

**STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARKET ORIENTATION  
AND MARKETING EFFECTIVENESS IN B-SCHOOLS: WITH  
SPECIFIC REFERRENCE TO B-SCHOOLS IN HYDERABAD AND  
RANGAREDDY DISTRICTS OF TELANGANA STATE**

**Synopsis of the Research Proposal**

Submitted for the Registration into the  
**Ph. D. Programme (Part-Time) in Management Of  
The ICFAI University, Jharkhand Ranchi**

By

**Arijit Santikary**

Under the Supervision of

**Research Supervisor  
Dr.SF Chandrasekhar  
Professor & Area Chair (Research & HRM),  
Siva Sivani Institute of Management**

**Research Guide  
Prof. ORS Rao  
Vice Chancellor  
ICFAI University Jharkhand**



**THE ICFAI UNIVERSITY**  
Jharkhand Ranchi

2018

## Table of contents

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1	Introduction (the backdrop of the topic)	3
2	Relevance of the Topic (why this topic?)	3-4
3	Objective/s and scope ( what will be covered and what will NOT be covered)	4-5
4	Concepts/Theories/Philosophies (Give details of Literature Reviewed)	5- 12
5	Research work that was done on the topic, so far (please give details of the Researcher, work done etc.)	12 - 17
6	Problem Statement (Identifying Gap on the basis of Literature Reviewed)	17-18
7	Hypotheses (If any) Justification	18
8	Methodology Proposed	19
9	Data proposed to be collected ( Types, Collection Method/s) and Statistical Techniques (for Analysis) Projected Justification	19 -21
10	Relevance of Projected Findings	21
11	Challenges / difficulties anticipated taking up the study and how do you propose to address them?	21
12	Proposed time frames for completion of the major mile stones (start date ,time estimated and end date)	22
13	Help required ,if any, from the University	22
14	Acknowledgements	23
15	Bibliography	23 - 30

In Subsequent Pages there will be one or more Sections in each page.

## **Introduction**

Business Management education has come of age. It has celebrated its more than century old existence across the world (Business & Economy, 2011). Nevertheless, the top ten institutions offering Business Management are outside of the Asian continent (The Economist, Business Insider, and Forbes 2014), despite the Asian Economy being the emerging economy.

In India, until 90s, not many Universities and Institutes of national repute were offering Management education. Consequently, the post liberalization era has witnessed a mushroom growth of institutions offering management education at graduate, post-graduate and PhD levels, in addition to post experience certificate programs (Dayal Ishwar, 2006). On the contrary, during the last five years around three hundred institutions offering business education have withdrawn offering the courses by winding off their operations (AICTE, 2014; The Times of India, 2015). A good number of them are still struggling for survival while the matured established institutes are thriving.

Perhaps, such dismal scenario of the institutes meant for offering management education could be due to certain explicit and implicit reasons of internal and external business environment. Most pertinently the internal reasons may be related to structural and functional issues of these institutions including their management practices like, marketing, HR, Finance and operations of these institutions (Warren G. Bennis & James O'Toole, 2005). Many of these institutes have realized the need for establishing marketing function to address some of these challenges. Marketing function addresses inculcating all the employees with market orientation, through training and development activities, to ensure that the institutions perform effectively year after year. Institutional performance is determined by the efforts of all other functional areas, however, the present study is confined to the concept of marketing effectiveness which is a subset of overall organizational effectiveness of these institutes. Thus, it is assumed that market orientation will affect marketing effectiveness (Craig C. Julian).

## **Relevance of the Topic**

The business management education enjoys higher status among all kinds of education inspite of the drop in the number of aspirants for CAT, MAT and other management aptitude test. As a result, the percentage of admissions among these institutes is wavering (India Today, 2014; Mingle box, 2013). On the other hand, corporate expectations during campus placement from the B-schools and their students are not completely met (Krishna Kishore and Mousumi Majumdar, 2012).

The current environmental changes are creating pressures for management institutions in India. Due to increased competition, it is becoming important for the B-schools to consider their market and competitive environment. More recently, it has been also noticed through various online forums and also through literature that the students and faculty satisfaction is lowering consequently the satisfaction of corporate clients is also affected. B-schools should adopt a market or customer oriented approach that focuses primarily on students to improve the service provider-customer relationship. The objective of market oriented institutions is to satisfy customers by coordinating activities around their needs (Levitt, 1960; Boyd & Walker, 1990). A market orientation reflects an organization's culture, shared values, and beliefs

about putting the customer first (Desphande, 1999). Nevertheless, market orientation can be a source of competitive advantage if imparted value to the customers though it is hard to replicate (Slater & Narver, 2000). Consequently, it is also confirmed by the literature that firms which implement a customer intensive strategy usually enjoy improved performance (Hult, Ketchen & Slater, 2005).

Many a b-school has realized the importance of professionalizing their management practices particularly the marketing function in response to the challenges face by them. With the strong evidences about benefits accumulated by the organizations due to adoption of market orientation, it is important for an organization to understand and appreciate the marketing function. The present intends to examine this issue in the context of B-schools' faculty on one hand, who are important front-line people at any B-schools and also students, on the other hand, as they are co-creator of services and also primary customer who receive the services. Therefore, there is a need to understand such marketing efforts, particularly the market orientation of the faculty members and students and also the marketing effectiveness as perceived by them in their institutions. Thus the present study has a three-fold purpose. Firstly, it will address the market orientation of the faculty members and students of B-schools. Secondly, it will address marketing effectiveness of the b-schools perceived by them. Lastly, it will address the relationship between the two variables namely market orientation and marketing effectiveness.

### **Objectives of the Study**

In view of the challenges of B-schools, the present research address while formulating the following objectives.

1. To study market orientation of the employees including faculty members, staffs and students of the selected B-schools.
2. To assess marketing effectiveness of B-schools responded by employees, corporates and students.
3. To objectively measure B-schools' performance variables.
4. To examine the variations in Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness according to classification of B-schools.
5. To analyze the relationship between Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness of the b-schools.

### **Scope of the Study**

The present study covers the B-schools operating in the Hyderabad and Rangareddy district of Telangana state. In the process, firstly, this study will cover all the institutions offering management education in Hyderabad and Rangareddy district of Telangana state. It is estimated that around 300 institutions are offering management education which includes autonomous AICTE run institutions and the university affiliated institutions. Further, it is decided to include top 30 b-schools either according to survey ratings or being atleast 15 years old. Secondly, this study intends to examine the prevailing market orientation and marketing effectiveness of the B-schools. Lastly, the respondents include students, faculty members, non-teaching staffs and employers.

## **Concepts/Theories/Philosophies:**

In the present study, there are two major concepts such as Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness used and discussed. The theory related to these concepts and their relationship, clarifying the theory related to differences between market orientation and marketing orientation are discussed in the following section.

### **Market Orientation**

Marketing is one of the most misunderstood concepts in management. Most people believe it is selling and promotion. These are important aspects, but the central idea of marketing is matching the B-school's offerings with the wants and needs of customers (students, parents and corporates) in order to achieve the goals. It is recognized that all school market to a greater or lesser degree. There are basically three reasons why schools market: to increase or maintain enrolments; gain financial resources and other forms of support; and improve the B-school's reputation or image.

Marketing activities aimed at promoting the school include brochures, pamphlets, prospectus, newspaper advertisement, informative website, social media, direct mailing, hoardings, word of mouth, educational fairs, videos etc.

While most schools highlight quality education and excellence, an emerging marketing approach is to emphasize a distinctive feature, program or aspect of the school's educational program; for example, business analytics program or digital marketing program in B-schools may be given media exposure. Thus, schools need to do more than just conduct marketing activities which in a number of cases may not produce the expected results: B-schools need to become 'market oriented.'

But increasing the range and level of sophistication of marketing activities and engaging in 'the trappings of marketing' does not guarantee that a school is market oriented. Research in industry is suggesting that while engaging in marketing activities may be important, 'market orientation' is a vital ingredient in determining an organization's success.

### **Market Orientation vs. Marketing Orientation in the context B-school**

Market orientation is more than simply 'getting close to the customer.' An organization can be market oriented only if it completely understands its market. Customer information must go beyond research and promotional functions to permeate every organizational function.

Market orientation is generally regarded as the implementation of the 'marketing concept'. The marketing concept is a philosophy of doing business, which puts the customer's needs at the center of the organization. With respect to B-school, the marketing concept starts with the student's and corporate needs as the central function of school purpose. The school must identify these needs and then decide which ones it should try to satisfy and also concentrate closely on external environment like competitors and related information about their offering and marketing strategies. Everyone in the organization should focus on the positive experience of the customer and satisfaction.

Thus, market orientation is considered as a very comprehensive concept which includes marketing culture (Drysdale.L.1999). Therefore, in this study market orientation have been used as a variable over marketing orientation.

The market orientation concept originated from a management philosophy known as ‘marketing concept’. The marketing concept has been a foundation of the marketing functions since Drucker (1988) pointed out that the purpose of business is to create a customer. There is a good number of research conducted to understand what a market orientation is (Day, 1994b; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990), market orientation construct can be operationalized and measured (Deshpandé *et al.*, 1993; Kohli *et al.*, 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990), causes and effects of market orientation as well as possible mediating variables (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Narver and Slater, 1990), and the focus on managerial actions to device a market orientation (Day, 1999; Gebhardt *et al.*, 2006; Harris and Ogbonna,2001a; Narver, *et al.*,1998). The first issues on concept of market orientation can be discussed by the different definition given by the various authors over the time in the below mentioned table no 1.

**Table No-1 Definitions of Market Orientation**

Shapiro (1988)	A company is market oriented if information related to all important buying influences goes to every functional department and any strategic and tactical decisions are made after the consultation with every functional division and also execute them with sense of commitment.
Deshpande & Webster (1989)	Market orientation is defined as an organization-level culture of attempting to put the customer first in business planning
Narver and Slater (1990)	Market orientation is defined as “the business culture that most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for customers.” Market orientation consists of three behavioral components – customer orientation, competitor orientation, and interfunctional co-ordination – and two decision criteria – long-term focus and profitability.”
Ruekert (1992)	The degree of market orientation in a business unit is “the degree to which the business unit (1) obtains and uses information from customers; (2) develops a strategy which will meet customer needs; and (3) implements that strategy by being responsive to customer needs and wants.”
Deshpande, Farley, and Webster (1993)	Customer or market orientation (as they see customer and market orientations as being synonymous) is “the set of beliefs that puts the customer’s interest first, while not excluding those of all other stakeholders such as owners, managers, and employees, in order to develop a long-term profitable enterprise.”
Day (1994b)	“Market orientation represents superior skills in understanding and satisfying customers.”

The second issue is the measurement of market orientation related which focuses on the development of scales. The array of definitions on market orientation provides multitude of scales for measuring the construct but the most popular measurement scales either in their original form or adapted by the researchers are Narver and Slater’s the MKTOR scale and Kohli and Jaworski’s the MARKOR scale. MKTOR’s fifteen items are three components of market orientation: customer orientation, competitor’s orientation, and interfunctional co-ordination. A business’s market orientation score is the simple average of the scores of the three components (Narver and Slater, 1990). Underlying MARKOR’s twenty items are three components: intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, and responsiveness. The third component is composed of two sets of activities: response design and response implementation (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). Similar to MKTOR, the market orientation score is a un- weighted sum of the three components.

The third issue in market orientation research is the model issue. The model focuses on the antecedents and consequences of a market orientation, as well as variables that might moderate or mediate the relationships between market orientation and its consequences. There was many research had been conducted to understand the relationship between market orientation and business performance almost in all the sectors and found that a firm's degree of market orientation has a positive effect on (financial) business performance, more specifically on sales, market share, and profitability (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Kirca *et al.*, 2005; Pelham and Wilson, 1996; Slater and Narver, 1994). It was also clear from the studies have provided empirical support for the positive effects of market orientation on customer perceived quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty (Becker and Homburg, 1999; Homburg and Pflesser, 2000; Kirca *et al.*, 2005). Market orientation has also been shown to have positive consequences for employees (Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Kirca *et al.*, 2005). Ruekert (1992) found a positive effect on job satisfaction, trust in leadership and organizational commitment, Jaworski and Kohli (1993) found a positive effect on employees' satisfaction and organizational commitment, and Sigauw *et al.* (1994) found a negative effect on role stress, as well as positive effects on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of sales people.

In addition to consequences, the antecedents of a market orientation have also been studied. These antecedents are also important from an implementation perspective, as they may provide hints about how to develop a market orientation in an organization (Kennedy *et al.*, 2003). We here distinguish between external antecedents, i.e., environmental factors that stimulate a firm's adoption of a market orientation, and internal antecedents, i.e., organizational factors that enable the adoption of the market orientation concept. External antecedents that have been proposed in the literature are market dynamism and competitive intensity (Avlonitis and Gounaris, 1999; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Pelham and Wilson, 1996). Kohli and Jaworski (1990) argue that in a stable environment few adjustments to the marketing mix are needed, requiring a low level of market orientation. Furthermore, the lower competitive intensity, the more a firm can implement a low level of market orientation (Pelham and Wilson, 1996). Various internal antecedents to market orientation have also been proposed and empirically tested. Ruekert (1992) has identified three organizational processes that foster a market orientation: recruiting and selecting customer focused individuals; market oriented training; and market oriented reward and compensation systems. All three factors were found to be positively correlated with market orientation. Jaworski and Kohli (1993) advanced eight antecedents: top management emphasis on market orientation; top management risk aversion; interdepartmental conflict; interdepartmental connectedness; degree of formalization; degree of centralization; degree of departmentalization; reliance on market-based factors for evaluations and rewards. However, top management emphasis, interdepartmental conflict and connectedness, and reward systems found to be the most important antecedents and empirically supported by the study. Even the meta-analytic study conducted by Kirca *et al.* (2005) confirms the importance of these three variables.

The fourth issue in market orientation research is the implementation issue. In contrast to the literature on definitions, measurements and models, the literature on implementation takes an explicitly managerial view of market orientation and asks what firms can do to improve their market orientation. Although the implementation issue has not been studied as intensively as the other three issues, since 1990, nine different implementation approaches have nevertheless been published.

**Table No 2 Implementations of Market Orientation**

<b>Author's</b>	<b>Concepts</b>	<b>Approaches</b>	<b>Research Type</b>
Kohli and Jaworski	Market orientation as activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Instill senior management commitment</li> <li>– Improve interdepartmental connectedness and reduce interdepartmental conflict</li> <li>– Redesign organization wide systems (organization structure, reward systems)</li> </ul>	Recommendations based on 62 interviews with managers; data from about 500 managers show correlations between market orientation and five implementation factors
Lichtenthal and Wilson	Market orientation as behavioral norms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Diagnose current organizational value system</li> <li>– Develop list of desired behaviors</li> <li>– Develop top-down programs to change norms and/or create new norms</li> </ul>	Conceptual paper
Ruekert	Market orientation as activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Diagnose current behaviors, systems, individual outcomes, and business performance</li> <li>– Adapt systems for recruitment and selection</li> <li>– Adapt systems for training</li> <li>– Adapt systems for rewards and compensation</li> </ul>	Data from 400 managers from one firm show correlations between market orientation and recruiting, training and reward systems
Day	Market orientation as a capability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Diagnose current market sensing, customer linking, and channel bonding capabilities</li> <li>– Anticipate future needs for capabilities</li> <li>– Redesign business processes</li> <li>– Signal management commitment</li> <li>– Use information technology creatively</li> <li>– Stretch improvement targets and monitor progress continuously</li> </ul>	Largely conceptual; case descriptions illustrate the process of becoming market-driven
Narver and Slater	Market orientation as culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Use a priori education to gain commitment to the continuous creation of superior customer value</li> <li>– Use experiential learning to create an understanding of how to implement this norm</li> </ul>	Conceptual paper
Homburg <i>c.s.</i>	Market-oriented management as organizational systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reduce number of hierarchical levels, appoint key account managers, and fill key management positions with employees having a marketing background</li> <li>– Increase interfunctional integration</li> <li>– Empower customer contact employees and involve customers in process redesign</li> <li>– Collect and disseminate market information, and store it in accessible information systems</li> <li>– Set market-based objectives, engage in environmental scanning, and involve customer contact personnel and customers in decision-making</li> <li>– Measure and analyze performance on the basis of market data</li> </ul>	Data from 234 SBU's show correlations between market oriented systems and performance; 50 interviews with managers confirm many of the implementation factors.



Harris c.s.	Market orientation as culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recognize and confront negative organizational behaviors (such as conflictual, formalized, and political behaviors)</li> <li>– Identify and foster positive organizational behaviors (such as communication)</li> <li>– Use a participative or a supportive leadership style to implement market orientation, and avoid an instrumental leadership style</li> <li>– Use recruitment and training to establish the appropriate leadership styles</li> </ul>	Three in-depth case studies and data from 107 store managers offer support for the behavioral implementation factors. Data from 323 firms offer support for the choice of leadership style.
Kennedy, Goolsby and Arnould	Market orientation as culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ensure an unbroken circuit of passionate, sincere, unified, and committed leadership from top levels to local managers, “walking the walk” of customer orientation</li> <li>– Use customer requirements and performance feedback to instill a culture of interdepartmental connectedness</li> <li>– Collect, disseminate and use data from external and internal customers so that a customer orientation becomes self-reinforcing</li> </ul>	Two in-depth case studies show differences between a progressing and a struggling organization.
Gebhardt, Carpenter and Sherry	Market orientation as culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Once a threat to the organization is recognized, a group of empowered managers needs to create a coalition to plot the change process.</li> <li>– A complete transformation of the organization must be planned, the larger organization must be mobilized, and a cultural shift created through a process of value and norm development, reconnecting organization members with customers, and removal of dissenters and hiring of believers.</li> <li>– Formal changes, such as alignment of rewards and indoctrination and training should follow informal ones.</li> </ul>	Ethnographic studies at seven firms reveal a four-stage process of cultural transformation.

## Marketing Effectiveness

Marketing effectiveness has several definitions given by many researchers. The first one was given by (Kotler, 1977). He opined that claiming marketing effectiveness required strategic managers should recognize the primacy of studying the market, distinguishing many opportunities, selecting the best sections of the market to serve, and gearing up to offer superior value to the target market with respect to their needs and wants. (Webster, 1995) stated that managers need to have adequate information for planning and allocating resources properly to different markets, products, territories, and marketing tools to be considered as

effective marketing.

(Powell, 2008) stated that the purpose of marketing effectiveness is to optimize marketing spending for the short and long term in support of the brand strategy by building a market model using valid and objective marketing metrics and analytics. Finally, (Adu *et al*, 2001) marketing effectiveness is influenced by the ability to implement marketing plans successfully at various levels of the organization. (Norburn *et al*. 1990) opined that companies with high degree of marketing effectiveness are close to consumers and established a common set of values which demonstrate external market orientation. Generally such kind of companies involve customer for creating the services and give proper attention to the quality and innovations, also transparent to the consumer.

It was also confirmed that importance of marketing effectiveness tremendously grown in service companies (Webster, 1995).

According to Nwokah & Ahiauzu (2007), there are four important elements of marketing effectiveness:

1. Company. Each company has certain limitations which determined from the company budget, size and adaption to make organizational change.
2. Competitive. It is becoming important for the marketers to have information about the competitors' action along with their own. Many industries information related to competitors is hard to get.
3. Consumers. Information about the consumer buying decisions behavior and segment them according to their needs would help the marketers to improve their marketing effectiveness. Consumers are received information from various communication tools about the attributes of the product which helps building a brand.
4. Exogenous factors. Corporate, competitive and customer environmental factors can influence marketing effectiveness. Interest rate, weather, government regulations are examples of external factor that affect marketing effectiveness.

Further, (Nwokah & Ahiauzu, 2009), stated five driving factors of marketing effectiveness. These are:

1. Marketing strategy. Marketing effectiveness is a result of superior marketing strategy related to segmentation, targeting and positioning and all other marketing programs to gain edge over the competitors.
2. Marketing Creative. Innovation and creative concepts can help to improve results.
3. Marketing execution. Step by step execution at all levels and required changes time to time is important to gain higher degree of effectiveness.
4. Marketing infrastructure. Management of agencies, budgeting, motivation, and coordination of marketing activities can lead to improved competitiveness and improved results.
5. Exogenous factors. Exogenous factors also influence marketing effectiveness, for example, seasons, climate etc. also have impact on sales and marketing.

Marketing effectiveness research evidences two schools of thoughts. The first school of thought stated the concept of marketing effectiveness and identifies its components. The other school of thought study marketing effectiveness metrics and examine its measures.

First viewpoint: This view was among the first, and it was developed by Philip Kotler (1977). He mentioned that marketing effectiveness of a company, division, or product line depends largely on a combination of five activities: Customer philosophy, Integrated marketing organization, Adequate marketing information, Strategic

orientation and Operational efficiency. Kotler's marketing effectiveness and its components are outlined in table 3.

**Table no 3: Kotler's marketing effectiveness model**

<b>Attributes</b>	<b>Components</b>
Customer philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management's commitment to market needs and wants</li> <li>• Market segmentation strategy</li> </ul>
Integrated marketing organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marketing integration and control</li> <li>• Synergy with other marketing units</li> <li>• New product process</li> </ul>
Adequate marketing information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct of market research</li> <li>• Management knowledge of the market</li> <li>• Cost-effectiveness of marketing</li> </ul>
Strategic orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of formal marketing planning</li> <li>• Quality of marketing strategy</li> <li>• Extent of contingency planning</li> </ul>
Operational efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top-down communication of marketing thinking</li> <li>• Effectiveness of marketing resources</li> </ul>

Kotler's marketing effectiveness model has been tested empirically by many researchers where they examine the impact of various factors on marketing effectiveness (Dunn *et al*, 1994; Webster, 1995 and Nwokah and Ahiauzu, 2008, 2009). Also, others have investigated Kotler's (1977) amalgam of five components presented in Table 3, and applied it to a certain country or industry (Yoon and Kim, 1999; Stefanov and Todorov, 2004; Cizmar and Weber, 2000 and Adu et al, 2001).

The second school of thought mostly consists of evaluating and measuring marketing performance. This view gained importance because Marketing Science Institute has made Accountability and ROI of marketing expenditure one of its research priorities since 2000. Research has been conducted in this view attempts to identify and represent various measures and metrics of evaluating marketing effectiveness. There are some researches which identify variety of marketing metrics. Such as, Clark (1999) identifies about 20 measures, 38 metrics were tested by Ambler and Riley (2000), while Davidson (1999) considers ten more useful metrics of marketing effectiveness and Meyer (1998) mentions hundreds. Also, Barwise and Farley (2004) examine six metrics in five industrial countries. However, Clark (1999) suggests that it is better to use existing metrics rather than present new ones. Kokkinaki and Ambler (1999) identify marketing success in six main categories:

1. Financial measures (such as turnover, contribution margin and profit).
2. Competitive market measures (such as market share, advertising and promotional share).
3. Consumer behavior measures (such as consumer penetration, loyalty and customer gained).
4. Consumer intermediate measures (such as brand recognition, satisfaction and purchase intention).
5. Direct customer measures (such as distribution level, profitability of intermediaries and service quality). And
6. Innovativeness measures (such as products launched and their revenue).

Marketing effectiveness refers to internal and external marketing processes. The benefit of marketing effectiveness to the company is huge: estimates of sales potential and assessments of the cost effectiveness of various marketing expenditures; monitoring of consumer satisfaction, includes internal communication, internal coordination and internal implementation of marketing activities. Marketing effectiveness results consumer's satisfaction, while consumer's satisfaction results in repeat consumers who purchase on a regular basis and this, in turn, contribute to profitability and growth (Appiah, Adu et al., 2001) as well as have influence on company to reach marketing goals, which are: market growth, sales growth, overall profitability.

**Research work that was done on the topic, so far**

Here are some of the literatures I have reviewed based on the work done so far related to my research in a broad manner.

**Table no 4: Related Literature Review**

<b>Literature Reviewed</b> (Title of the paper, article, etc. along with the source, i.e., the name of the Journal, Magazine, Book, etc.)	<b>Literature Type</b> (Research Paper, Review Paper, Chapter of a Book, etc.)	<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Publishing Year</b>	<b>Gist of Points gained</b>	<b>Linkage to own research</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1.The Best Business Schools: A Market Based Approach	Research Paper	Joseph Tracy Joel Waldfoegel	1994	Author presented a new methodology for ranking B-schools. Data they have used from the labor market for management graduates with the intention of distinguishing the program quality from its incoming student's quality. The researchers found as a result that variables were co-relates of value added like a school connection with the business community is a positive force in determining a schools ranking and Schools having research intensity and attractive faculty salaries have a stronger impact on the quality of its students and finally the tuition fees of a program has stronger connection with the perceived value added to the program compare to the adjusted salary received from the corporates.	Market based approach variables and impact of one important variable understood	

2.How Business Schools Lost Their Way	Conceptual Paper	Warren G. Bennis and .James O'Toole	2005	B-school is focusing much on scientific research and hiring faculties who are rich in qualification and academic research but very limited practical experience to deal with all complex and unquantifiable issues. They have also argued that crisis in management education occur due to the adoption of self-defeating model of academic excellence which judge a faculty from their scientific research and ignoring the faculties limited practical experience on understanding key drivers of business performance. The author suggested that there should be a perfect balance between scientific rigor and practical relevance to make the management education more practical.	Business School related general studies	
3.The changing business model of B-schools	Conceptual Paper	Santiago Iniguez de Onzono and Salvador Carmona	2007	Suggested that changes occurred in the broad context of B-schools and Universities indicate a paradigm shift in their business model. Researcher has also reviews position of a B-school holds traditional view of business model to the extent of regular changes in their institutional environment. Their paper proposes some actions which B-schools might follow to gain competitive advantage and also identified some structural measures which probably B-schools wish to address to cope with the changes occurred in their wider environments. Authors has identified the key drivers signal change in the wider context of the business model of B--schools are structure of the MBA programs, the sources of income of B-schools, market concentration, new profile of customers, and the changing		

				<p>distribution and promotion channels. To mitigate such problems due to changes in the business model researcher has suggested two structural measures like institution should adopt an entrepreneurial mind set and also consider diversity in their structure and functions to help mobilize concrete actions, such as a focus on a portfolio of financial sources, segments of activities depicts entrepreneurial mindset, geographical markets and strategic alliances depicts diversity.</p>		
4.Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education	Research Paper	Christopher Grey	2004	<p>Proposed a solution to the problems encountered by management education in his paper titled 'Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education'. The proposed solution is a body of educational practices known as Critical Management Education (CME) which were found from a tradition of research called Critical Management Studies (CMS).He argued that CME may benefit business schools by stressing two important elements that are value and context. In practice B-schools leads to an explicitly debated version of management studies where issues of power and politics are seen as overt and inescapable.</p>		
5. Students Satisfaction in Management Education: Study and Insights	Research paper	Roma Mitra Debnath et al	2005	<p>Studied the overall expectation and satisfaction of the management students. They also give importance to student's feedback system for the enhancement of teaching learning experience. They have also discussed and debated that acceptable expectation and expectation with abnormality has to be segregated to measure the overall satisfaction more accurately.</p>		
6. Universities in a Competitive Global Market Place-A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing	Conceptual Paper	Izhar Oplatka, Jane Hemsley-Brown	2006	<p>Stated that higher education marketing with the objective to explore the nature of higher education marketing in an international context. Author has systemically collect, document, and analyze the literature on HE marketing and looked upon the scope of HE marketing. They found in their paper after thorough literature survey that Higher Education market has realized the benefit of applying marketing</p>		

				theories and concepts and gradually started to apply in their business context. However, it is also proved through existing literature that there is very limited research carried out to describe the strategic marketing perspective of HE market and the nature of services.		
7.The Business School business': Some Lessons from the US Experience	Research Paper	Jeffrey Pfeffer and Christina T. Fong	2004	Documented problems faced by US business school and show the arousal of such problems due to lack of professional ethos and market-like orientation to education. In the year 2002 according to the author that MBA unless it is from a topnotch B-school does not appear to increase the chances of career success neither from the MBA degree nor from the grade students receives in the degree. He also opined through literature survey that B-school research does not have acceptance in management practice.		
8. The future of business schools	Conceptual Paper	Gabriel Hawawini	2005	Reviewed some of the challenging issues B-school are facing such as (1) the effects of globalization on business education and how to respond to this phenomenon (2) the shortage of highly qualified faculty and what to do to make up for the shortfall (3) the need to introduce softer skills into the curriculum while preserving the more analytical and concept-based courses (4) the effects of information and communication technologies on teaching and learning methods (5) the need to achieve financial balance and whether current or alternative funding models are sustainable (6) the need to adopt more effective governance structures and to make the appropriate strategic choices that will allow the school to better cope with competitive pressures and, finally, (7) the need to strengthen reputation and build up the school brand in order to secure its long term competitive position. The researcher also gave some suggestions to improve those challenges and stated the importance of innovation on those aspects to sustain in the future.		

9.Revitalising Management Education in India: A Strategic Approach	Conceptual	Manoj Kumar, shwetha jha	2012	Stated through their paper that there is a need for reorientation of Indian B-schools for the survival and also to maintain their significance in the society and to the corporate houses. They also instigated the major areas of development such as revamping mission and vision of the B-school, holistic development of faculty members, increased industry-academic interface and pedagogical innovations etc. Author suggested for adopting a common action plan probably through the consortium for the overall development of management education endorsed by the trustees, corporate leaders, regulatory bodies, faculty members and the students to enrich management education.	Conceptually linked with my research and confirming that orientation is important	
10.A synthesis model of market orientation constructs toward building customer value: A theoretical perspective	Conceptual paper	Wail Alhakimi and Rohaizat Baharun	2009	Has built a synthesis model for market orientation constructs through a systematic and exhaustive review of literature. This model has integrated all the popular scale used in measuring Market Orientation of any organization such as Kohli & Jaworsky's (1990) MARKOR scale, Narver & Slater's (1990) MKTOR scale, Deshpande & Farley's (1998) MORTN scale and Carr & Lopez's (2007) MOCCM scale etc. This Model developed a conceptual framework by considering integration of attributes namely Customer Orientation, Competitors Orientation, Profit Orientation, Intelligence Generation, Interfunctional Co-ordination, Intelligence Dissemination and Responsiveness. In his conceptual model he shows vertical relationship between customer, competitors and profit orientation and also horizontal relationship among competitor's orientation, interfunctional co-ordination and intelligence dissemination. Finally the linkages between intelligence generations to responsiveness with all the variables.	This paper is instigated the important variables of market orientation	



11. Market Orientations in the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector: A Meta-Analysis of Their Relationships With Organizational Performance	Research paper	Aviv Shoham et.al.	2006	Has done a meta analytical research to understand theoretical grounds and rationality of MO strategies, advantages of MO strategies and applicability of MO in Voluntary and nonprofit organizations (VNPOs).Researcher found that in VNPOs has stronger impact of MO strategies than from profit organizations.	Strong linkage with my research but done on different service sector	
12. Market orientation in a multiple stakeholder orientation context: implications for marketing capabilities and assets	Research Paper	Gordon E et. al.	2005	Researcher has investigated whether market orientation approach in an organization concentrated more on customer at the cost of other important stakeholders. They addressed this issue by using multiple stakeholder orientation profile (MSOP) which means simultaneously looked upon the each stakeholder's interest and serve those interests with expected managerial behavior. The study with a sample of senior marketing executives found that marketing capabilities and assets are both different and similar among executives with a market focus in their MSOPs and those with other MSOPs.	Related as it studied about implications of MO to different stakeholder	
13. INTERNAL MARKET ORIENTATION: CONSTRUCT AND CONSEQUENCES	Conceptual	Ian N Lings	2004	Examined the internal marketing contribution to develop internal focus for the firm and define internal marketing orientation by developing internal marketing construct in services context. In his proposed conceptual model has shown positive relationship between internal and external market orientation to internal and external aspects of organizational performance.	Market orientation construct development	
14. Market Orientation in Schools in Harbin,China.	Research Paper	Deyun Yang	2011	Studied market orientation of two schools where one is Govt.School (not for profit) and another is private school (for profit) in Harbin city of China. Researcher adopted a quantitative and qualitative techniques in comparative study and found that for profit schools had more mature understanding of marketing and focused on market needs compare to not for profit school who do not consider marketing as a function.	Related to my research but the population is only two school and conducted in China.	

15. The impact of internal and external market orientations on firm performance	Research Paper	Ian N Lings and Gordon E Greenley	2009	Empirically investigated the impact of internal market orientation on external market orientation and organizational performance. Data collected from UK retail managers were analyzed and found significant relationships between internal market orientation, employee motivation and external marketing success and customer satisfaction.	MO and Business performance relationship established with regard to retailing in UK. Strong linkages to understand the important variables for profit sector.	
16. MAKING UNIVERSITIES RELEVANT: MARKET ORIENTATION AS A DYNAMIC CAPABILITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING	Research Paper	Jun Ma, Zelimir Todorovic	2011	Has explored the role of Market Orientation (MO) in Universities by using Narver and Slater (1990) scale. They found positive correlation between MO and University commercialization. More surprisingly it also confirms external community as university customer rather than students or internal stakeholders.	Directly linked with my study with respect to commercialization of education.	
17. MARKET ORIENTATION EFFECTS ON BUSINESS SCHOOL PERFORMANCE : VIEWS FROM TWO MANAGEMENT LEVELS	Research Paper	Robert L. Webster, Kevin L. Hammond	2014	Investigated Market Orientation towards students and the MO impact on B-school performance in USA. The researcher used combined modified scale of MARKOR and MKTOR for the study in two different management levels one accounting department chairpersons and other is business school's deans. This research confirmed that market orientation has a significant impact on organizational performance as reported by accounting department chairperson and B-schools deans. This research also stated that improved market orientation approach may increase the organization performance.	Directly related with my research but in the US context.	
18. Modeling MO An Application in the Education sector	Research Paper	Noel YM.Siu and Richard M.S. Wilson	1998	Investigated market orientation and marketing thinking of Further Education (FE) colleges and to make those colleges understand the importance of market orientation and assist them for long term survival. The researchers used three case studies in the midland area of UK to develop MO in FE colleges. To know the MO of the FE College's author has researching on three major attributes- customer orientation,		

				employee orientation and organizational coordination. The finding of the study stated that three colleges invariably wish to follow customer (students and corporates) centered approach. To understand the extent of customer orientation by understanding four issues such as the interaction among customers; the interaction between customer and college staff; the interaction among tangible aspects and customer; the interaction among intangible aspect and customers. An examination of three case studies helped the researcher to understand the employee orientation and organizational coordination, found that it is the role of management to be aware of employee's demands, to develop appropriate rewards within resource limitations, to establish appropriate system for information flows and to provide continuous training so that employees can be integrated in to the change process and develop a customer focus culture.		
19.Pitfalls in evaluating market orientation: an exploration of executives' interpretations	Research Paper	Mason and Harris	2005	Investigated and found that many practitioners faced difficulties on interpreting the marketing orientation concepts and also at the time of implementation of this concept.	This paper gives insight on discussion of implementation of MO.	

Market orientation is an attitude held by individuals employed in an organization with reference to internal and external business environment which influences performance of an organization. Therefore, both the dimension included in this study. To be more specific external environment includes students and employers as units of analysis because they are the customers of the institutions. The internal environment includes faculty members and non-teaching staffs. All the levels of faculty members who directly provide services to the students are expected to have such market oriented attitudes. In this study all the categories of respondent namely employees, employers and student will be the main units of sample.

### **Problem Statement**

In the preceding sections, a focused review of literature was made covering both the two major study variables. Based on the review of literature the following are the gaps identified in the literature.

Evidences suggest that understanding market orientation of the b-schools in our country is not undertaken by research fraternity as expected owing to their focus on most important

aspects like education, curriculum, pedagogy and the like. Though there are scanty evidences of studies on market orientation which are either in bits and pieces or cursorily carried out. Therefore, there is a need for understanding market orientation of B-schools which forms the first step in diagnosing what's ailing the b-schools of today.

From the review of research, there is ample evidence of poor student satisfaction, faculty satisfaction and also corporate client's satisfaction. Evidences also suggest that B-schools by and large have never has a system of tracking grievances of all the stake holders in place. Besides, when such challenges were to be addressed, they did not have a proper perspective of addressing them. All these reflect that there was no market orientation which includes customer and service orientation. Therefore, firstly this study will attempt at examining market orientation in B-schools is the need of the hour as there are no concrete evidences of measuring market orientation of B-schools in India. Thus, in this study market orientation of the faculty members and students will be examined.

The scenario of management education in the country today is deplorable as evident from the review of literature. Gradually, hundreds of b-schools have closed down their units which reflects their overall effectiveness in general and their marketing effectiveness in specific. It may be also due to the fact that they did not have a systematic marketing program in the first place. Therefore, there is a need to understand marketing effectiveness of the B-schools in India.

In this study, the research model proposed to include both the major variables namely market orientation and marketing effectiveness in a relational manner. It is proposed in the model that every organization must give importance to customer, in order to have focus on the users; there is need for market orientation as a conscious and systematic effort to promote it among employees of the organization. As a result, marketing effectiveness can be realized year after year. Thus, in sum, it is assumed that market orientation will influence marketing effectiveness. Such assumption will be tested in this research.

## **Hypotheses**

B-schools are reviewed periodically by the press with fall of criticism for their style of functioning and their results. Evidences show that B-schools lack market orientation there are several cases on student teacher relationship and virtually non-existent of faculty and industry interaction. Sometimes the perplexity of B-schools is who is their customer? Whether the students or corporates. To analyses such perplexity there is a need to understand Market Orientation.

Thus, it is hypothesized that

*“Market Orientation of the b-schools does not vary according to the employees, students and corporates.”*

The existing media report have evidence on even the top B-schools seeking services from the consultancies for admission and placement process. It is also clear from the reports that many B-schools now appointing external as an advisor for the overall growth including Marketing Effectiveness even though B-schools have learned faculty. To know such problem in detail there is a need to understand Marketing Effectiveness of B-schools.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that

*“Marketing effectiveness of the b-schools does not vary according to the employees, students and corporates.”*

T.Amblar et al. (2001) defined marketing effectiveness as the extent to which marketing actions have helped the company to achieve its business goals. Philip Kotlar (1977) mentioned strategic orientation, customer philosophy, integrated marketing organization, adequate marketing information and operational efficiency is some of the most important elements of marketing effectiveness. Therefore, there is a need to understand the extent of impact of market orientation on marketing effectiveness.

Thus, it is hypothesized that

*“There is no relationship between Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness among B-schools”*

### **Methodology Proposed**

In the world of marketing research, the two major types of research methods are descriptive and analytical research which is mostly used by the researchers, though experimental designs are very scarcely adopted. A descriptive survey attempts to picture or document current conditions or attitudes, that is, to describe what exists at the moment. Analytical surveys attempt to describe and explain why certain situations exist. In this approach two or more variables are usually examined to test research hypotheses. The results allow researchers to examine the interrelationships among variables and to draw explanatory inferences.

Therefore, descriptive and analytical research design is adopted in this study to investigate the effect of variable namely Market Orientation on Marketing Effectiveness of select B-schools. This design is also helpful in analyzing those variables.

### **Study Area**

The B-schools in and around Hyderabad and Rangareddy districts of Telangana state are part of the study area. More specifically, top rated 30 B-schools (includes both AICTE autonomous and University affiliated colleges) are covered in Hyderabad and Rangareddy districts of Telanagana according to various rating agency such as Business Today and Career 360 etc.

### **Sampling**

According to indianmba.com there are around 87 management institutes operated in Hyderabad and Rangareddy districts of Telangana state. In this study two category of respondent each from internal and external environment will be considered as sample units from the considered to be top B-school in Hyderabad and Rangareddy districts. Details of the sample size mention in the table no 4.

**Table No 5: Sample Size of respondents in Business School**

Top Rated 30 B-school in Hyderabad and Rangareddy district.		
Sl.No	Type of Respondent	Total
1	Faculty	150
2	Student	300
3	Corporate	150
	Total	600

Using stratified dis-proportionate random sampling techniques around 10 students from each of the top 30 B-schools and around 05 faculty members and 05 corporates from each of them will be selected randomly. Thus a total of 150 faculty and 300 students and 150 corporates will be contacted for the data collection. The list of 30 B-School presented in the table below:

SL.NO	Autonomous B-School	University Affiliated B-School	University Department
1.	Siva Sivani Institute of Management (SSIM)	Siddhartha Institute of Management	Osmania University
2.	Vignana Jyothi Institute of Management (VJIM)	Mallareddy Institute of Business Management	Jawaharlal Nehru Technical University
3.	Vishwa Vishwani Institute. of Systems & Mgmt. (VVISM)	SVR Institute of Business Management	University of Hyderabad
4.	Aurora's Business School	Horizon Institute of Technology	NALSAR University
5.	National Institute of Agricultural Extension Mgmt.	MRM Institute of Management	ICFAI Foundation for Higher Learning
6.	Institute of Public Enterprises (IPE)	Apex College of Computers and Management	
7.	Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI)	TKR Institute of Management and Science	
8.	ICFAI Business School (IBS)	Hyderabad School of Management	
9.	Dhruva College of Management	Loyola Academy	
10.	Institute of Management Technology (IMT)	Bhavans	
11.	ICBM	CMR College of Engineering & Technology	
12	Synergy School of Business	Mahaveer Institute of Science & Technology	
13	Bhadruka Institute of Foreign Trade	DRK College of Engineering & Technology	

## **Measure**

In my study two major instruments will be used to measure the variables individually and established relationships. The details of both the variables are given below in brief.

### **A - Market Orientation.**

Marketing orientation is conceptualized as a business model that focuses on delivering products and services designed according to customer desires, needs, and requirements in addition to continuous improvements on the efficiency of the product and service. As stated by Bernard J. Jaworski and Ajay K. Kohli in the "Journal of Marketing", marketing orientation is, "The organization-wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, dissemination of the intelligence across departments and organization wide responsiveness to it."

In order to measure market orientation, there are two most frequently used scales MARKOR and MKTOR. In this study, MKTOR Scale by Narver and Slater (1990) is adopted to measure the market orientation of B-schools. This scale proposed three components of market orientation which are customer orientation, competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination. This scale is a 15- item, 7- point Likert scale. Many researchers used this scale and confirmed that those businesses which are market oriented attain higher profitability and sales growth. This scale includes, Customer Orientation referred as sufficient understanding of one's target buyers and also be able to create superior value for them continuously. Competitor orientation is referred as need of organization to keep its focus on competitors along with the customer needs. The analysis of competitors' long-term capabilities, strengths and weaknesses is a key factor in determining market orientation and culture. Inter-functional coordination is to create superior customer value there is a need of coordinating and integrating organization's resources.

### **B- Marketing Effectiveness**

Marketing effectiveness is the quality of how marketers go to market with the goal of optimizing their spending to achieve good results for both the short-term and long-term. It is also related to Marketing ROI and Return on Marketing Investment (ROMI).

To measure marketing effectiveness one of the widely used scale developed by Kotlar (1982) as 'effectiveness rating instrument' (ERI), will be used in this study to examine whether the B-schools are pursuing its best opportunities with respect to markets and services. The ERI scale consists of fifteen questions arranged in five sets of three. Each set attempts to measure five 'marketing attributes'. These factors are customer philosophy, an integrated marketing organization, adequate marketing information, a strategic orientation and operational efficiency. Each of the five factors will have scoring and sum of all the five factors score attributed to marketing effectiveness.

The objective measure of marketing effectiveness includes 1. Nos.of application received 2.Nos. of seats 3.Nos.of admissions 4. Nos. of Companies visited for placement 5.Nos.of job offered for the last 5 years 6. Revenue generated.

### **Proposed Data Collection**

Using primary sources of data collection and questionnaire method, three sets of structured questionnaires will be developed to collect the data from the employees, employers and the students. Thus, questionnaire will include instruments of Market Orientation, Marketing Effectiveness and demographic profiles separately for all the respondents.

## **Statistical Techniques**

Data collection using questionnaire will be analyzed with the help of statistic like descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Mean and SD will be computed for presentation of the variable Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness.

Two-way Anova will be conducted to know the significance of the variations in the mean scores on all the study variables according to the school and the demographic variables of the employees and the students. Correlation and regression analysis will be carried out to find out the relationships between the study variables.

## **Relevance of Projected Findings**

The finding of this study will be useful for designing marketing strategies, developing curriculum for their employees' orientation and adopting a market oriented culture.

## **Challenges / difficulties anticipated taking up the study and how do you propose to address them?**

Firstly, the literature resources are very scarce for this study. In fact, there is no research in the world conducted on B-schools with these two variables Market Orientation and Marketing Effectiveness.

Secondly, Primary data collection will be a biggest challenge especially with regard to permission for entering to a B-school and interacting with the faculty members.

Thirdly, Data collection will be a challenge since data will be collected from the students of the different type B-schools. Since creating interest to involve them for filling up the questionnaire will be challenges, it has been addressed.

Lastly, sample population consists of faculty members and dealing with them may be difficult as before the collection of data needs extensive deliberation on the topic.

## **Chapter Schema**

Chapter-1	Introduction
Chapter-2	Review of Literature
Chapter-3	Problem Statement, Scope and Objective
Chapter-4	Methodology and Data Collection
Chapter-5	Results and Discussion
Chapter-6	Summary, Implications and Conclusions

## **Proposed Time Frames**

The overall duration of research is expected to be of 3 years. Break-up of various activities have been depicted in the table below.



**Table no 6: Proposed Time Frame**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Tentative Time Frame</b>
1	Finalization of Synopsis (and submitting the Synopsis to the University)	January15, 2015 to April 07, 2015
2	Reviewing Literature (updating the Synopsis and Preparing for Defense)	April 08, 2015 to April 20,2015
3	Review of Literature for further clarification of concepts	April 21, 2015 to July 30, 2015
4	Developing Methodology	August 01,2015 to August 30, 2015
5	Questionnaire Designing	September 1,2015 to October 20,2015
6	Data Collection	October 20,2015 to February 28, 2016
7	Data Interpretation	March 01, 2016 to June 01, 2016
8	Preparing first draft of Thesis	June 01 2016 to October 10, 2016
9	Preparing second draft of Thesis	November 01, 2016 to December 10,
10	Preparing final draft of thesis on the basis of feedback of my supervisors and University authorities	December 20, 2017 to April 20, 2017
11	Submission of Thesis	June 01, 2017

### **Help required, if any, from the University.**

I have been delighted with the assistance and guidance offered by the esteemed University time to time since the orientation. If the same assistance and guidance continued and provide online access to some e-libraries of databases such as Emerald, ProQuest and JSTOR etc. would be a great help for completing my Ph.D. research.

### **Acknowledgement**

The journey of my research which started from ICFAI University, Jharkhand have been challenging for me but with the extend of support from many important people who has directly or indirectly related to my Ph.D. helping me to continue the journey. Let me take this opportunity to convey my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to the following.

Dr. SF Chandra Sekhar, my research supervisor and mentor, who relentlessly guided, encouraged and supported me every time I seek help. Moreover, he is a true researcher and motivator. Every minute spend with him give abundant knowledge and confidence. His guidance is priceless.

Prof. ORS Rao, my guide, who supported me every time whenever I need a helping hand right from the beginning. Every time meeting and interacting with him gives lot of motivation and right direction.

Dr. Sukant Swain, my friend and mentor, a person is so accessible despite his busy schedule he always gives right suggestion whenever needed. His co-ordination is making me confident to complete my research at the earliest possible time.

I would also like to thank the management of ICFAI University, Jharkhand to name a few Dr. KK Nag for motivating and providing valuable inputs, Dr.BM Singh for the constant support and encouragement.

I would also like to express my thanks and appreciation to my co-researcher, the staff of ICFAI University and co-faculties at SSIM for their continuous moral support and helps in various stages of my research.

My acknowledgement will not be complete if I would not thank my family for being my strength at all the time

## Bibliography

1. Adalsteinsson, Gylfi Dalmann, and T. O. Gudlaugsson. "Can a specific Icelandic organizational culture explain the success of Icelandic businesses in foreign expansion." *19th Nordic Academy of Management Conference*. 2007.
2. Alhakimi, Wail, and Rohaizat Baharun. "A synthesis model of market orientation constructs toward building customer value A theoretical perspective." *African Journal of Marketing Management* 1.2 (2009) 43-49.
3. Ambler, T.; Kokkinaki, F.; Puntoni, S.; and Riley, D. (2001). Assessing market performance the current state of metrics. In Working Paper No. 1–903. London London Business School.
4. Appiah-Adu, Kwaku, Alan Fyall, and Satyendra Singh. "Marketing effectiveness and business performance in the financial services industry." *Journal of Services Marketing* 15.1 (2001): 18-34.
5. Avlonitis, G.J. and Gounaris, S.P. (1999), "Marketing orientation and its determinants: an empirical analysis", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33 Nos 11/12, pp. 1003-37.
6. Barwise, Patrick, and John U. Farley. "Marketing Metrics:: Status of Six Metrics in Five Countries." *European Management Journal* 22.3 (2004): 257-262.
7. Becker, J. and Homburg, C. (1999), "Market-oriented management: a systems-based perspective", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 17-41.
8. Bennis, Warren G., and James O'Toole. "How business schools lost their way." *Harvard business review* 83.5 (2005): 96-104.
9. Boyd, Helper W., and O. C. Walker. "Marketing Management: A Strategic Approach, Richard D." *Irvine Inc., Boston* (1990).
10. Carr, Jon C., and Tará Burnthorne Lopez. "Examining market orientation as both culture and conduct: modeling the relationships between market orientation and employee responses." *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 15.2 (2007): 113-125.
11. Cizmar, Sanja, and Sanda Weber. "Marketing effectiveness of the hotel industry in Croatia." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 19.3 (2000): 227-240.
12. Clark, Bruce H. "Marketing performance measures: History and interrelationships." *Journal of Marketing Management* 15.8 (1999): 711-732.
13. Day, George S. "The capabilities of market-driven organizations." *the Journal of Marketing* (1994): 37-52.
14. Day, George S. "The market driven organization." *USA. Simon&Schuster* (1999).

15. Dayal Ishwar, developing management education in India, *Journal of management Research* 2, August 2006 P.101
16. Deal, Terrence E., and Allan A. Kennedy. *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Da Capo Press, 2000.
17. Debnath, Roma Mitra, et al. "Students. Satisfaction in Management Education: Study and Insights." *Decision (0304-0941)* 32.2 (2005).
18. Denison, Daniel R. *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. John Wiley & Sons, 1990.
19. Denison, Daniel R., and Aneil K. Mishra. "Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness." *Organization science* 6.2 (1995): 204-223.
20. Denison, Daniel R., Stephanie Haaland, and Paulo Goelzer. "Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness: Is Asia different from the rest of the world?." *Organizational Dynamics* 33.1 (2004): 98-109.
21. Deshpande, Rohit, and Frederick E. Webster Jr. "Organizational culture and marketing: defining the research agenda." *The Journal of Marketing* (1989): 3-15.
22. Deshpandé, Rohit, John U. Farley, and Frederick E. Webster Jr. "Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: a quadrad analysis." *The journal of Marketing* (1993): 23-37.
23. Drucker, Peter Ferdinand. "The coming of the new organization." (1988): 45-53.
24. Drysdale, Lawrie. "Marketing V Market Orientation." *The Professional Journal for Australian Primary School Leaders* (1999): 28-29.
25. Dunn, Mark G., David Norburn, and Sue Birley. "The impact of organizational values, goals, and climate on marketing effectiveness." *Journal of Business Research* 30.2 (1994): 131-141.
26. Fey, Carl F., and Daniel R. Denison. "Organizational culture and effectiveness: can American theory be applied in Russia?." *Organization science* 14.6 (2003): 686-706.
27. Gainer, A., Padanyi, B. (2005).The relationship between market-oriented activities and market-oriented culture: implications for the development of market orientation in nonprofit service organizations. *Journal of Business Research*, 58,854– 862.
28. Gebhardt, G.F., Carpenter, G.S. and Sherry, J.F. Jr (2006), "Creating a market orientation: a longitudinal, multifirm, grounded analysis of cultural transformation", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 70, pp. 37-55.
29. Gladson Nwokah, N., and Augustine I. Ahiauzu. "Emotional intelligence and marketing effectiveness." *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 27.7 (2009): 864-881.

30. Greenley, Gordon E., Graham J. Hooley, and John M. Rudd. "Market orientation in a multiple stakeholder orientation context implications for marketing capabilities and assets." *Journal of Business Research* 58.11 (2005) 1483-1494.
31. Grey, Christopher. "Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 3.2 (2004): 178-186.
32. Harris, L.C. (1996), "*Benchmarking against the theory of market orientation*", *Management Decision*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 25-9.
33. Harris, L.C. (1998), "*Cultural domination: the key to market-oriented culture?*", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 32 Nos 3/4, pp. 354-73
34. Harris, L.C. (2000), "*The organizational barriers to developing market orientation*", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 Nos 5/6, pp. 598-624.
35. Harris, L.C. (2001), "Market orientation and performance: objective and subjective empirical evidence from UK companies", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 17-43.
36. Harris, L.C. (2002a), "Developing market orientation: an exploration of differences in management approaches", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 603-32.
37. Harris, L.C. (2002b), "Sabotaging market-oriented culture change: an exploration of resistance justifications and approaches", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 58-74.
38. Harris, L.C. and Ogbonna, E. (1999), "Developing a market oriented culture: a critical evaluation", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 177-96.
39. Harris, L.C. and Ogbonna, E. (2000), "The responses of front-line employees to market-oriented culture change", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 Nos 3/4, pp. 318-40.
40. Harris, L.C. and Ogbonna, E. (2001a), "Leadership style and market orientation: an empirical study", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 Nos 5/6, pp. 744-64.
41. Harris, L.C. and Ogbonna, E. (2001b), "Strategic human resource management, market orientation, and organizational performance", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 51, pp. 157-66.
42. Harris, L.C. and Piercy, N.F. (1999), "Management behavior and the barriers to market orientation", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 113-31.
43. Hawawini, Gabriel. "The future of business schools." *Journal of Management Development* 24.9 (2005): 770-782.

44. Hemsley-Brown, Jane, and Izhar Oplatka. "Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 19.4 (2006): 316-338.
45. Heskett, James L., and John P. Kotter. "Corporate culture and performance." *Business Review*. Vol 2 (1992): 83-93.
46. Homburg, C. and Pflesser, C. (2000), "A multiple layer model of market-oriented organizational culture: measurement issues and performance outcomes", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 37, pp. 449-62.
47. <http://indiatoday.intoday.in/education/story/cat-2014-registrations-recorded-new-low-from-previous-8-years/1/394520.html>
48. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/education/news/147-B-schools-shut-shop-during-2013-14/articleshow/46113811.cms>
49. [http://www.economist.com/whichmba/full-time-mbaranking?year=2011&term\\_node\\_tid\\_depth=All](http://www.economist.com/whichmba/full-time-mbaranking?year=2011&term_node_tid_depth=All)
50. [http://www.forbes.com/business/schools/#page2\\_sort0\\_directionasc\\_search\\_filterAll%20states](http://www.forbes.com/business/schools/#page2_sort0_directionasc_search_filterAll%20states)
51. <http://www.minglebox.com/article/cmat-aicte/mba-aspirants-hit-an-all-time-low-in-cmatexam>
52. <http://www.forbes.com/business-schools/list>
53. [https://www.academia.edu/1791517/Management\\_Education\\_and\\_Corporate\\_expectations\\_-\\_Gap\\_Analysis](https://www.academia.edu/1791517/Management_Education_and_Corporate_expectations_-_Gap_Analysis)
54. Hult, G. Tomas M., David J. Ketchen, and Stanley F. Slater. "Market orientation and performance: an integration of disparate approaches." *Strategic Management Journal* 26.12 (2005): 1173-1181.
55. Iñiguez de Onzoño, Santiago, and Salvador Carmona. "The changing business model of B-schools." *Journal of Management Development* 26.1 (2007): 22-32.
56. Jaworski, B. J. & Kohli, A. K. (1993) Market orientation antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57, pp. 53-70.
57. Jaworski, B.J. and Kohli, A.K. (1996), "Market orientation: review, refinement, and roadmap", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 119-35.
58. Jaworski, Bernard J., and Ajay K. Kohli. "Market orientation: antecedents and consequences." *The Journal of marketing* (1993): 53-70.
59. Jha, Shweta, and Manoj Kumar. "Revitalising Management Education in India: A Strategic Approach." *Journal of Management & Public Policy* 3.2 (2012): 5-17.

60. Julian, Craig C. "The market orientation-marketing performance relationship: the empirical link in international joint ventures." *International Journal of Trade and Global Markets* 3.4 (2010): 414-431.
61. Kennedy, Karen Norman, Jerry R. Goolsby, and Eric J. Arnould. "Implementing a customer orientation: Extension of theory and application." *Journal of Marketing* 67.4 (2003): 67-81.
62. Kirca, A.H., Jayachandran, S. and Bearden, W.O. (2005), "Market orientation: a meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 24-41.
63. Kohli, A.K. and Jaworski, B.J. (1990) Market Orientation The Construct, Research Propositions and Managerial Implications. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, pp. 1-18.
64. Kokkinaki, Flora, and Tim Ambler. *Marketing performance assessment: an exploratory investigation into current practice and the role of firm orientation*. No. 99-114. Marketing Science Institute, 1999.
65. Kotler, P. (1977). From sales to marketing effectiveness. In *Harvard Business Review*, 55(6) 67–75.
66. Kotler, Philip. "From sales obsession to marketing effectiveness." (1977): 1-9.
67. Laforet, Sylvie. "Size, strategic, and market orientation affects on innovation." *Journal of Business Research* 61.7 (2008): 753-764.
68. Levitt, Theodore. "Marketing myopia." *Harvard business review* 38.4 (1960): 24-47.
69. Lichtenthal, J.D. and Wilson, D.T. (1992), "Becoming market oriented", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 191-207.
70. Lings, Ian N. "Internal market orientation Construct and consequences. " *Journal of Business Research* 57.4 (2004) 405-413.
71. Lings, Ian N., and Gordon E. Greenley. "The impact of internal and external market orientations on firm performance." *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 17.1 (2009) 41-53.
72. Ma, Jun, and Zelimir Todorovic. "Making universities relevant market orientation as a dynamic capability within institutions of higher learning. " *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal* 15.2 (2011) 1.
73. Martin, Joanne. *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Sage Publications, 2001.
74. Mason, Katy, and Lloyd C. Harris. "Pitfalls in evaluating market orientation: an exploration of executives' interpretations." *Long Range Planning* 38.4 (2005): 373-391.

75. Meyer, Jörn-Axel. "Information overload in marketing management." *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 16.3 (1998): 200-209.
76. Mobley, William H., Lena Wang, and Kate Fang. "Organizational culture: measuring and developing it in your organization." *Harvard Business Review China* 3 (2005): 128-139.
77. Mousumi Majumdar and Krishna Kishore In the Handbook of Management and Behavioural Science, Vol 7, edited by Dr. Sunil Kumar and Dr. Shyam Lata Juyal, June 2012
78. Narver, J. C. and Slater, S. F. (1990) The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 20-35.
79. Narver, J.C., Slater, S.F. and Tietje, B. (1998), "Creating a market orientation", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 241-55.
80. Narver, John C., and Stanley F. Slater. "The effect of a market orientation on business profitability." *The Journal of Marketing* (1990): 20-35.
81. Pelham, A.M. and Wilson, D.T. (1996), "A longitudinal study of the impact of market structure, firm structure, strategy, and market orientation culture on dimensions of small-firm performance", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 27-43
82. Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Christina T. Fong. "The Business School 'Business': Some Lessons from the US Experience\*." *Journal of Management Studies* 41.8 (2004): 1501-1520.
83. Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Christina T. Fong. "The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1.1 (2002): 78-95.
84. Ruekert, R.W. (1992), "Developing a market orientation: an organizational strategy perspective", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 9, pp. 225-45.
85. Schein, Edgar H. *How can organizations learn faster?: the problem of entering the Green Room*. Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992.
86. Schein, Edgar. "H.(2004): Organizational culture and leadership." *San Francisco* (2014).
87. Selnes, Fred, Bernard J. Jaworski, and Ajay K. Kohli. "Market orientation in United States and Scandinavian companies. A cross-cultural study." *Scandinavian journal of management* 12.2 (1996): 139-157.



88. Shahaida, P., H. Rajashekar, and R. Nargundkar. "A conceptual model of brand-building for B-schools: an Indian perspective." *International Journal of Commerce and Management* 19.1 (2009): 58-71.
89. Shapiro, B.P. (1988), "What the hell is 'market oriented?'", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 66, pp. 119-25.
90. Shoham, Aviv, et al. "Market orientations in the nonprofit and voluntary sector A meta-analysis of their relationships with organizational performance." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35.3 (2006) 453-476.
91. Siguaw, Judy A., Gene Brown, and Robert E. Widing. "The influence of the market orientation of the firm on sales force behavior and attitudes." *Journal of marketing research* (1994): 106-116.
92. Siu, Noel YM, and Richard MS Wilson. "Modelling market orientation an application in the education sector." *Journal of Marketing Management* 14.4 (1998) 293-323.
93. Škerlavaj, Miha, Mojca Indihar Štemberger, and Vlado Dimovski. "Organizational learning culture—the missing link between business process change and organizational performance." *International Journal of Production Economics* 106.2 (2007): 346-367.
94. Slater, S.F. and Narver, J.C. (1994), "Does competitive environment moderate the market orientation-performance relationship?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, pp. 46-55.
95. Slater, Stanley F., and John C. Narver. "The positive effect of a market orientation on business profitability: a balanced replication." *Journal of business research* 48.1 (2000): 69-73.
96. Sørensen, Jesper B. "The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance." *Administrative science quarterly* 47.1 (2002): 70-91.
97. Source: Boundless. "Marketing Orientation." Boundless Marketing. Boundless, 03 Jul. 2014. Retrieved 10 Mar. 2015 from <https://www.boundless.com/marketing/textbooks/boundless-marketing-textbook/an-overview-of-marketing-1/the-marketing-orientation-evolution-19/marketing-orientation-118-6857/>
98. Stanger, Melissa & Robinson Melia. "The World's 50 Best Business Schools." <http://www.businessinsider.com>. Business Insider Inc., 4th August 2015 Published.
99. Stefanov VeleV, Mladen, and Ivo Todorov Marinov. "Research of Bulgarian companies' marketing effectiveness." *Managerial Auditing Journal* 19.6 (2004): 774-789.

100. Tracy, Joseph, and Joel Waldfogel. *The best business schools: A market based approach*. No. w4609. National Bureau of Economic Research, 1994.
101. Van Raaij, Erik M., and J. W. Stoelhorst. "The implementation of a market orientation: A review and integration of the contributions to date." *European Journal of Marketing* 42.11/12 (2008): 1265-1293.
102. Webster, Cynthia. "Marketing culture and marketing effectiveness in service firms." *Journal of Services Marketing* 9.2 (1995): 6-21.
103. Webster, Robert L., and Kevin L. Hammond. "MARKET ORIENTATION EFFECTS ON BUSINESS SCHOOL PERFORMANCE VIEWS FROM TWO MANAGEMENT LEVELS." *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 18.4 (2014).
104. Xenikou, Athena, and Maria Simosi. "Organizational culture and transformational leadership as predictors of business unit performance." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21.6 (2006): 566-579.
105. Yang, Deyun. Market orientation in schools in Harbin, China. Diss. The University of Melbourne, 2011.