

A Study On Different Roles Of B-school Students

Vivek Shantaram Prabhu and Prof. (Dr.) Krishna Kant Dave

Abstract

Rise in awareness towards importance of management education, mushrooming management institutes across the nation, rising competitiveness among management institutions has brought shift in the role of faculty, students the overall way of working of management institutions. In this research paper an attempt is made to highlight the changing role of students which is not limited to receiver of the knowledge but it is multi fold. The paper highlights how students have the role of judge, brand ambassadors, alumni, recruiter and many more roles.

Keywords

Management education, students of management, B-Schools

Introduction

With the ever increase in demand of management courses, more & more awareness among youth and society at large the importance of management education and along with UGC's initiatives of introducing number of management colleges in different cities of nation, the shape of management is ever changing.

With the shift in management education approach the role of student is not limited to the receiver of education.

A business school, according to Dr. Chakravarthy, is a university-level institution that teaches subjects like accounting, finance, marketing, organizational behavior, strategic planning, quantitative techniques, and so on. These include "business" schools, "business administration" schools, and "management" institutions. It should

also teach students about application software like ERP, POS, Simulation, SCM, and logistics. They must also gain experience with the day-to-day operations of a business. A business school is now an independent institution that cannot be managed as a department within a technical school. A business school's branding might originate from the quality of its education and its diversity. The school's reputation is enhanced by its graduates. The quality of the instructional team and placement are linked.

India has become a major center of management education in the recent four decades. IIM Ahmedabad (IIMA) was founded in 1961 as a self-contained institute in conjunction with the state and federal governments. IIM Bangalore (IIMB) was established in 1973 to meet the growing demand for technical leadership in the country. The Ford Institute and the government of West Bengal established IIM Calcutta (IIMC) in November 1961, in collaboration with Alfred P. Sloan School of Management (MIT). IIMI (Indian Institute of Management, Indore) was founded ten years ago. The government of India and the state government of Kerala collaborated to create the fifth Indian Institute of Management in Kozhikode (IIMK). In 1981, IIM Lucknow (IIML) was founded. Shillong's Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Management Studies began its inaugural batch in 2008.

The All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) is in charge of regulating, overseeing, and assuring the quality of management education throughout the country. The foundation of the

Vivek Shantaram Prabhu, Research Scholar, Pacific Academy of Higher Education & Research University, Udaipur, Rajasthan. India. Email: vivek.prabhu@ves.ac.in &

Prof. (Dr.) Krishna Kant Dave, President (Vice Chancellor), Pacific Academy of Higher Education & Research University, Udaipur, Rajasthan. India. Email: krishnakantdave@gmail.com

National Board of Accreditation (NBA) and the number of seminars it has hosted have significantly increased public knowledge and concern about management education quality. Indian business schools are divided into four categories

1. Autonomous B-Schools affiliated with the Ministry of Human Resources Development and the AICTE, such as Indian Institutes of Management, Xavier's Labor Relations Institute in Jamshedpur, S P Jain Institute of Management and Research in Mumbai, Xavier's Institute of Management in Bhubaneswar, Fore School of Management in Delhi, and others.
2. The national university education system covers management schools and departments at universities. The University Grants Commission regulates and supervises them (UGC). UGC oversees central institutions, whereas state universities are overseen in part by state governments and in whole by UGC.
3. University Affiliated Colleges follow University policies and procedures.
4. The UGC oversees private universities that are supported by groups, trusts, or corporations.

Objective and Methodology of The Study

To study and understand the various roles of different management students. The study is descriptive in nature. The data is purely based on secondary data collected through literature review. For secondary data relevant books, journals, magazines, the internet, newspapers have been used. All facts, opinions, and problems discussed are assessments of the corresponding authors.

CRITICAL REVIEW

Students at business schools: Customers, Products, Partners, or Stakeholders

Students as Clients: While some writers feel that objective quality assessment is difficult or impossible due to the complex, dynamic, and intangible consequences of education (Tofte, 1993; Sayed, 1993), several others believe it is necessary if quality enhancement is to be tracked

(Burkhalter, 1993 Morris & Haigh, 1993, Seymour, 1992;). Some educators object to the phrase's "customer" and "market," claiming that they only apply in business settings (Sallis, 1993; Corts, 1992). The dynamic and participatory character of higher education adds to the complexity. It has to do with the function of students. While pursuing an educational degree, students take on several roles. They are both the sources of information and the beneficiaries of it.

While students are colleges and universities' primary clients, they are also its raw material, suppliers, co-processors, and products (Harris, 1992). An interpretation is required for identifying consumers and prioritizing or reconciling their various needs in light of the university's goal (Taylor & Hill, 1993). While some administrators find the concept of students as consumers difficult to embrace, that is exactly what they are. Schools are sellers in today's competitive environment, proposing courses, a degree, and a vibrant alumni community. Students are purchasers enrolling in classes, apply for graduation, and give back to the community as alumni. The longer these recurring interactions satisfy both sides, the longer the partnership will last, to everyone's advantage (Bejou, 2005). While textbook material places B Schools in the "not for profit" service group, B-School marketing suggest else. Market segment, competitive study, positioning, and customer-centric service delivery were corporate principles that did not apply to advanced education (Kotler and Fox, 1995).

Though it is not stated obviously, B-Schools are increasingly viewing students as customers. Students are both education's consumers and merchandises (Conway and Yorke, 1991) Students believe higher education runs as a consumer-driven marketplace, according to a poll done by Delucci and Korgen (2002) for sociology. Are we sacrificing on the wide, overall advantages of B-School education (good citizenship, professionalism, ethical values, life skills, and so on) in favor of immediate, short-term student aspirations of lucrative jobs if students are viewed

as customers "This treatment of the student population as clients has lowered the rigor of the curricula and instructional techniques," Carlson and Fliesher (2002) argue.

It's tough to describe the "product" in a student customer orientation; it may be education, but even educators struggle with this concept, let alone kids (Clayson and Haley, 2005). The student-customer model has certain disadvantages: students may delegate accountability for their knowledge and employment success to the teachers and B-School. The student is no more held accountable, and if the faculty or B-School (service providers) fail to live up to the student's (customer's) potentials, the student fills out a service form (training assessment and feedback) indicating service failure, resulting in "bad word of mouth" for the service providers (faculty and B-school). If a comprehensive TQM-based method is used to assess worth in a B-School, students must be deliberated consumers, which has several downsides. According to Clayson and Haley (2005), handling students like clients is wrong and has a detrimental impact on their educational wellbeing. Interim perspective or an "easy A"-students may pick courses where trainers provide easy scores and the focus is on attaining scores rather than sincere learning because of the symptoms of this student as orientation. Dearth of student responsibility- Students may abdicate accountability for their own education and results to support providers (B-School and faculty)

Students as judges- If a service provider fails to please a client (for reasons that may or may not be linked to teaching), students complete assessment questionnaires (faculty evaluation). For a variety of reasons, student ratings may be distorted or prejudiced. Trainers may be perceived as opponents who view in the way of what the student wants, a symbol to despise, or an object to get through using some unfair method if they insist on a demanding curriculum. Education as a commodity- The product is not easily identified in a student-customer relationship. It might be

"education," but even educators, let alone students, struggle with this concept. If "education" is a product, the buyer should have the option of purchasing it with currency or determination. A degree might be viewed as just additional item to buy (Emery et al., 2001). Failure to acquire anticipated occupation- From the perspective of a student, a service provider's failure to secure a decent job might be considered as their responsibility. Curriculum and resource allocation- While most students are unaware with the architecture of labor markets, scholastic source provisions, and social demands, they have clear views about what they want to study and B Schools may deliver courses that, in the long term, do not benefit students or society.

Students as Consumers: Belohav (1984) presents two perspectives: one, the student is the ultimate client, and the other, the government and corporate sectors are the ultimate customers.

INCOMING STUDENT.....EDUCATIONAL PROCESS.....GRADUATE

Students as Partners:

The student might be seen as an educational collaborator (Henning-Thurau et al 2001: Bay and Daniel, 2001). The 'societal marketing approach,' proposed by Bell and Emery (1971) and Fieldman (1971), stresses that an organization exists to fulfil not just its own and customers' wants, nonetheless to sustain and promote people' and humanity's long-term benefits. A university or college's role under this paradigm would be to promote the benefits and aims of students, teachers, staff, parents, government, and society as a whole. Though student demands are at the heart of this approach, a diverse constituency vastly outweighs the kids' immediate objectives (Clayson and Haley, 2005).

Groccia (1997) defines the student as "a true learner," meaning that the student becomes a creator of information rather than a consumer of it. Students as Partial employees and clients: Students as part-time workers: The basic idea after buyer labour offerings is that, while consumers are mainly concerned in consuming a service,

when their skills match those required to complete a task for which the organization is responsible, the organization should employ the customers' skills, thereby making them "partial employees" (Mills & Morris, 1986). This perspective on consumers (or students) as partial workers implies that they may and should be coped like manpower in a company (Halbesleben, Becker, Buckley, 2003)

FINDINGS

With a student as customer perspective, not securing a good job can be seen as the fault of the service providers. Curriculum and allocation of resources- Although students are typically unfamiliar with the configuration of employment marketplaces, educational resource allocations, and societal needs, they have definite ideas about what they would like to study and B Schools may provide those courses, which may not really help students or society, in the long run.

A degree might be viewed as just additional item to buy (Emery et al., 2001). Failure to acquire anticipated occupation- From the perspective of a student, a service provider's failure to secure a decent job might be considered as their responsibility.

It's tough to describe the "product" in a student customer orientation; it may be education, but even educators struggle with this concept, let alone kids (Clayson and Haley, 2005). The student-customer model has certain disadvantages: students may delegate accountability for their knowledge and employment success to the teachers and B-School.

The student is no more held accountable, and if the faculty or B-School (service providers) fail to live up to the student's (customer's) potentials, the student fills out a service form (training assessment and feedback) indicating service failure, resulting in "bad word of mouth" for the service providers (faculty and B-school).

CONCLUSION

Study highlights the changing role of students with the shift in the working of B-schools. We are witnessing a change and it does have more positives than negatives. Students are exposed to

outer world; this kind of engagement helps in boosting their confidence and similarly even B-school is also benefitting out of it. However, academic learning gets affected many a times since all the students couldn't cope up with managing many things at the same time. Broadly a good and welcome change.

REFERENCES

- Chakravarty A (2007). "Concept of a Business School Management Education," available at <http://hosteddocs.ittoolbox.com/AC071807.pdf>
- Tofte, B (1993). A theoretical Model for Implementation of Total Quality Leadership in Education", EEC Seminar in Total Quality in Education, Denmark
- Burkhalter, B (1993). The Evaluation of a Quality Management Process in a University setting, EEC Seminar in Total Quality in Education, Denmark.
- Morris, D. S and Haigh, R. H (1993). Introducing TQM into the Student Service Department of a College of Further Education in the UK, EEC Seminar in Total Quality in Education, Denmark
- Seymour, D. T. (1992). On Q: Causing Quality in higher Education. New York: Macmillan
- Sallis, E (1993). Total Quality Management in Education, London, Kogan Page.
- Corts, T. E (1992). Customers: You Can't do Without Them, In: J.W. Harris and M. Baggett (Eds) Quality Quest in the Academic Process (Birmingham, Samford University)
- Harris, J. W (1992). Key Concepts of Quality Improvement for Higher Education, In: J. W. Harris & M Baggett (Eds) Quality Quest in the Academic Process, Birmingham: Samford University
- Taylor, A. W & Hill, F. M (1993). Issues for Implementing TQM in Further and Higher Education, Quality Assurance in Education, vol 1 pp 12-21.
- Bejou, David (2005). Treating Students like Customers, Biz ed, March / April pp 44-27.
- Kotler, Philip and Karen, F.A. Fox (1995). Strategic Marketing for Educational Organizations (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall

- Conway, A and D.A. Yorke (1991). Can the Marketing Concept be Applied to the Polytechnic and College Sector of Higher Education?" *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 4 (2) pp 23-35.
- Delucchi, M and K. Korgen (2002), *We're the Customer – We Pay the Tuition: Student Consumerism Among Undergraduate Sociology Majors*, *Teaching Sociology*, 30 (January), pp 100-107.
- Carlson, Peter M. and Fleisher, Mark, S (2002). *Shifting Realities in Higher Education: Today's Business Model Threatens our Academic Excellence*, *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 25 (9 and 10), pp. 1097-1111.
- Clayson, E. Dennis and Haley, A. Debra (2005). *Marketing Models in Education: Students as Customers, Products, or Partners*, *Marketing Education Review*, vol 15 (1), Spring, pp 1-10
- Emery Charles, Tracy Kramer, and Robert, Tian (2001). *Customer vs. Products: Adopting an Effective Approach to Business Students*, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 9(2), pp 110-115.
- Belohav, J (1984). *Academic Planning- Back to the Basics*, *Higher Education*, Vol. 13.
- Fieldman, Laurence P. (1971). *Social Adaptation: A New Challenge for Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing* (July), pp 54-60.
- Bell, Martin L. and C. William, Emery (1971). *The Faltering Marketing Concept*, *Journal of Marketing*, (October), pp 37-42
- Bay, Darlene and Harold, Daniel (2001). *The student is not the Customer- an Alternative Perspective*, *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 11 (1) pp 1-19
- Henninger E.A (1998). *Perceptions of the New AACSB Standards on Faculty Qualifications*. *Journal of Organizational Change*, vol.11 (5) pp 407-424.
- Groccia, James E (1997). *The Student as Customer Versus the Student as Learner*, *About campus*, (May-June), 31-32.
- Mills, P. K., & Morris, J. H. (1986). *Clients as "Partial Employees" of Service Organizations: Role Development in Client Participation*. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, pp 726-735
- Halbesleben, Jonathon., Becker, Jennifer and Buckley Ronald (2003), *"Considering the Labor Contributions of Students: An Alternative to the Student as-Customer Metaphor"*, *May/June*, 255-257.