International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME)
ISSN (Online): 2455 - 4200
(www.rdmodernresearch.com) Volume I, Issue II, 2016

EXCELLENCE IN INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS: EXAMINING THE ACTIVE ROLE OF ROLE MODELS (DEANS) OF WORLD TOP BUSINESS SCHOOLS

Dr. P. S. Aithal
Principal, Srinivas Institute of Management Studies, Mangalore, Karnataka

Abstract:

As per one of the postulates of Theory A on organizational Behaviour, the scholars appointed as Deans/Directors in higher educational & research institutions are expected to be an exemplary performer in their career and through their administrative abilities and hence their individual research contributions inspire every person in the organization as a role model. Organizational performance depends on individual & team performance so that being the head of the institution, Dean/Director are expected to be role models for youngsters and have a responsibility in increasing institutional research performance by their active involvement in Research and Publications. Recently introduced ABC model of institutional research productivity has facilitated to study organizational research performance by calculating individual and institutional annual research index. In many educational and research institutions including top business schools, the Deans appointed are expected to be 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 made an attempt to study the role model ability of Deans through their current research contribution in the form publications of 35 WorldTop business schools by studying their average research productivity of last five years for 2012-2016. The research publications of the Deans of these 35World Top business schools are studied by identifying the number of research papers published, number of books/edited books published, and number of book chapters published in an ISBN serial number books, and number of business cases published during last five years. Finally, the institutional annual research index for the year 2015 and the director's average research index for last five years are compared and analysed. It is observed that many directors failed to act as role model and to reach optimum or super researcher rank. This study shows that the Deans/Directors of should become more active in their individual research contribution to the research output of the higher education institutions so that they can inspire other researchers in the organization as active role models.

Index Terms: Role of Deans in the Research & Individual Research Contribution in Institutional productivity

1. Introduction:

Inspiring and motivating people resource through creating a role model is one of the strategies to increase the people performance in organizations [1]. 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 employeeshave 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 [2] has 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 [3]. There are two types of role models as positive role models and negative role models [4]. 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 [5-6]. 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 [7]. At different times, people may be differentially receptive to positive and negative role models [8].

Recently published 'Theory A' and its analysis [9-12] 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.

In many educational and research institutions including top business schools, the Deans appointed are expected to be 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. 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 World top business schools Deans in research & publications by collecting last five years data on their research productivity using ABC model. In this paper, we made an attempt to study the role model ability of Deans through their current research contribution in the form publications of 35 World Top business schools by studying their average research productivity of last five years for 2012-2016. The research publications of the Deans of these 35 World Top business schools are studied by identifying the number of research papers published, number of books/edited books published, and number of book chapters published in an ISBN serial number books, and number of business cases published during last five years. Finally, the institutional annual research index for the year 2015 and the director's average research index for last five years are compared and analysed. The study also compares the organizational research performance and

the Deans research performance of respective organizations 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 [13], 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 [13-18] 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 ISSN number (A), the number of Books published in the subjects/Edited volumes with ISBN number (B), and the number of Business cases or Book chapters (C) published with ISBN number. (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 weightage 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.

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

The weighted average is an average in which each quantity to be averaged is assigned a weightage. These weightages determine the relative importance of each quantity on the average. Weightages 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:

Weighted Research Productivity index, $\beta = [(2A + 5B + 1C) /8] / F$ --- (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 [13].

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)

The 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 [19-37] 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 [13]

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 one's 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 [9-12] 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 [38-44].
- ✓ 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. World Top Business Schools – A Survey:

The top 35 Business schools from FT ranking list with their country and the institutional website address for the year 2015 [13] are given in table 2 and the top 35 Business schools from FT ranking list along with Number of Faculty members and the Research information (ABC values) for the year 2015 are given in table 3.

Table 2: List of 35 World Top Business Schools in FT 2015 Survey [17]

Rank	Name of Business School	Country	Website Address
1	Harvard Business School, Harvard University Boston, Massachusetts	Massachusetts, USA	www.hbs.edu/
2	London Business School, London	London, UK	www.london.edu
3	Wharton Business School University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, USA	www.wharton.upenn.edu/
4	Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University,	California, USA	www.gsb.stanford.edu/
5	INSEAD Business School Fontainebleau	France	www.insead.edu/
6	Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York City	New York, USA	www8.gsb.columbia.edu/
7	IESE Business School, University of Navarra, Barcelona	Spain	www.iese.edu/en/

8	Sloan School of Management, MIT, Cambridge	Massachusetts, USA	www.mitsloan.mit.edu/
9	Booth Business School Chicago University	Chicago, USA	www.chicagobooth.edu/
10	Haas Business School, University of California at Berkeley	California USA	www.haas.berkeley.edu/
11	China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai	China	www.en.ceibs.edu/
12	IE Business School, IE University, Madrid	Spain	www.ie.edu/business-school/
13	Judge Business School, University of Cambridge	Cambridge, UK	www.jbs.cam.ac.uk/
14	HKUST Business School, Hong Kong	Hong Kong China	www.bm.ust.hk/
15	Kellogg School of Business, Northwestern University, Illinois	Illinois, USA	www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/
16	HEC, Paris	France	www.hec.edu/
17	Yale School of Management, Yale University, New Haven	Connecticut, USA	www.som.yale.edu/
18	Stem School of Business New York University	New York USA	www.stern.nyu.edu/
19	Esade Business School, University in Barcelona	Spain	www.esade.edu/
20	IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland	Switzerland	www.imd.org/
21	FUKUA School of Business, Duke University, Durham	North Carolina USA	www.fuqua.duke.edu/
22	Oxford Said Business School Oxford University	Oxford, UK	www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/
23	Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, Hanover, USA	New Hampshire USA	www.tuck.dartmouth.edu/
24	Ross Business School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,	Michigan USA	www.michiganross.umich.edu/
25	UCLA: Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles	California, USA	www.anderson.ucla.edu/
26	Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad	India	www.iimahd.ernet.in/
27	SDA Boccioni School of Management, Bocconi University	Italy	www.sdabocconi.it/
28	Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University	USA	www.johnson.cornell.edu/
29	School of Business, University of Hong Kong,	Hong Kong, China	www.business.hku.hk/
30	CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong China	www.bschool.cuhk.edu.hk/
31	School of Business, National University of Singapore	Singapore	https://bschool.nus.edu.sg/
32	Darden School of Business, University of Virginia	Virginia USA	www.darden.virginia.edu/
33	Indian School of Business, Hyderabad	India	http://www.isb.edu/
34	Imperial College Business School, London	United Kingdom	wwwf.imperial.ac.uk/business-school/
35	Alliance-Manchester Business School, Manchester University	United Kingdom	http://www.mbs.ac.uk/

Table 3: List of World Top Business Schools along with Number of Faculty members and the Research information (ABC values) for the year 2015

Rank	Name of Business School	Faculty	A	B	C	β
1	Harvard Business School Harvard University Boston, Massachusetts	F=286 S=260 T= 372	207	11	309	0.26
2	London Business School, London	F=141 S=33 T= 152	220	6	3	0.39
3	Wharton Business School University of Pennsylvania	F=266 S=180 T= 326	253	15	0	0.21
4	Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University	F=114 S=101 T=147	138	10	60	0.33
5	INSEAD Business School Fontainebleau	F=185 S=83 T = 212	132	11	74	0.232
6	Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York City	F=146 S=132 T=190	115	5	2	0.17
7	IESE Business School, University of Navarra, Barcelona	F=108 S=39 T=121	50	17	40	0.23
8	Sloan School of Management, MIT, Cambridge	F=281 S=68 T = 303	153	6	29	0.15
9	Booth Business School Chicago University	F=210 S=126 T=252	114	7	-	0.13
10	Haas Business School, University of California at Berkeley	F=286 S= 70 T= 309	137	-	-	0.11
11	China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai	F=66 S= 25 T = 74	35	3	0	0.144
12	IE Business School, IE University, Madrid	F=231 S= - T=231	18 (2012)	2 (2012)	10 (2012)	0.03 (2012)
13	Judge Business School, University of Cambridge	F=68 S=31 T=78	75	5	0	0.28
14	HKUST Business School, Hong Kong	F=222 S= - T= 222	15	-	-	0.017
15	Kellogg School of Business, Northwestern University, Illinois	F=149 S= - T=149	160	18	18	0.36
16	HEC, Paris, France	F=115 S= - T=115	100	11	2	0.28
17	Yale School of Management, Yale University, New Haven	F=87 S= - T=87	23	1	0	0.07
18	Stem School of Business New York University	F=336 S=105 T=371	-	3	-	-

19	Esade Business School, University in Barcelona	F=107 S= - T= 107	91	12	2	0.29
20	IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland	F=58 S = - T=58	-	5	23	-
21	FUKUA School of Business, Duke University, Durham	F=126 S= - T=126	46	-	-	-
22	Oxford Said Business School Oxford University	F=64 S= 51 T=81	144	-	0	0.45
23	Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, Hanover	F=55 S= -	25	-	-	-
24	Ross Business School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	F=230 S= -	43	-	-	-
25	UCLA: Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles	F=110 S=62	-	-	-	-
26	Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad	F=143 S= 55 T=161	61	4	79	0.17
27	SDA Boccioni School of Management, Bocconi University, Italy	F=341 S= - T=341	4	0	5	0.005
28	Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University	F=152 S=39 T=165	105	4	23	0.19
29	School of Business, University of Hong Kong,	F=114 S = - T=114	64	2	0	0.15
30	CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong	F=140 S=67	-	-	-	-
31	School of Business, National University of Singapore, Singapore	F=160 S = - T=160	100	7	22	0.20
32	Darden School of Business, University of Virginia:, USA	F=74 S= - T=74	40	3	0	0.16
33	Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India	F=45 S= 11 T=48	30	2	32	0.27
34	Imperial College Business School, London, UK	F=66 S= - T=66	106	1	0	0.41
35	Alliance-Manchester Business School, Manchester University, UK	F=245 S = - T=245	74 (2014)	6 (2014)	12 (2014)	0.10

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 35 World top business school Deans/Directors for last 5 years (2012-2016) and is listed in table 4. Based on weighted research index (β) value of these directors/deans, the ranking of Directors/Deans for their individual research output is listed in table 4.

Table 4: Average Annual Research index for last 5 years (2012-2016)

S.No	Institute	Dean (2016)	Google Scholar Citation	A	B	C	β = (2A+5B+C) /(5x8)
1	Wharton Business School University of Pennsylvania, USA	Geoffrey Garrett (2014-Present)	5,138	3	0	0	6/40 = 0.15
2	Harvard Business School Harvard University, USA	NitinNohria (2010-Present)	-	5	1	4	0.475
3	London Business School, London, UK	Andrew Likierman (2009-Present)	-	1	0	0	0.05
4	Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, USA	Jonathan Levin (2016-Present)	3,556	10	1	1	0.65

5	INSEAD Business School Fontainebleau, France	IlianMihov (2013-Present)	2,724	4	0	0	0.20
6	Columbia Business School, New York, USA	Glenn Hubbard	-	3	3	0	0.525
7	IESE Business School, University of Navarra, Barcelona, France	Franz Heukamp (2016- Present)	-	2	0	0	0.10
8	Sloan School of Management, MIT, USA	David Schmittlein (2007-Present)	-	0	0	0	0.00
9	Booth Business School, Chicago University USA	Douglas Skinner (Present)	8,936	5	0	0	0.25
10	Haas Business School, University of California at Berkeley, USA	Richard K. Lyons (2008-Present)	2,732	4	1	0	0.325
11	China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai, China	Ding, Yuan	-	15	0	0	0.75
12	IE Business School, IE University, Madrid, Spain	Santiago Iñiguez de Onzoño (2004-Present)	-	2	1	0	0.225
13	Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, U.K.	Christoph H. Loch (2011 – Present)	-	3	0	0	0.15
14	HKUST Business School, Hong Kong China	Tam Kar Yan (2011-Present)	-	3	0	0	0.15
15	Kellogg School of Business, Northwestern University, Illinois, USA	Sally Blount	6,134	3	0	0	0.15
16	HEC, Paris France	Peter A. TODD (2015-Present)	-	2	0	0	0.10
17	Yale School of Management, Yale, Connecticut, USA	Edward A. Snyder	-	1	1	0	0.175
18	Stern School of Business New York University, New York, USA	Peter Henry	-	1	1	0	0.175
19	Esade Business School, University in Barcelona, Spain	JosepFranch	-	2	0	0	0.10
20	IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland	Dominique Turpin	-	0	0	0	0.00
21	FUKUA School of Business, Duke University, Durham, USA	Bill William Boulding	-	4	0	0	0.20
22	Oxford Said Business School Oxford University, U.K.	Peter Tufano	-	8	0	0	0.45
23	Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, Hanover, USA	Matthew J. Slaughter (2015- Present)	-	4	1	1	0.35
24	Ross Business School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA	Scott DeRue (2016-Present)	3,504	11	1	1	0.70
25	UCLA: Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles, USA	Judy D. Olian (F) (2006 – Present)	-	0	0	0	0.00
26	Indian Institute of	Ashish Nanda	-	0	0	6	0.15

	Management, Ahmedabad, India						
27	SDA Boccioni School of Management, Bocconi University, Italy	Busacca Bruno (2012-Present)	834	8	4	4	1.00
28	Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University, USA	Mark Nelson	-	7	2	0	0.60
29	School of Business, University of Hong Kong, China	Eric C. Chang	6,072	12	0	0	0.60
30	CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China	Kalok Chan	-	6	0	0	0.30
31	School of Business, National University of Singapore, Singapore	Bernard Yeung	8,632	15	0	3	0.825
32	Darden School of Business, University of Virginia, USA	Scott C. Beardsley (2015-Present)	-	2	1	3	0.30
33	Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India	K. RajendraSrivastava	-	5	2	3	0.575
34	Imperial College Business School, London, UK	Nelson Phillips Strategy	8,645	22	2	1	0.825
35	Alliance-Manchester Business School, Manchester University, UK	Professor Fiona Devine (F) (2014-Present)	-	5	0	0	0.25

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) [45] 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* involve motivation to actualize or extend the valued qualities of faculty and researchers to innovate new knowledge through research. Thrash and Elliot (2004) [46] 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 [46]. 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: Ranking of World Top Business Schools based on Deans Research Contribution during last 5 years (2012-2016)

S.No	Institute	Dean (2016)	G.S. Citation	$\gamma = (2A+5B+C)/(4\times8)$	Rank
1	Wharton Business School University of Pennsylvania, USA	Geoffrey Garrett (2014-Present)	5,138	0.15	Rank 24
2	Harvard Business School Harvard University, USA	NitinNohria (2010-Present)	-	0.475	Rank 11
3	London Business School, London, UK	Andrew Likierman (2009-Present)	-	0.05	Rank 32
4	Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, USA	Jonathan Levin (2016-Present)	3,556	0.65	Rank 6
5	INSEAD Business School Fontainebleau, France	IlianMihov (2013-Present)	2,724	0.20	Rank 20
6	Columbia Business School, New York, USA	Glenn Hubbard	-	0.525	Rank 10
7	IESE Business School, University of Navarra, Barcelona, France	Franz Heukamp (2016- Present)	-	0.10	Rank 29
8	Sloan School of Management, MIT, USA	David Schmittlein (2007-Present)	-	0.00	Rank 33
9	Booth Business School, Chicago University USA	Douglas Skinner (Present)	8,936	0.25	Rank 17
10	Haas Business School, University of California at Berkeley, USA	Richard K. Lyons (2008-Present)	2,732	0.325	Rank 14
11	China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai, China	Ding, Yuan	-	0.75	Rank 4
12	IE Business School, IE University, Madrid, Spain	Santiago Iñiguez de Onzoño (2004-Present)	-	0.225	Rank 19
13	Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, U.K.	Christoph H. Loch (2011 – Present)	-	0.15	Rank 24
14	HKUST Business School, Hong Kong China	Tam Kar Yan (2011-Present)	-	0.15	Rank 24
15	Kellogg School of Business, Northwestern University,	Sally Blount	6,134	0.15	Rank 24

	Illinois, USA				
16	HEC, Paris France	Peter A. TODD (2015-Present)	-	0.10	Rank 29
17	Yale School of Management, Yale, Connecticut, USA	Edward A. Snyder	-	0.175	Rank 22
18	Stern School of Business New York University, New York, USA	Peter Henry	-	0.175	Rank 22
19	Esade Business School, University in Barcelona, Spain	JosepFranch	-	0.10	Rank 29
20	IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland	Dominique Turpin	-	0.00	Rank 33
21	FUKUA School of Business, Duke University, Durham, USA	Bill William Boulding	-	0.20	Rank 21
22	Oxford Said Business School Oxford University, U.K.	Peter Tufano	-	0.45	Rank 12
23	Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, Hanover, USA	Matthew J. Slaughter (2015- Present)	-	0.35	Rank 13
24	Ross Business School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA	Scott DeRue (2016-Present)	3,504	0.70	Rank 5
25	UCLA: Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles, USA	Judy D. Olian (F) (2006 – Present)	-	0.00	Rank 33
26	Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India	Ashish Nanda	-	0.15	Rank 24
27	SDA Boccioni School of Management, Bocconi University, Italy	Busacca Bruno (2012-Present)	834	1.0	Rank 1
28	Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University, USA	Mark Nelson	-	0.6	Rank 8
29	School of Business, University of Hong Kong, China	Eric C. Chang	6,072	0.6	Rank 7
30	CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China	Kalok Chan	-	0.3	Rank 16
31	School of Business, National University of Singapore, Singapore	Bernard Yeung	8,632	0.825	Rank 3
32	Darden School of Business, University of Virginia, USA	Scott C. Beardsley (2015-Present)	-	0.3	Rank 15
33	Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India	K. RajendraSrivastava	-	0.575	Rank 9
34	Imperial College Business School, London, UK	Nelson Phillips Strategy	8,645	0.825	Rank 2
35	Alliance-Manchester Business School, Manchester University, UK	Professor Fiona Devine (F) Sociology (2014-Present)	-	0.25	Rank 18

Table 6: Average Annual Research index for last 5 years (2012-2016)

S.No	Institute	β Institutional Weighted research Index for 2015 & Research Grade	Dean (2016)	Deans Average β = (2A+5B+C) /(5x8) For last 5 Years & Research Grade
1	Wharton Business School University of Pennsylvania, USA	0.26 Satisfactory Performer	Geoffrey Garrett (2014-Present)	6/40 = 0.15 Poor Performer
2	Harvard Business School Harvard University, USA	0.39 Good Performer	NitinNohria (2010-Present)	0.475 Good Performer
3	London Business School, London, UK	0.21 Poor Performer	Andrew Likierman (2009-Present)	0.05 Non-Performer
4	Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, USA	0.33 Satisfactory Performer	Jonathan Levin (2016-Present)	0.65 Better Performer
5	INSEAD Business School Fontainebleau, France	0.232 Poor Performer	IlianMihov (2013-Present)	0.20 Poor Performer
6	Columbia Business School, New York, USA	0.17 Poor Performer	Glenn Hubbard	0.525 Better Performer
7	IESE Business School, University of Navarra, Barcelona, France	0.23 Poor Performer	Franz Heukamp (2016- Present)	0.10 Non-Performer
8	Sloan School of Management, MIT, USA	0.15 Poor Performer	David Schmittlein (2007-Present)	0.00 Non-Performer
9	Booth Business School, Chicago University USA	0.13 Poor Performer	Douglas Skinner (Present)	0.25 Satisfactory Performer
10	Haas Business School, University of California at Berkeley, USA	0.11 Non-Performer	Richard K. Lyons (2008-Present)	0.325 Satisfactory Performer
11	China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), Shanghai, China	0.144 Poor Performer	Ding, Yuan	0.75 Better Performer
12	IE Business School, IE University, Madrid, Spain	0.03(2012) Non-Performer	Santiago Iñiguez de Onzoño (2004-Present)	0.225 Poor Performer
13	Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, U.K.	0.28 Satisfactory Performer	Christoph H. Loch (2011 – Present)	0.15 Poor Performer
14	HKUST Business School, Hong Kong China	0.017 Non-Performer	Tam Kar Yan (2011-Present)	0.15 Poor Performer
15	Kellogg School of Business, Northwestern University, Illinois, USA	0.36 Satisfactory Performer	Sally Blount	0.15 Poor Performer
16	HEC, Paris France	0.28 Satisfactory Performer	Peter A. TODD (2015-Present)	0.10 Non-Performer
17	Yale School of Management, Yale, Connecticut, USA	0.07 Non-Performer	Edward A. Snyder	0.175 Poor Performer
18	Stern School of Business New York University, New	-	Peter Henry	0.175 Poor Performer

	York, USA			
19	Esade Business School, University in Barcelona, Spain	0.29 Satisfactory Performer	Josep Franch	0.10 Non-Performer
20	IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland	-	Dominique Turpin	0.00 Non-Performer
21	FUKUA School of Business, Duke University, Durham, USA	-	Bill William Boulding	0.20 Poor Performer
22	Oxford Said Business School Oxford University, U.K.	0.45 Good Performer	Peter Tufano	0.45 Good Performer
23	Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, Hanover, USA	-	Matthew J. Slaughter (2015- Present)	0.35 Satisfactory Performer
24	Ross Business School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA	-	Scott DeRue (2016-Present)	0.70 Better Performer
25	UCLA: Anderson School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles, USA	-	Judy D. Olian (2006 – Present)	0.00 Non-Performer
26	Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India	0.17 Poor Performer	Ashish Nanda	0.15 Non-Performer
27	SDA Boccioni School of Management, Bocconi University, Italy	0.005 Non-Performer	Busacca Bruno (2012-Present)	1.00 Best Performer
28	Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University, USA	0.19 Poor Performer	Mark Nelson	0.60 Better Performer
29	School of Business, University of Hong Kong, China	0.15 Poor Performer	Eric C. Chang	0.60 Better Performer
30	CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China	-	Kalok Chan	0.30 Satisfactory Performer
31	School of Business, National University of Singapore, Singapore	0.20 Poor Performer	Bernard Yeung	0.825 Better Performer
32	Darden School of Business, University of Virginia, USA	0.16 Poor Performer	Scott C. Beardsley (2015-Present)	0.30 Satisfactory Performer
33	Indian School of Business, Hyderabad, India	0.27 Satisfactory Performer	K. Rajendra Srivastava	0.575 Better Performer
34	Imperial College Business School, London, UK	0.41 Good Performer	Nelson Phillips	0.825 Better Performer
35	Alliance-Manchester Business School, Manchester University, UK	0.10 Non-Performer	Professor Fiona Devine (2014-Present)	0.25 Satisfactory Performer

Table 7: Percentage of Deans of World Top Business schools with their grade

S.No	Grade	Number (out of 35)	Percentage (%)
1	Non-performers	08	22.86
2	Poor Performers	09	25.71

3	Satisfactory Performers	06	17.14
4	Good Performers	02	5.72
5	Better Performers	10	29.0
6	Optimum Performers	0	0
7	Super Performers	0	0

Based on the analysis data of 35World Top business schools, 22.86% of deans are falling into non-performers category, 25.71% of deans are falling into poor performers category, 17.14% deans have satisfactory research performance, 5.72% deans are good research performers, and 29 % deans are Best performers as per their individual research contribution is concerned. The result shows there are no optimum and super research performers serving as deans in this 35World Top Business schools as shown in table 7. The result shows that many World top business school Deans are poor/non research performers and fails to inspire the young researchers through their inability to individual contribution to their subject through research publications. Such researcher cum Deans are lacking in their contribution to the business management research. This may be also one of the reasons for observed low research output in many business schools in the world.

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 35World Top Business Schools, 22.86% of Deans are falling into non-performers category, 25.71% of Deans are falling into poor performers category, 17.14% Deans have satisfactory research performance, 5.72% Deans are good research performers, and 29 % Deans are Best performers as per their individual research contribution is concerned. The result shows there are no optimum and super research performers serving as Deans/Directors in this 35World Top Business schools. This study shows that the Deans/Directors of should become more active in their individual research contribution to the research output of the higher education institutions so that they can inspire other researchers in the organization as active role models.

8. References:

1. Aithal P. S., (2016). Inspiring through Self-Contribution – An Analysis of How Active the Indian Top Business School Directors in Research & Publications. International Journal of Engineering Research and Modern Education (IJERME), 1(2), 137 – 154. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.164690.
2. 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.

3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Salience of best selves undermines inspiration by outstanding role models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 214–228.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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), 18(7), 126-134. DOI: http://doi.org/10.9790/487X-180704126134.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Aithal, P. S. & Suresh Kumar, P.M., (2016). ABC Model of Research Productivity and Higher Educational Institutional Ranking. International Journal of Education and Management Engineering (IJEME), 6(6), 74-84, DOI: 10.5815/ijeme.2016.06.08.
14. 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
15. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Study of Annual Research Productivity in Indian Top Business Schools. International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME), Volume I, Issue I, 2016, pp.402-414. DOI : http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.161041
16. 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.

17. 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
18. 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.
19. Rogers, E.M., (1995), 'Diffusion of Innovation', The Free Press, NY.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. Aithal P. S., and Shubhrajyotsna Aithal, (2015). Ideal Technology Concept & its Realization Opportunity using Nanotechnology.International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEM), Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 153 - 164. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.61591.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.

30. 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
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. 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.
37. ShubhrajyotsnaAithal, &Aithal, P. S., (2016), ABCD analysis of Dye doped Polymers for Photonic Applications, IRA-International Journal of Applied Sciences, Vol. 4, No.3, pp. 358-378. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jas.v4.n3.p1.
38. 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.
39. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Realization of Ideal Banking Concept using Ubiquitous Banking. International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education (IJSRME), 1(2), 119-135. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.164703.
40. Aithal, P. S. & VaikuthPai, 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.
41. 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.

42. 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.
43. 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.
44. Aithal, P. S. (2016). Ideal Banking Concept and Characteristics.International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences (IRJMIS), 3(11), 46-55. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v3i11.311.
45. Thrash T. M., Elliot A. J. (2004). Inspiration: core characteristics, component processes, antecedents and function. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 87, 957–973.
46. 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.