)	-	0	0	0	0
12	International Management Institute, Kolkata	Arindam Banik (2014- present)	88	4	2	3	0.525
13	Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI), Bangalore	E. Abraham, S.J. (2009-present)	-	0	0	0	0
14	IIM, Tiruchirappalli	PrafullaAgnihotri	-	0	0	0	0
15	Thiagarajar School of Management, TN	M. Selvalakshmi	-	4	0	0	0.2
16	S. P. Jain Institute of Management & Research, Mumbai	Ranjan Banerjee (2015-Present)	-	2	0	0	0.1
17	IIM, Rohtak	AtanuRakshit	-	4	0	0	0.2
18	Indian Institute of Management, Meghalaya	Amitabha De	-	0	0	0	0
19	IIM, Kashipur	GautamSinha	152	2	0	0	0.1
20	Fore School of Management-New Delhi	Jitendra K. Das	-	2	0	7	0.275
21	LalBahadurShastri Institute of Management, Delhi	Arya Kumar	-	11	01	2	0.725
22	Jaipuria Institute of Management, Noida	Rajiv R Thakur	-	2	0	0	0.1
23	IIM, Ranchi	AnindyaSen	-	0	0	0	0
24	Xavier Institute of Management & Entrepreneurship, Bangalore	JeyakarVedamanickam	17	0	0	0	0
25	Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai	Bala V. Balachandran	-	4	1	0	0.225
26	Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad	AtishChattopadhyay	-	2	0	1	0.125
27	Institute of Management Technology, Nagpur	Subhajit Bhattacharyya	-	0	0	0	0
28	Birla Institute of Management Technology	H.Chaturvedi (1999-Till date)	-	1	2	0	0.30
29	Institute of Management, Nirma University	Mallikarjun M	-	4	0	2	0.25

30	VIT Business School, Vellore Institute of Technology.	Ashok D	-	0	0	0	0
31	TAPMI, Manipal	Natarajan R C	-	0	0	0	0
32	SDMIMD, Mysore	N. R. Parasuraman	-	8	04	10	1.15
33	ISB, Hyderabad	K. RajendraSrivastava	-	5	2	3	0.575

Table 4: Ranking of Indian top business schools based on research output of Directors/Deans during last 5 years (2012-2016) as on 30/09/2016

S.No	Institute	Director/Dean (2016)	Google Scholar Citations since 2011	Average Annual Research index, β	Rank
1	IIM, Bangalore	Raghavan Srinivasan	-	0.40	Rank 7
2	IIM, Ahmedabad	Ashish Nanda	-	0.15	Rank 17
3	IIM, Indore	Rishikesha T Krishnan	263	0.625	Rank 3
4	IIM, Calcutta	Saibal Chattopadhyay	-	0.0	Rank 22
5	IIM, Lucknow	Ajit Prasad	-	0.0	Rank 22
6	IIM, Kozhikode	Kulbhushan Balooni	296	0.30	Rank 9
7	IIM, Raipur	B. S. Sahay	1,762	0.40	Rank 7
8	IIM, Udaipur	Janat Shah	-	0.575	Rank 4
9	International Management Institute-New Delhi	Pradip K Bhaumik	-	0.20	Rank 14
10	Indian Institute of Forest Management, Bhopal	G. A. Kinhal (2013)	-	0	Rank 22
11	Management Development Institute, Gurgaon	C.P. Shrimali (2011-Present)	-	0	Rank 22
12	International Management Institute, Kolkata	Arindam Banik (2014- present)	88	0.525	Rank 6
13	Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI), Bangalore	E. Abraham, S.J. (2009-present)	-	0	Rank 22
14	IIM, Tiruchirappalli	Prafulla Agnihotri	-	0	Rank 22
15	Thiagarajar School of Management, T. N.	M. Selvalakshmi	-	0.20	Rank 14
16	S. P. Jain Institute of Management & Research, Mumbai	Ranjan Banerjee (2015-Present)	-	0.10	Rank 19
17	IIM, Rohtak	Atanu Rakshit	-	0.20	Rank 14
18	Indian Institute of Management, Meghalaya	Amitabha De	-	0	Rank 22
19	IIM, Kashipur	Gautam Sinha	152	0.10	Rank 19

20	Fore School of Management-New Delhi	Jitendra K. Das	-	0.275	Rank 11
21	LalBahadur Shastri Institute of Management, Delhi	Arya Kumar	-	0.725	Rank 2
22	Jaipuria Institute of Management, Noida	Rajiv R Thakur	-	0.10	Rank 19
23	IIM, Ranchi	Anindya Sen	-	0	Rank 22
24	Xavier Institute of Management & Entrepreneurship, Bangalore	Jeyakar Vedamanickam	17	0	Rank 22
25	Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai	Bala V. Balachandran	-	0.225	Rank 13
26	Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad	Atish Chattopadhyay	-	0.125	Rank 18
27	Institute of Management Technology, Nagpur	Subhajit Bhattacharyya	-	0	Rank 22
28	Birla Institute of Management Technology	H. Chaturvedi (1999-Till date)	-	0.30	Rank 9
29	Institute of Management, Nirma University	Mallikarjun M	-	0.25	Rank 12
30	VIT Business School, Vellore Institute of Technology.	Ashok D	-	0	Rank 22
31	TAPMI, Manipal	Natarajan R C	-	0	Rank 22
32	SDMIMD, Mysore	N. R. Parasuraman	-	1.15	Rank 1
33	ISB, Hyderabad	K. Rajendra Srivastava	-	0.575	Rank 4

6. Analysis of the Result:

As per the ABC model of research productivity, the individual research performance can be determined using annual research productivity of the faculty members and it can be averaged for a given period, say five years. In the present research, the five years averaged research performance of some of the top Indian business school Directors/Deans is determined. As per the result, the average research index is observed to be very low for a major number of directors/deans. In any business school which is involved in higher education and research, the institutional Directors are expected to be role models for all the faculty members through their individual contribution for the research output along with inspiring other researchers in their organization and they should be a motivator for other faculty members of the institution to maximize their performance.

Directors of higher educational & research institutions if act as the role model based on their direct involvement in new knowledge creation and hence in research publication, their exceptional performance can inspire the faculty members and other researchers in the organization get inspiration for innovative research. Thrash and Elliot (2004) [43] argued that inspiration involves two distinct processes—a relatively passive process that they called being inspired *by*, and a relatively active process that they called being inspired *to*. The process of being inspired *by* involves appreciation of

the perceived intrinsic value of a stimulus object, usually the senior professors and director of the institution, whereas the process of being inspired *to* involves motivation to actualize or extend the valued qualities of faculty and researchers to innovate new knowledge through research. Thrash and Elliot (2004) [44] further proposed that the process of being inspired *by* gives rise to the core characteristics of evocation and transcendence, whereas the process of being inspired *to* gives rise to the core characteristic of approach motivation [44]. Thus it is evident that the director or senior professors who do exceptionally well in research are essential to inspire other faculty and researchers in higher educational institutions and should act as role model so that everybody in the organization get motivation to create innovative research through their active involvement in creating new ideas or concepts and publish them as research output of the organization as a major construct of Theory A. As seen from table 5, some of the directors who are good research performer or better research performer could not act as role model and inspire the faculty and other researchers in their organization probably due to their low leadership and administrative abilities. This may be because of the reason that such directors might be failed to implement other components of Theory A like target setting, motivation, continuous monitoring, or due to the failure of adopting proper accountability system in the organization.

Table 5: Comparison of institutional research index for the year 2015 and the last five years average research index of directors/Deans

S.No	Institute	α & β Institutional Research Grade for 2015	Director/Dean	β and Individual Grade averaged for last 5 years
1	IIM, Bangalore	1.33&0.166 Poor Performer	Raghavan Srinivasan	0.40 Good Performer
2	IIM, Ahmedabad	1.39&0.174 Poor Performer	Ashish Nanda	0.15 Poor Performer
3	IIM, Indore	1.57&0.176 Poor Performer	Rishikesh T Krishnan	0.625 Better Performer
4	IIM, Calcutta	1.03&0.129 Poor Performer	Saibal Chattopadhyay	0.0 Non-Performer
5	IIM, Lucknow	1.44&0.18 Poor Performer	Ajit Prasad	0.0 Non-Performer
6	IIM, Kozhikode	1.15&0.144 Poor Performer	Kulbhushan Balooni	0.30 Satisfactory Performer
7	IIM, Raipur	0.20&0.025 Non-Performer	B. S. Sahay	0.40 Good Performer
8	IIM, Udaipur	0.41&0.051 Non-Performer	Janat Shah	0.575 Better Performer
9	International Management Institute-New Delhi	1.88&0.235 Poor Performer	Pradip K Bhaumik	0.20 Poor Performer
10	Indian Institute of Forest Management, Bhopal	-	G. A. Kinhal (2013 - present)	0 Non-Performer
11	Management Development Institute, Gurgaon	0.42&0.053 Non-Performer	C.P. Shrimali (2011-Present)	0 Non-Performer
12	International Management Institute, Kolkata	0.58&0.0725 Non-Performer	Arindam Banik (2014- present)	0.525 Non-Performer

13	Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI), Jemshedpur	1.78&0.223 Poor Performer	E. Abraham, S.J. (2009-present)	0 Non-Performer
14	IIM, Tiruchirappalli	0.588&0.074 Non-Performer	Prafulla Agnihotri	0 Non-Performer
15	Thiagarajar School of Management, T. N.	1.23&0.154 Poor Performer	M. Selvalakshmi	0.2 Poor Performer
16	S. P. Jain Institute of Management & Research, Mumbai	0.934&0.117 Non-Performer	Ranjan Banerjee (2015-Present)	0.1 Poor Performer
17	IIM, Rohtak	3.91&0.489 Good Performer	AtanuRakshit	0.2 Poor Performer
18	Indian Institute of Management, Meghalaya	0.9&0.113 Non-Performer	Amitabha De	0 Non-Performer
19	IIM, Kashipur	1.14&0.143 Poor Performer	GautamSinha	0.1 Poor Performer
20	Fore School of Management-New Delhi	1.29&0.161 Poor Performer	Jitendra K. Das	0.275 Satisfactory Performer
21	Lal Bahadur Shastri Institute of Management, Delhi	1.44&0.18 Poor Performer	Arya Kumar	0.725 Better Performer
22	Jaipuria Institute of Management, Noida	0.58&0.073 Non-Performer	Rajiv R Thakur	0.1 Poor Performer
23	IIM, Ranchi	0.87&0.109 Non-Performer	AnindyaSen	0 Non-Performer
24	Xavier Institute of Management & Entrepreneurship, Bangalore	1.0&0.125 Poor Performer	Jeyakar Vedamanickam	0 Non-Performer
25	Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai	0.22&0.028 Non-Performer	Bala V. Balachandran	0.225 Poor Performer
26	Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad	2.45&0.306 Satisfactory Performer	Atish Chattopadhyay	0.125 Poor Performer
27	Institute of Management Technology, Nagpur	1.15&0.144 Poor Performer	Subhajit Bhattacharyya	0 Non-Performer
28	Birla Institute of Management Technology	1.5&0.188 Poor Performer	H. Chaturvedi (1999-Till date)	0.30 Satisfactory Performer
29	Institute of Management, Nirma University	2.02&0.253 Satisfactory Performer	Mallikarjun M	0.25 Satisfactory Performer
30	VIT Business School, Vellore Institute of Technology.	0.4&0.05 Non-Performer	Ashok D	0 Non-Performer
31	TAPMI, Manipal	0.46&0.058 Non-Performer	Natarajan R C	0 Non-Performer
32	SDMIMD, Mysore	2.44&0.305 Satisfactory Performer	N. R. Parasuraman	1.15 Poor Performer
33	ISB, Hyderabad	2.13&0.266 Satisfactory	K. Rajendra Srivastava	0.575 Better Performer

	Performer		
--	-----------	--	--

Table 6: Percentage of Directors of Indian top Business schools with their grade

S.No	Grade	Number (out of 33)	Percentage (%)
1	Non-performers	13	38
2	Poor Performers	10	30
3	Satisfactory Performers	04	13
4	Good Performers	02	07
5	Better Performers	04	12
6	Optimum Performers	0	0
7	Super Performers	0	0

Based on the analysis data of 33 top Indian business schools, 38% of directors are falling into non-performers category, 30% of directors are falling into poor performers category, 13% directors have satisfactory research performance, 7% directors are good research performers, and 12% directors are Best performers as per their individual research contribution is concerned. The result shows there are no optimum and super research performers serving as directors in this 33 top Indian Business schools as shown in table 6. In contrary, there are many directors worked or working in Indian top engineering and scientific institutions performed/performing very well in terms of their individual research contribution and reached the grades like super researchers, optimum researchers, or better researchers as shown in table 7 as an example. Such researcher cum directors are lacking in the business management research area in the country. This may be also one of the reasons for observed low research output in business management schools in the country.

Table 7: Last five years average research index of directors of Top IIT's

S.No	Institute	Director	Last 5 years Average Research Index & Grade	Total Citation since 2011
1	JNCASR, Bangalore	C.N.R. Rao Former Director	7.63 Super Performer	36,919
2	IISc. Bangalore	Anurag Kumar	1.33 Best Performer	1,930
3	IIT, Madras	B. Ramamoorthi	1.5 Best Performer	-
4	IIT, Bombay	Devang Khakhar	1.0 Best Performer	1,703
5	IIT Delhi	V. Ramgopal Rao	3.4 Super Performer	-
6	IIT, Kharagpur	Partha Pratim Chakraborty	1.4 Best Performer	733
7	IIT, Kanpur	Indranil Manna	1.0 Best Performer	-
8	PRL, Ahmedabad	G. S. Agarwal Former Director,	3.75 Super Performer	7,509

7. Conclusion:

The role model's performance is an essential component to motivate the employees so that they set a high target and capable of taking more challenges through enhanced confidence and ability to do hard work. In this paper, we have used role model - one of the components of theory A and its effect on organizational research performance using ABC model. With an intention to study how the institutional leader can inspire his employees through self-contribution to organizational objectives, an analysis is carried out on how active the Indian top business schools directors in research & publications by collecting last five years data on their research productivity using ABC model. The study also compares the organizational research performance

and the director's research performance and discusses the importance of the role models contribution in improving organizational performance. This study also becomes an eye-opener to the directors or people who wants to become directors/deans in higher education and research organizations. Based on the analysis data of 33 top Indian business schools, 38% of directors are falling into non-performers category, 30% of directors are falling into poor performers category, 13% directors have satisfactory research performance, 7% directors are good research performers, and 12% directors are Best performers as per their individual research contribution is concerned. The result shows there are no optimum and super research performers serving as directors in this 33 top Indian Business schools.

8. References:

1. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2013). Do role models matter? An investigation of role modeling as an antecedent of perceived ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1769-0.
2. Payne, W., Reynolds, M., Brown, S., Fleming, A. (2004). Sports role models and their impact on participation in physical activity: A literature review. *Journal of Sports Management*, 26, 1, 146-152.
3. Lockwood, P., Jordan C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by Positive or Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854-864.
4. Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997). Superstars and me: Predicting the impact of role models on the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 91-103.
5. Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Salience of best selves undermines inspiration by outstanding role models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 214-228.
6. Lockwood, P. (2002). Could it happen to you? Predicting the impact of downward comparisons on the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 343-358.
7. Stapel, D. A., & Koomen, W. (2001). I, we, and the effects of others on me: How self-construal level moderates social comparison effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 766-781.
8. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016). Organizational Behaviour in 21st Century – Theory A for Managing People for Performance, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, ISSN: 2319-7668, Vol. 18, Issue 7, pp. 126-134. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.9790/487X-180704126134>.
9. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016). Comparative Analysis of Theory X, Theory Y, Theory Z, and Theory A for Managing People and Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME)*, 1(1), 803-812. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.154600>.
10. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016). Theory A for Optimizing Human Productivity, *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences (ISSN 2455-2267)*, 4(3), 526-535. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v4.n3.p2>.
11. Aithal, P. S. (2016). How to Increase Research Productivity in Higher Educational Institutions –SIMS Model, *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME)*, 1(1), 447-458. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161037>.
12. Aithal, P. S., & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016). ABC Model of Research Productivity and Higher Educational Institutional Ranking, *Proceedings of National*

- conference on Curriculum Design and Development for Student centric Learning, Mangalore, India, pp.11-22. ISBN 978-81-929306-9-5.
13. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P. M., (2016). ABC Model of Research Productivity and Higher Educational Institutional Ranking, Accepted in International Journal of Education and Management Engineering (IJEME), IJEME-V6- N6 or V7- N1. Paper ID-61.10th June 2016. ISSN: 2305-3623 (Print), ISSN: 2305-8463 (Online). DOI :<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161160>
 14. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Study of Annual Research Productivity in Indian Top Business Schools. International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME), ISSN (Online): 2455 – 5630 (www.rdmodernresearch.com), Volume I, Issue I, 2016, pp.402-414. DOI : <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161041>
 15. Aithal, P. S. (2016). How to Increase Research Productivity in Higher Educational Institutions –SIMS Model, International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME), Vol. I, Issue I, pp.447-458. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161037>.
 16. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Study of Research Productivity in World Top Business Schools, International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME), Vol. I, Issue I, pp. 629-644, June 2016. DOI : <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.160969>
 17. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree V. T & Suresh Kumar P. M., (2016). Analysis of ABC Model of Annual Research Productivity using ABCD Framework. International Journal of Current Research and Modern Education (IJCRME), Vol. I, Issue I, pp. 846-858. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.62022>.
 18. Rogers, E.M., (1995), 'Diffusion of Innovation', The Free Press, NY.
 19. Aithal P.S. and Varambally K.V.M (2006), Security Issues in Online Financial Transactions with Special Reference to Banking Industry. In Quality in Service Sector and Managerial Challenges – Allied Publisher Pvt. Ltd. 2006, ISBN: 81-7764-992-2, pp 103- 114.
 20. Aithal, P. S., & Varambally, K.V.M. (2009). Mobile Business Technology and Business Proliferation of Banks – A futuristic Approach, Amity Business Review – an Indian Journal, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 9 – 25.
 21. Aithal P. S., and Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, (2015). Ideal Technology Concept & its Realization Opportunity using Nanotechnology. International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEEM), Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 153 - 164. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.61591>.
 22. Aithal, P. S., and Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, (2015).A review on Anticipated Breakthrough Technologies of 21st Century. International Journal of Research & Development in Technology and Management Sciences, Vol. 21, Issue 6, pp. 112 – 133. DOI : <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.61617>.
 23. Aithal, P. S. (2015). Concept of Ideal Business & Its Realization Using E-Business Model. International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), Vol. 4, Issue 3, pp. 1267 - 1274, DOI : <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.61648>.
 24. Aithal, P. S. & Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, (2015). An Innovative Education Model to realize Ideal Education System. International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM), Vol. 3, Issue 3, pp. 2464 - 2469, March, 2015, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.61654>.
 25. Reshma, Aithal, P. S., Shailashree, V. T., Sridhar Acharya, P. (2015). An Empirical study on working from home – A popular E-business model. International

- Journal of Advance and Innovative Research, Vol. 2 Issue 2 (I), pp. 12-18, 2015. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.164429>.
26. Reshma, Aithal, P. S & Sridhar Acharya, P. (2015).Relevance of On-line Office Administration through Working from Home in Future Education System. International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management, Vol. 4, Issue 4, pp 44 – 53. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.163882>.
 27. Aithal, P. S. &Suresh Kumar, P. M., (2015). Applying SWOC Analysis to an Institution of Higher Education. International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 5, Issue 7, pp. 231-247. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.163425>.
 28. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree, V. T., & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2015).Application of ABCD Analysis Model for Black Ocean Strategy. International Journal of Applied Research (IJAR), Vol. 1, Issue 10, pp. 331 - 337. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.163424>.
 29. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree, V. T., & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016).ABCD analysis of Stage Model in Higher Education. International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 11-24. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.154233>
 30. Aithal, P.S. (2016). Study on ABCD Analysis Technique for Business Models, Business strategies, Operating Concepts & Business Systems. International Journal in Management and Social Science, Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 98-115. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161137>.
 31. Aithal P. S., Shailashree V.T., & Suresh Kumar P. M. (2016). Analysis of NAAC Accreditation System using ABCD framework, International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 30 - 44, January 2016. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.154272>.
 32. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P. M. (2016). Opportunities and Challenges for Private Universities in India, International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 88-113. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161157>.
 33. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree V. T., & Suresh Kumar P. M. (2016). Application of ABCD Analysis Framework on Private University System in India. International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research (IJMSBR), Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp. 159-170. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161111>.
 34. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree V. T., & Suresh Kumar P. M., (2016). The Study of New National Institutional Ranking System using ABCD Framework. International Journal of Current Research and Modern Education (IJCRME), Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 389 – 402. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161077>.
 35. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree V. T & Suresh Kumar P. M., (2016). Analysis of ABC Model of Annual Research Productivity using ABCD Framework. International Journal of Current Research and Modern Education (IJCRME), Vol. I, Issue I, pp. 846-858. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.62022>.
 36. Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, & Aithal, P. S., (2016), ABCD analysis of Dye doped Polymers for Photonic Applications, IRA-International Journal of Applied Sciences, (ISSN 2455-4499). Vol. 4, No.3, pp. 358-378. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.155103>.
 37. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Review on Various Ideal System Models Used to Improve the Characteristics of Practical Systems. International Journal of Applied and

Advanced Scientific Research, ISSN (Online): 2456 – 3080, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 47-56, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.159749> .

38. Aithal, P. S., (2016). Concept of Ideal Banking and Realization of it using Ubiquitous Banking, Proceedings of National Conference on Changing Perspectives of Management, IT, and Social Sciences in Contemporary Environment, Manegma 2016, SIMS, Mangalore, India, Vol. 14, 13-24, ISBN 978-93-5265-6523.
39. Aithal, P. S. & Vaikuth Pai, T. (2016). Concept of Ideal Software and its Realization Scenarios. International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME), Vol. 1, Issue 1, 2016. pp. 826-837. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.160908>.
40. Sridhar Acharya, P. and Aithal, P. S. (2016). Concepts of Ideal Electric Energy System for production, distribution and utilization, International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 367-379. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161143>.
41. Aithal, P. S. (2015). Mobile Business as an Optimum Model for Ideal Business. International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering (IJMIE), Vol. 5, Issue 7, pp. 146-159. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.163880>.
42. Aithal, P. S. & Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, (2014). Ideal education system and its realization through online education model using mobile devices, Proceedings of IISRO Multi-Conference 2014, Bangkok, pp. 140 - 146, ISBN No. 978-81-927104-33-13.
43. Thrash T. M., Elliot A. J. (2004). Inspiration: core characteristics, component processes, antecedents and function. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 87, 957–973.
44. Oleynick, V. C., Thrash, T. M., LeFew, M. C., Moldovan, E. G., & Kieffaber, P. D. (2014). The scientific study of inspiration in the creative process: challenges and opportunities. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 436. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00436>.