CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY ROLE PERFORMANCE IN B-SCHOOLS

Prof Dr. Savitha G R
Welingkar Institute of Management Development & Research, Bangalore.
Prof Dr. Madhavi Lokhande
Welingkar Institute of Management Development & Research, Bangalore.

ABSTRACT
The role and expected contribution of B-school faculty continues to get scrutinized by various stakeholders associated with the management education community. Teaching and research has always been the two major responsibilities of faculty. However, over a period of time these two roles have become the point of debate and discussion in all management education forums. Much of this debate and discussion about the faculty work load has been in the form of opinions and speculation. Some of the opinions are yet to be substantiated by a thorough research that involves all stakeholders. With this as an objective, the authors of this paper sought to study the major role(s) of faculty members in Business schools in these changing times. The authors believe that the role of B-school faculty has considerably changed to meet the demands of management education. They are of the opinion that the teaching and research activities has been replaced by corporate networking and other Industry-Academia interface which in turn could be leveraged by institutions for students placement and for other developmental activities of the institution.

Key Words: Role of Faculty, Expectations in B Schools, Work Allocation, Performance Indicators, Teaching and other Administrative Roles.

INTRODUCTION
The landscape of education and academia has changed significantly over the last decade. Inception of new B-schools and exponential growth in management education has increased the roles and responsibilities of faculty members. The traditional role of faculty encompasses two major areas of responsibility that is teaching and research. Teaching normally means actual 'in class time' with students, as well as time spent in preparing for class. Such time could also include time spent on revising old course or creating new modules. Research refers to the publication and participation in conferences. It also includes writing papers, cases, text books and guiding students on projects and also guiding doctoral students. Faculty members in B- schools engage in some form of intellectual inquiry that demands a considerable portion of their time and energy.

In today's scenario, the role of faculty does not limit to teaching and research as B-schools expects its faculty to be multi-faceted. They expect faculty members to contribute their time in most of its administrative activities along with the traditional teaching assignments. This includes admissions, brand building, placements, and alumni interaction and so on.

This research work empirically examines the process in which faculty identify their academic positions and also explores perception of various stakeholders of B-schools towards the role of faculty.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To understand how B-school faculty wish to identify themselves in academic positions.
2. To understand the perspective of other stakeholders of B-school towards roles and responsibilities of a faculty

LITERATURE REVIEW
While the articles and readings referred to have been included as part of the bibliography, the literature listed below impacted the researchers in formulating the designing the research question and the hypothesis.

Faculty Involvement in Institutional Governance by Willis A. Jones, 2011: A literature review, Journal of the Professoriate : Debates about college and university management have increased in recent years, so too has the amount of scholarship attempting to understand how and why certain decisions are made by institutions of higher education. One of the areas of institutional governance which has received significant scholarly attention is faculty involvement in shared governance.

The What and Why of Faculty Development in Higher Education by C. Amundsen, P. Abrami, L. McAlpine, C. Weston, M. Krbavac, A. Mundy, M. Wilson (2005), An In-depth Review of the Literature, April 2005: It is maintained that a professor's discipline is a point of identification or reference and is therefore an inherently interesting (from the point of view of the professor) starting point from which to consider teaching. The format of these activities or programs is generally small groups composed of colleagues from the same discipline or across disciplines. In these groups, professors are encouraged to make explicit their understanding of knowledge development or learning in their disciplines; use this understanding to develop their own teaching and to critique the perspectives and understandings of their colleagues

Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement, Adrianna J. Kezar, Anthony C. Chambers, John C. Burkhardt , 2005 : The concern for the public role of higher education stems from a combination of forces, including soaring tuition costs, public distrust, perceived neoliberal tendencies, and a lack of congruency among societal expectations and institutional priorities. Within engagement broadly-defined, there are two distinct emphases: one which aims to involve students in the community and prepare them for responsible citizenship and another encouraging faculty and administration to frame higher education "as a public good for the public good

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities .The engaged institution. washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (Study in 1999): Engagement, or how colleges and universities address important social issues while preparing an educated citizenry for active civic, economic and cultural participation, has become a widespread concept, phenomenon, and movement.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY
Faculty in B Schools performs multiple tasks like teaching, counseling, guiding on projects, administration, placement assistance etc. It was imperative to get the inputs of faculty for the study along with the others who come in interaction with the faculty. For the purpose of this study the stakeholders whose opinions are important were considered as students, corporate professionals and members of the board of management at select institutions. In order to understand the current roles and responsibilities of faculty members a questionnaire was administered on a sample size of 80 faculty members across 30 B-schools in Bangalore. Faculties with minimum of 10 years of work experience were selected for the study. On the other hand, in order to get an in depth understanding of expected roles and responsibilities of faculty members a separate questionnaire was prepared for each set of stakeholders of B-schools. The sample size of each set of stakeholders was maintained at 50 in number. The geographic area identified for the study was urban Bangalore. The study was conducted in the time frame of 2 months of June and July, 2014.

In order to bring a holistic approach to the study, apart from the primary research, expectations from Government bodies like All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) and University Grants Commission (UGC) were also considered in the form of inputs from notification, gazettes etc. This investigation consists of both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative data includes statistics on the existing role and responsibilities of a faculty in B-schools and qualitative data was collected meticulously in order to get the essence of perception of various stakeholders on roles and responsibilities of B-school faculty.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data of actual sample size was collected on convenience sampling method. Face to face and telephonic methods depending upon comfort level of the target audience was used for data collection. The maximum interviewing time for external stake holders was 15-20 minutes while for B-school faculty it was 25-30 minutes. The projected sample size is based on 95% confidence and +/- 5% sampling error; applying extrapolation technique in SPSS.

Hypothesis

Ho: Role of faculty members of B-school is restricted to teaching and research.
H1: Role of faculty members of B-school is not restricted to teaching and research.

The data collected was sorted and the major findings related to the hypothesis have been segregated as per the tables below:

Table -1, Showing the percentage of faculty time spent in performing the following roles in an academic year

Particulars	NA	1-20%	21-40%	41- 60%	61-80%	81-100%
Administration	**4%**	**6%**	**10%**	**10%**	**34%**	**36%**
Teaching	8%	32%	20%	22%	12%	6%
Student placement activities	**8%**	**4%**	**6%**	**12%**	**40%**	**30%**
Research guide	8%	32%	26%	20%	6%	8%
Consultancy	10%	36%	18%	20%	10%	6%
Industry interface	12%	4%	20%	18%	8%	**38%**
Sales & Marketing	10%	8%	20%	20%	6%	**36%**
Student event management	10%	12%	20%	18%	8%	**32%**
Administration & related	6%	6%	22%	20%	8%	**38%**
Institution branding exercise	4%	14%	18%	22%	4%	**38%**
Accreditation related activities	**4%**	**8%**	**4%**	**16%**	**32%**	**36%**
Case study	2%	36%	22%	22%	16%	2%
Research papers	4%	32%	22%	18%	14%	10%
Paper evaluation	0%	30%	20%	28%	18%	4%
Preparation for sessions/lectures	2%	28%	30%	20%	10%	10%
As a committee member	6%	36%	22%	24%	6%	6%
Attending conferences or seminars	6%	46%	18%	18%	4%	8%
Extracurricular activities	8%	34%	18%	24%	8%	8%
Further studies	6%	32%	20%	24%	6%	12%

Majority of respondents were of an opinion that they spend more than 60% of their time in activities like Student placement activities, Administration and Accreditation related activities. Faculties spend only 1 to 20% of the time in teaching, attending conferences, in writing cases and towards research work. Independent sample t-test was performed between the perceptions of work experienced respondent on the priority of the roles of faculties. Calculations were made assuming both equal and unequal variances. Under equal variance it was observed that the mean difference between the scores of work experienced respondent and inexperienced respondent for all the variables and factors are not significant except for teaching and research. There exists a significant mean difference between experienced respondent and inexperienced respondent.

Table- 2 ,Showing the perception of stake holders on the faculty roles

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Faculties are responsible for providing knowledge during an MBA programme	36%	56%	4%	4%	0%
The quality of B-School depends mainly on the Student intake	26%	49%	21%	4%	0%
The quality of B-School depends on the quality of Faculties	43%	45%	8%	4%	0%
Faculties should act as guardian	27%	34%	.280	11%	4%
should report to parents on the attendance status of the students	2%	32%	22%	23%	21%
should report to parents on the academic performance of the students	8%	26%	25%	19%	22%
Faculties should be lenient towards internal marks	9%	26%	30%	27%	11%
Faculties should be strict with respect to attendance of the students	9%	32%	25%	27%	11%
Faculties should be approachable and accessible	59%	40%	11%	0%	0%
Faculties should help in getting placements	49%	38%	11%	0%	2%
Faculties should have corporate work experience	66%	23%	9%	0%	2%
Faculties should have Ph D	8%	25%	45%	21%	2%
Should use case studies /video presentations	47%	45%	6%	2%	0%
Faculties should act as Mentors and guide	55%	36%	8%	2%	0%
There should be more number of internal faculties than visiting faculties	15%	40%	26%	19%	0%
should accompany students during industrial visits and conferences	36%	47%	13%	4%	0%
Responsible for conducting the corporate interfaces	21%	60%	13%	6%	0%
Faculties should be held responsible for not completing the syllabus during the MBA programme	15%	40%	23%	23%	0%
Faculties are responsible for the overall reputation and brand building of the institute	9%	53%	25%	13%	0%
Responsible for strong alumni network	25%	55%	3%	8%	0%
Should engage themselves in continuous education	28%	45%	25%	2%	0%

Other stake holders of B-school agree that teaching and research is important for a faculty and at the same time they believe that the driving role of a faculty is to support in student placement activity. They also wish the faculty to have corporate experience. It was a interesting find from the data gathered that the other stake holders do not give much weightage to the qualification of a faculty, but the regulations of AICTE / UGC insists the B-school faculty to have Doctoral qualification. In order to understand the top preferences of stakeholders expectations, factor analysis was done on the above factors and the most dominating factors were, faculties should be lenient towards internal marks, student placement activities, industry interface with the communalities 0.838, 0.814,0.835 and 0.855 respectively. Apart from these outcomes, it was also observed that faculties were expected to be on various professional bodies like AIMS, AIMA, NHRD, etc. It was found that arranging guest lecture is the sole

responsibility of faculties and above all faculty members were expected to be in the campus for fixed number of hours ranging from 6 Hrs to 8 Hrs. Their communalities are 0.870, 0.866 and 0.841 respectively which represents the variance content of 87%, 86.6% and 84.1%.

Table 3 Showing the roles preferred by a faculty to do on priority

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.721
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	531.267
	Df	210
	Sig.	0

It may be noted that the value of KMO is greater than 0.5, indicating that the factor analysis can be used for the given set of data. Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates that the co-relation co-efficient matrix is significant. P –value which is less than .05 indicates rejection of hypothesis. All these justify the use of factor analysis for this problem.

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
Administration	1.000	.809
Teaching	1.000	.798
Student placement activities	1.000	.835
Research Guide	1.000	.719
Consultant	1.000	.802
Industry Interface	1.000	.855
Sales and Marketing	1.000	.714
Students event management	1.000	.741
Admissions and related	1.000	.695
Institution Branding exercises	1.000	.833
Accreditation related activities	1.000	.666
Case study	1.000	.783
Research papers	1.000	.712
Paper evaluation	1.000	.730
Preparation for sessions/lectures	1.000	.794
As a committee / council member	1.000	.683
Attending conferences and seminars	1.000	.847
Attending to institutio0l guests/visitors	1.000	.791
MDP/FDP	1.000	.806
Extra Curricular Activities	1.000	.734
Further Studies	1.000	.817

The most dominating factors are Student placement activities, Industry interface, Attending conferences and seminars. Their communalities are 0.835, 0.855 and .847 respectively which represents the variance content. 83.5% 85.5% and 84.7% of variance content are present respectively. Similarly communalities for the other factors are explained.

Total Variance Explained								
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.260	34.572	34.572	7.260	34.572	34.572	5.306	25.268	25.268
2	3.019	14.374	48.946	3.019	14.374	48.946	2.573	12.254	37.522
3	1.921	9.147	58.093	1.921	9.147	58.093	2.472	.770	49.292
4	1.685	8.025	66.8	1.685	8.025	66.8	2.123	10.108	59.401
5	1.217	5.795	71.913	1.217	5.795	71.913	2.077	9.893	69.293
6	1.061	5.053	76.966	1.061	5.053	76.966	1.6	7.673	76.966
7	.687	3.271	80.237						
8	.637	3.034	83.270						
9	.595	2.831	86.102						
10	.510	2.429	88.530						
11	.471	2.244	90.775						
12	.372	1.771	92.546						
13	.304	1.445	93.991						
14	.290	1.382	95.374						

Component 1 has the highest Eigen value of 7.260 and the variance explained by the component 1 is 34.572%. Component 2 has the Eigen value of 3.019 and variance explained by it is 14.374%. Similarly for the remaining factors it can be explained. The first 6 components are dominating because their Eigen values are greater than 1.

Component Transformation Matrix						
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	.817	.183	.316	.264	.276	.231
2	-.131	.778	.387	.028	-.433	-.200
3	-.088	.057	.429	-.780	.441	.044
4	.324	.434	-.736	-.406	.008	-.025
5	-.160	.075	-.015	-.084	-.270	.943
6	-.422	.406	-.156	.386	.685	.124
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.						

The Component Transformation Matrix displays the component correlation matrix prior to and after rotation. It displays the principle components.

Component Score Coefficient Matrix						
	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Administration	-.017	.108	.8	-.406	.153	.0
Teaching	.098	-.004	-.200	.038	.8	.134
Student placement activities	-.069	.003	.002	-.105	-.080	.650
Research Guide	.5	-.004	-.1	.072	.056	.056
Consultant	-.022	.041	-.031	.038	.296	.126
Industry Interface	-.040	.042	-.008	-.079	.471	-.088
Sales and Marketing	.068	.198	-.040	-.102	-.316	.200
Students event management	-.160	-.014	.403	.054	.027	.060
Admissions and related	-.093	.357	.000	-.088	.149	.009
Institution Branding	-.072	.405	-.121	.140	.171	-.074
Accreditation related	.038	.287	-.078	.005	-.072	.039
Case study	.199	-.045	-.036	.002	-.049	-.058
Research papers	.174	.009	-.013	-.026	-.090	.019
Paper evaluation	.303	-.065	-.033	-.089	-.283	-.145
Preparation for lectures	.199	.030	-.079	-.120	.015	-.016
As a committee member	.202	-.104	.157	-.107	-.050	-.261
Attending onferences/seminars	-.4	.060	.6	.265	.133	.191
MDP/FDP	-.031	-.063	.209	.155	-.7	.248
Extra Curricular Activities	.087	-.128	.360	-.140	-.8	-.097
Further Studies	-.087	.081	.051	.431	.138	-.216

It displays the correlation between the existing factors and the newly created factors whether it is negatively or positively correlated. We can see from the table that some are negatively correlated and some are positively correlated.

Table 4 showing the expectation from the stakeholders towards faculties role in B-school

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.609
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	491.104
	Df	231
	Sig.	.000

It may be noted that the value of KMO is greater than 0.5, indicating that the factor analysis can be used for the given set of data. Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates that the co-relation co-efficient matrix is significant. P –value which is less than .05 indicates rejection of hypothesis. All these justify the use of factor analysis for this problem.

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
R-esponsible for providing knowledge during an MBA programme	1.000	.667
The quality of B-School depends mainly on the Student intake	1.000	.721
The quality of B-School depends on the quality of Faculties	1.000	.722
Faculties should act as guardian	1.000	.720
Faculties should report to parents on the attendance status of the students	1.000	.814
Should report to parents on the academic performance of the students	1.000	.709
Faculties should be lenient towards internal marks	1.000	.838
Faculties should be strict with respect to attendance of the students	1.000	.666
Faculties should be approachable and accessible over phone / email	1.000	.719
Faculties should help in getting placements	1.000	.634
Faculties should have corporate work experience	1.000	.679
Faculties should have Ph D	1.000	.764
Faculties should use case studies and video presentations during the class	1.000	.594
Faculties should act as Mentors and guide them throughout the programme	1.000	.775
There should be more number of inter0l faculties than visiting faculties	1.000	.669
Should accompany students during industrial visits and conferences	1.000	.776
Faculties are responsible for conducting the corporate interfaces	1.000	.746
Responsible for not completing the syllabus during the programme	1.000	.629
Right to punish the students during a professio0l programme like MBA	1.000	.707
Overall reputation and brand building of the institute	1.000	.664
Faculties are responsible for strong alumni network in your B-School	1.000	.601
Faculty should engage themselves in continuous education	1.000	.670

The most dominating factors are faculties should be lenient towards internal marks and faculties should report to parents on the attendance status of the students. Their communalities are 0.838 and 0.814 respectively which represents the variance content. 83.8% and 81.4% of variance content are present respectively. Similarly communalities for the other factors are explained.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.489	24.950	24.950	5.489	24.95	24.950	3.553	16.149	16.149
2	2.772	12.599	37.548	2.772	12.59	37.548	3.271	14.866	31.015
3	1.982	9.010	46.558	1.982	9.01	46.558	2.383	10.830	41.845
4	1.547	7.031	53.589	1.547	7.03	53.589	1.698	7.720	49.565
5	1.342	6.102	59.691	1.342	6.10	59.691	1.672	7.602	57.166
6	1.222	5.554	65.246	1.222	5.55	65.246	1.498	6.808	63.974
7	1.133	5.149	70.395	1.133	5.14	70.395	1.412	6.420	70.395
8	.912	4.146	74.541						

Component 1 has the highest Eigen value of 5.489 and the variance explained by the component 1 is 24.950%. Component 2 has the Eigen value of 2.772 and variance explained by it is 12.599%. Similarly for the remaining factors it can be explained. The first 7 components are dominating because their Eigen values are greater than 1.

Component Transformation Matrix							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	.633	.504	.443	.153	.289	.176	-.105
2	-.595	.765	.078	-.002	-.160	.101	.138
3	.242	.1	-.547	.646	-.331	.273	.169
4	-.3	-.383	.559	.408	-.0	.521	.082
5	.095	-.035	-.065	-.217	.315	.135	.906
6	-.201	.006	.038	.585	.473	-.619	.092
7	.202	-.026	.425	.051	-.677	-.461	.324
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.							

The Component Transformation Matrix displays the component correlation matrix prior to and after rotation. It displays the principle components.

Component Score Coefficient Matrix							
	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Responsible for providing knowledge	-.099	.030	.170	.061	.294	-.194	-.080
The quality depends mainly on the intake	.027	-.021	-.010	.010	.051	.024	.597
The quality depends on the Faculties	.003	.130	.134	-.032	.121	-.201	.406
Faculties should act as guardian	.189	-.023	-.013	-.003	-.054	.144	-.157
Report to parents on the attendance status	.274	-.052	-.130	.014	.074	-.072	.015
Report to parents on the performance	.205	.002	-.040	.074	.083	-.103	.031
Should be lenient towards internal marks	-.037	-.089	-.3	.062	.604	.060	.075
Strict with respect to attendance	.274	-.029	.131	-.137	-.238	-.083	.099
Approachable and accessible	-.020	.251	.041	.163	-.139	-.198	-.021
Faculties should help in getting placements	.015	.079	.057	-.095	.081	-.058	-.324
Should have corporate work experience	-.085	.174	.043	-.166	.156	.145	.014
Faculties should have Ph D	-.026	-.070	-.081	.008	.057	.610	-.021
Faculties should use case studies and video	.0	.276	-.126	-.025	-.037	-.024	-.030
Act as Mentors and guide them throughout	.003	.313	-.200	.045	-.010	-.031	-.070
More internal faculties than visiting	.001	.004	.101	.426	-.075	-.032	.069
Accompany students for industrial visits	-.053	-.030	-.039	.534	.103	-.026	-.020
Should conduct corporate interfaces	-.139	-.101	.371	.133	.062	.089	-.095
Responsible for not completing syllabus	.079	-.143	.377	-.003	-.154	-.171	.029
Right to punish the students	.273	.025	-.131	.012	-.087	.046	.029
Responsible for the overall reputation	.6	.038	.149	-.163	-.5	.213	.200
Responsible for strong alumni network	.021	.122	-.049	-.166	.202	.162	-.032
Engage themselves in continuous education	-.060	.050	.238	.054	-.202	.247	.036

It displays the correlation between the existing factors and the newly created factors whether it is negatively or positively correlated. We can see from the table that some are negatively correlated and some are positively correlated.

CONCLUSION

Although the faculty of an institution is traditionally considered to refer to full-time faculty members, part-time and adjunct faculty members at many institutions have assumed a larger proportion of teaching responsibilities. However, focus also has been shifted to institutional structures and norms. Professional socialization experiences serve as barriers to progress within faculty ranks.

The identity, authority, and functions of B-school faculty members are largely dependent on institutional type, history, and traditions, as well as on formal codifications of faculty authority and role. The faculty traditionally is responsible for planning and delivering curricula and instruction consistent with the educational goals of the institution and selecting and evaluating probationary faculty members within their colleges, departments, or units. Faculty members were also involved in institution-level budget processes, strategic planning - with the exception of academic planning and curriculum planning. Because of their academic, curriculum, placement and other administrative functions, the faculty at B-school may hold a more central and influential position within the Institution.

The respondents agree with the factors like Management involves faculties in academic planning, curriculum development & change and research planning. It was very evident from the research that faculties are involved in admission process, placement process and these activities have substituted the major roles of teaching and research. It was also found in the research that Faculty members were expected to engage themselves in continuous education, involve in external consulting activities, were also responsible for conducting the corporate interfaces, for building strong alumni network etc.

Yet another interesting fact which came to light was that faculties spend more than 60% of their time in major activities like student placement activities, industry interface and others. In contrast to the above findings, it came out in the research that the most preferred role that a faculty wished was research, teaching and attending to seminars and conferences. Under equal variances it was observed that the mean difference between the scores of men and women for all the variables and factors were not significant and hence there was no noteworthy mean difference between the men & women in their opinion. Under equal variances it is observed that the mean difference between the scores of work experienced respondent and inexperienced respondent for all the variables and factors were not significant except these factors; teaching, consultant and case study. There exists a significant mean difference between experienced respondent and inexperienced respondent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. An agenda for reforming management education, Financial Express (Net Edition), Saturday, November 20, 2004.
2. Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J.Y. & Wang H. H. (2006)."The Development of an Employee Satisfaction Model for Higher Education" .The TQM Magazine, 18(5): 484-500.
3. Dhar, Upinder, Managing: Educational Services with special references to a management education in India. U niversity News, 38(20), May 15, 8-11
4. Duderstadt, J. (2001). Fire, ready, aim! University decision making during an era of rapid change . Paris, Economica, 26 - 51
5. Myrick-Harris, C.; Nagle, B. (2008). UNCF Faculty Engagement Study. Prepared by the UNCF Institute for Capacity Building and the UNCF Special Programs Center for Assessment, Planning and Accountability
6. Fairweather, James S. 1996. Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
7. Floyd, Carol. 1984. Faculty Participation in Decision Making (ASHE - ERIC Higher Education Report No. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
8. Park, Shelley M. 1996. "Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" The Journal of Higher Education 67 (1):46 - 84.
9. Singh B.P., Singh Shivkumar, Upadhyay Yogesh, 2002, "Business Education in the new Millennium" University news, 40(35), September 2 - 8.