

## **Business Management on the International Market : The Changing Substance, with an Illustrative Case Study of the Australian Newcastle Experience**

AA Rahman, Ph.D. (MIT)<sup>1</sup>

Business Management, often abridged into "Management", and lately referred to as "Business Administration", has come to be one of the commodities on sale, on the contemporary international market. As education began in the latter end of the 20th century, to be increasingly commercialized, to the dismay of real educators, and thereby converted into commodity on sale - admission, instruction and degrees in Management as field of study began to be vigorously promoted for sale, mainly in the West, for international buyers from the East. The process is somewhat being reversed - and the trend will be increasingly widened and fast-tracked in the future—with Management as function, of "skilled foreign labour"—with nations from the East, notably those of the SAARC led by India, supplying relatively much cheaper-to-hire managers and managerial expertise and services, to the West and affluent-yet-underdeveloped, developing nations of the Middle East and Southeast Asia. This, through various mechanisms, including temporary immigration of expatriate skilled management "-sector white collar "workers", and online out-sourcing. Management, in both its aspects, is by now a truly international commodity, and will be more so, in the future. This article will focus at the latter parts, more on Management as a field of study, but of course, changes therein definitely would reflect changes in Management as a vocation itself.

### **International Standards**

As globalization takes over the world like a whirlwind in these early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, pressure mounts on – by realities of practical life such as

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor AA Rahman studied Political Economy at MIT, and taught Management at the Malaysian University of Management (UUM). Over 35 years since his joining Dacca University as a young Lecturer, he has taught and/ researched in diverse subjects at different universities of the world, including Harvard and Melbourne Universities, and currently specializes in International Trade and Commercial Law, among other things. Apart from his long-standing academic standing, he also draws upon his own, personal, practical business-management experience at different locations in the world, including Chicago where he served as a Manager/ Director (Operations) with an American firm specializing in production and sales audio-visual products, and Boston, where he served as a young Manager at a small private hospital in his youthful years.

unavoidable internationalization of even the most insignificant aspects of life, and competition in a globalised market – to raise performance in virtually all significant sectors, to "international standards". But these standards themselves are in flux, and are changing, and relatively fossilized and culturally biased indexes in the shape of "ISO", foreign-based "Accreditation Boards", etc. are not satisfactory points of reference for purposes of "raising performance" to international standards. Though temptingly attractive as instant coffee, as ready-made, easy tools for international standardization—often resorted to administrators with inadequate expertise in the in-depth multiple aspects involved in the phenomenon – these do not work in the long run in contexts outside those of the where they were originally devised, e.g. in the US or UK factories or workers' training polytechs. Unsuitability of these "instant coffee" gimmicks will be discussed in greater details elsewhere, and we shall not delve any deeper into that here. Here we have a relatively briefer look at such ready-made "standardization tools" in the passing.

As for the so-called "ISO standards", we may note that, the ISO itself, in its own introduction entitled "*International Standards for Business, Government and Society*", tells that,

"ISO is a network of the national standards institutes of 157 countries, on the basis of one member per country, with a Central Secretariat in Geneva, Switzerland, that coordinates the system.

"ISO is a non-governmental organization... occupies a special position between the public and private sectors.... [O]n the one hand, many of its member institutes are part of the governmental structure of their countries, or are mandated by their government. On the other hand, other members have their roots uniquely in the private sector, having been set up by national partnerships of industry associations.

"Therefore, ISO is able to act as a bridging organization in which a consensus can be reached on solutions that meet both the requirements of *business* and the broader needs ... such as the needs of *stakeholder* groups like consumers and users"<sup>2</sup> –

obviously a clearing house for needs of politicians ("governments"), businesses and the likes of stakeholders, hardly anything to do with academic excellence, the academia being side-stepped carefully enough.

While arguably of some use in many areas of material-mundane day to day life, the ISO standards have hardly anything to do with academic quality

---

2 International Organization for Standardization, "About ISO" in *International Standards for Business, Government and Society*, <http://www.iso.org/iso/about.htm>.

or standards – they focus more on things like, " metric screw threads", " Pipe threads where pressure-tight joints are made on the threads ", and "paper sizes, e.g. the A4 paper size " – any attempt to translate their interest or expertise from such main areas of their attention and experience to academic quality standards' assessment or implementation, is sheer Quixotic and insult enough to the academic profession, to turn Socrates and Professor Harvard in their graves - at the least. This we can see from even a quick look through a standards which ISO has set and which are reported by an Encyclopedia.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, so-called international accreditation boards, like ISO, too, are not of much real use in monitoring, guiding or assuring quality in Management education on ground in a given place and context. For example, the supposedly most reputable of such accreditation boards, the AACSB claims itself, to be "a ... corporation of educational institutions, corporations and other organizations devoted to the promotion and improvement of higher education in business administration and management", and in support of the self-styling claim, puts up the presumably strongest reference they can manage to get to advertise world-wide-that, "Forbes Magazine has described AACSB ... accreditation as the "gold standard of business school accreditations."<sup>4</sup> ...", and a comment by *a virtually unknown and in terms of academic profession, a total non-entity, Ms. "Pam Iorio, Mayor of the City of Tampa"*, a relatively small town in a retirement village sort of relatively small state in southeast US that, "*AACSB's reputation for quality services and community involvement will benefit our city*"<sup>5</sup> As far as references go in the academic world for academic quality – these are worthless. Academic quality is not decided by comments by Magazines, and town-mayors—they are decided by academic peers at highest institutions of learning, e.g. Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, MIT, *al-Azhar*, etc.

Academically advanced nations - even in the Third World – like, say, India, Turkey, Bangladesh and Egypt—therefore, refer to their own, internal national accreditation bodies. For example, the Commercial University of Istanbul – Turkey's University of Management sciences – never bothered to seek seal of quality standards or accreditation from any Geneva-based

---

3 *Vide*: " List of ISO standards ", [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_ISO\\_standards](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_ISO_standards)", where the Encyclopedia provides a long list of ISO standards, and tells that, " This is a list of ISO standards that are discussed in *Wikipedia* articles. For a list of all the more than 16,000 ISO standards (as of 2007), see the ISO Catalogue", and "About 300 of the standards produced by ISO and IEC's Joint Technical Committee 1 (JTC1) have been made freely/publicly available".

4 *Vide*: AACSB website, <http://www.aacsb.edu/wxyz/employment-Mngr-publishing.asp>

5 *Ibid*.

ISO, or Tampa-based AACSB, but is accredited by the Turkey's own "*Milli Egitim Bakanligi*" (Ministry of National Education) as its "accreditation body".<sup>6</sup>

Enough, for the time being and for this article, on misleading points of reference on international standards for academic quality. Now we go on with our immediate concern, that about emerging international standards relating to Management as a field of practical function, as well as – of academic study. For this we shall apply methodological mix, which too, might not be a panacea, but, appears to us more suitable than the ready-made "ISO" and "Accreditation Board" index-formulas – for reasons, amongst others, its being a product of, as well as reflecting, long standing on-going dynamic process of evolution of the function and the academic treatment of the same, elements of the product itself being in the dynamic process of gradual but continuous change; and also, for its being a product of expert intuition gained by academicians, rather than administrators and trainers, through decades and generations of academic study in the relevant fields. Guinea-pigs can not study themselves, academics study them to deduce conclusions from such studies.

### **"Management", The Subject**

When "Management" was begun as a subject of study, in the 1960s, at Dacca University— one of the oldest and most reputable modern universities in Asia – built by British colonial administration in the early 1900s, as the "Oxford of the East"- it was within a new, tiny Department of "Commerce", nested away within the area designated for the Faculty of Social Sciences in the "Arts Building" of the University. It was a "Commerce" subject, and, by the norms of the times, would refer to a study of the tasks of "Supervision" in Commercial places, like, say shops. Management, then, as a function in practice, was mainly a task of commercial supervision— more like "bossing" and "policing", forcing employers to "behave", carry out orders, and catching them doing anything "wrong". Management then, as a subject of study, was a tiny course designed to teach the tricks of such a "bossing" job. Management— both as a function, and as a field of study- has come long way since, widening its scope, transforming itself onto Business Administration, with greater emphasis on the essentially political theme of "Administration", away from the shop-keeping, policing task and theme of commercial supervision.

---

6 *Vide: International Education Directory of Colleges and Universities*, <http://www.4icu.org/reviews/4572.htm>

Thus, for example, in the case the very function of "management",

"Traditionally, the term "management" refer[ed] ... to the activities ... involved in the four general functions: planning, organizing, leading and coordinating of resources.... the four functions recur[ring] throughout the organization and ... highly integrated. Emerging trends in management... assert ... that leading is different than managing [in the narrower, traditional sense], and that the nature of how the four functions are carried out... change[d] to accommodate a "new paradigm" in management [whereby]...

"...[Management] teachers and practitioners assert that the... [traditional] view is rather outmoded and that management needs to focus more on leadership [- essentially and primarily, a political theme-]... and... that leadership must be more facilitative, participative and empowering [-again, essentially and primarily, political themes - ] in how visions and goals are established and carried out. ..."<sup>7</sup>

This shift away from Management's focus on the narrower commercial supervision and policing tasks, onto to wider area of the micro-politics of leadership in economic activity, indicates the future direction of Management. That is, of Management, both as a function, and as a field of study of the that function. This article looks into some aspects of this newer direction, which must be taken into account in both workplace and Management education in the 21st century, if we wish to optimize.

### **Origins in Economics and Politics**

Interestingly, this move forward is essentially not new— but, actually, a kind of "back to the future": a going back to the essence of the field, in a spirit of renewal. Business Administration – or "Management", as it is also referred to— grew, initially as a field of study, and later on, as a modern vocation, out of a marriage between two of the offspring of the two related, but separate, fields of Economics and Political Science. As such, it is intra-tribal inbreeding, so to say. It wandered away, and seems to be back on track towards its original, genetically ordained form - and focus thereby.

Business Studies was an offshoot of the broader and older field of Economics; Public Administration, that of Political Science. As such, until now, Business is taught within the Faculty or Department of Economics at many places; and Public Administration is taught, similarly, within the Faculty/ School, or Department of Political Science. As such, Business

---

7 Carter McNamara, MBA, PhD, "Basics -- Definitions (and Misconceptions) About Management", <http://www.managementhelp.org/mgmtnt/defintion.htm#anchor654851>.

Studies and Public Administration came to grow up as cousins, so to say, and, married off by times and needs thereof, and produced Business Administration as their lovechild of a sort.

On a different level, Political Science and Economics themselves married, giving birth to the rather sexy—very attractive—lovechild of their own, through the midwifery of such great ones as Paul Baran<sup>8</sup> and Paul Sweezy<sup>9</sup>, the hybrid being known now as Political Economy. This we say, to clarify—about what is now known as "Political Economy"—modern field of "Political Economy". But there was a time when Economics as a whole was known as "Political Economy", and as such, Economics itself—and all that goes under that rubric taken broadly, including "Business", and "Management" therein—in reality, are within the broader field of expertise in Political Economy.<sup>10</sup> The artificial separation away of Economics from its realistically inseparable political framework occurred later, when, technician sort of

---

8. Paul Baran (1910-1964), was the author of *The Political Economy of Growth* (1957) and co-author, with Paul Sweezy, of *Monopoly Capital* (1966). He wrote numerous essays for *Monthly Review*, which Sweezy edited.

9 Paul M. Sweezy (1910-2004), was educated at Harvard University where he received his Ph.D. in 1937. His award-winning study on the English coal industry was published in 1938 and in 1942 his acclaimed *Theory of Capitalist Development* was published. In 1949 Sweezy founded *Monthly Review* (with the late Leo Huberman, 1903-1968). His published books are: *Theory of Capitalist Development* (1942), *Socialism* (1949), *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution* (with Leo Huberman, 1960), *Monopoly Capital* (with Paul Baran, 1966), *Socialism in Cuba* (with Leo Huberman, 1969), *The Dynamics of U.S. Capitalism* (with Magdoff, 1970), *The End of Prosperity* (with Magdoff, 1977), *The Deepening Crisis of U.S. Capitalism* (with Magdoff, 1980), *Stagnation and the Financial Explosion* (with Magdoff, 1987), *The Irreversible Crisis* (with Magdoff, 1988); "Articles and Lectures published", include those in the following collections of his articles and lectures: *The Present as History* (1953), *Modern Capitalism and Other Essays* (1972), *Post-Revolutionary Society* (1980), *Four Lectures on Marxism* (1981).

10 Robert Dixon, "The Origin of the Term "Dismal Science" to Describe", <http://www.economics.unimelb.edu.au/TLdevelopment/econochat/Dixonecon00.html>; James E. King, "The Origin of the Term "Political Economy" ", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1948), pp. 230-231; W. Barber, *A History of Economic Thought* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967); C. Staley, *A History of Economic Thought: From Aristotle to Arrow* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989); J. Galbraith, *A History of Economics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987); J. Oser, and S. Brue., *The Evolution of Economic Thought*. Fourth edition. (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988).

"economists<sup>11</sup>, in the last two hundred years, have emphasised the separation of the political from the economic... by insisting upon the dominance of the economic sphere in the relation between economics and politics... [thinking that,] the economic is the underlying reality that provides limits to the political... [together with a] similar insistence upon the separation between economics and ethics [as] can be seen the work of Ricard Lipsey. ..."<sup>12</sup>.

As relatively recent-times' scholars like

"Gunnar Myrdal and Karl Polanyi... [said] the economic sphere ... do not dominate.... [with] much more emphasis on the unity and mutual dependence of the two spheres, and a downplaying of the division and antagonism between the state [politics] and civil society [economics]"<sup>13</sup>,

and economists like Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy, among others gave much substance to this perspective, a rebirth of Political Economy Jr., out of a marriage between Economics as an estranged child of Political Economy, and Political Science as its child-in-house, took place rather a welcome journey "back to the future".

In any case, it is clear from the above line of discussion, that, Business Administration ("Management"), thus, is both a niece and in essence a clone of Political Economy. The only difference is that, Business Administration is one generation down the road, and more of "labour-classish" mundane

---

11 Economist Paul Baran calls intellectual wage-slaves such as these – rather generously - "intellect workers", and describes them as follows:  
"the purpose of the intellect workers work and thought is the particular job in hand. It is the rationalization, mastery, and manipulation of whatever branch of reality he is immediately concerned with. In this regard he differs little, if at all, from the manual worker who molds metal sheets, assembles parts of an engine, or lays bricks in constructing a wall. ... the intellect worker *as such* is not addressing himself to the meaning of his work, its significance, its place within the entire framework of social activity. In still other words, he is not concerned with the relation of the segment of human endeavor within which he happens to operate to other segments and to the totality of the historical process. His "natural" motto is to mind his own business, and, if he is conscientious and ambitious, to be as efficient and as successful at it as possible. ... Accustomed to think in terms of training, experience, and competence, the intellect worker regards dealing with problems of that totality as ... the "field" of philosophers, religious functionaries, or politicians, even as "culture" or "values" are the business of poets, artists, and sages [with nothing for him to bother about].  
*Vide:* Paul Baran, "The Commitment of the Intellectual", *Monthly Review* (N.Y.), May 1961.

12 *Vide:* Rod Hay, QUERY -- origin of "economics. <http://eh.net/pipermail/hes/2000-April/000204.html>;

13 *Ibid.*

"Applied" for of the hybridization of Economics and Political Science, while Political Economy is more of an "upper-classish" theoretical science committed to the political empowerment and economic welfare of the labour class. Political Economy is Business Administration's "Aunt Polly" where he belongs – or belonged, until steered away by various vested interest – i.e., until BA's recent journey back towards its prototypical, theoretical origins in Political Economy. The journey is a different pace for different "avatars" of BA ("Management") at different institutions. But the trend is the same – back to increasingly theoretical contextualization within the framework of its origins, Economics, Political Science, and their convenient hybridized theoretical framework in the form of Political Economy. This is both inevitable, and necessary, if Business Administration has to develop as a truly academic field of Higher Education, rather than languish as a mere vocational training tool – albeit packaged in glossy "MBA" and "BBA" degrees – for the production of "marketables"<sup>14</sup> only.

Before we launch on to the next stage of this discussion, let us quickly clarify that the nickname of "Management" was given currency for Business Administration during its growing up years in the lured away wandering condition noted above: obviously to tie it to down to the needs of the managers in the marketplace – a bit away from the Leadership-imbued Administrator, and the Economy-conscious Business-leaders. It seems that, with the end of those wandering years, Business Administration is gaining back its original identity as Business Administration, and this terms, once again, is gaining greater currency, hopefully to replace the nickname of "Management". Indeed, "Management" itself shall – and will – remain as what it really is: a name for a subfield – a subordinate – of the broader field of Business Administration. Management in real sense is only a part of Business Administration, or "Management" in that sense, as we shall see, later.

With all due apologies to Business Administration fans, however, in this article, we shall continue to use the terms "Business Administration" and "Management", interchangeably, usually to refer to Business Administration which still is often referred to as "Management" at many places: old habits die slowly, we suppose!

One more point here: we shall discuss the changing substance and shape of Business Administration *aka* Management, even though hinged on a single-sample case, with reference to the broad scenario of the global academia of

---

14 "Marketables" – in economist Paul Baran's terminology, disdainable "intellect workers".  
*Vide:* Baran, "The Commitment of the Intellectual", *op. cit.*



the English-speaking world, with its two major strands, the British-Anglophone, and the North American.

### **Newcastle, Representing Both the Strands**

To have an idea of where the academically advanced nations – and places – are moving towards, compared to the academically less developed ones, we may note the course the Bachelor of Management programme was guided onto, at the Australian University of Newcastle.

The choice of this particular university for an illustrative case study was, initially, by sheer probabilistic random sampling method in essence – a blind search for an university was conducted on the internet, and whatever came up first, was taken in as a sample. This random-sampling initial choice was further confirmed and retained upon further judgment on the basis of other, reasonable considerations, *viz.*, mainly:

- i) This particular university, on the basis of scholarly intuition developed over 30 years by one academically experienced across the globe, applied to information available on range of universities across the English speaking advanced western nations, appears to be just one average good university, and hence seemed suitable as a n illustrative case from the average-median;
- ii) Given that the Australian academia distills in, and combines the British academic heritage and new Americanism, this university, as a fairly representative average good Australian university, it is likely to represent the distillation of common as well as divergent advances, experiences and projections of both the North American and the British-Anglophone academia– the two major trends that cover virtually the entire range of universities across the English speaking world.

Because of the above two reasons, with the probabilistic random-sampling by which the university was selected in the first place, the University of Newcastle (Australia) is found to be as good an illustrative case as any simple-sample case-study sample can be. The study itself is limited, at this stage, to illustrative single-sample case-study orientation characteristic of psychoanalytical research method– for reasons of validity and suitability discussed elsewhere, for those who might like to delve slightly deeper on methodological issues. I intend to later further test, possibly corroborate and supplement findings from this study from the simple-sample methodological stance, with further studies of the same theme from

research from a multiple-sample, survey research methodological perspective— sometime in the future.

### Old "Management" in Exile and Reformed

A fundamental shift from narrow view of "Management" to a much wider view and seeing it in terms of "Business Administration", rather than just "management" in the narrower sense, is reflected by the way the Faculty restructured its programmes in recent years. Thus, for example, its "Bachelor of Management... a three year full-time program, or part-time equivalent"<sup>15</sup> was faded away by, first, limiting its offering to a less important, distant campus in the remoter countryside: "degree is offered by the University of Newcastle exclusively at the Ourimbah Campus"<sup>16</sup> only.

Then,

"designed to reflect the contemporary business and commercial environments in both the private and public sectors, thus equipping graduates for this rapidly changing world of work", " Bachelor of Management ...[was constructed as a] *multidisciplinary* program [that] provides a *minimal* core of foundation studies"<sup>17</sup>

in traditional "Management" subjects –

"four major sequences of study in the degree: Accounting, Management, Information Technology and Marketing",

with . narrower Management Major comprising, "New Venture Creation", " Enterpreneurial Diversity", "Investment Decisions and Management", "Managing for Performance", "Learning in Organisations", "Corporate Significance of Human Resources", "Leadership ..."<sup>18</sup>, and generally

"enabling the study of a broad range of courses across a number of discipline areas [e.g. Economics, Political Science, Law, etc.]"<sup>19</sup>.

### "Management" Reborn as Widened "Business" Administration

"The Bachelor of Management degree underwent a major change in 2005"<sup>20</sup>,

---

15 University of Newcastle Australia, *Bachelor of Management (Ourimbah Campus)*, Faculty of Business and Law, <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/program/undergraduate/2007/11250.html>

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*

18 *Ibid.*

19 *Ibid.*

20 *Ibid.*

and finally, after such limiting away "Management" in the traditional sense into exile to the Ourimba Campus, then widening its scope onto interdisciplinary broadening, finally, it was terminated as "Management" and recreated as a broader, interdisciplinary, Business Administration degree. Thus, the website at one stage declared,

"Bachelor of Management ...

"Program No Longer Available ...

"New students wishing to study management, should refer to the Bachelor of Business program."<sup>21</sup>

*Voilà!* The old, rigidly narrow Management was dead, long lives the newer, broader, interdisciplinary Management as Business Administration!

### **Torch Passed on ...**

For an idea of the direction the new Business Administration form of "Management" is made to move on to, we may note the following description, on the website, of the academic leadership ("Management") at a Business Administration Faculty, at a reputable university in Australia. The Faculty of Business Administration is called "Faculty of Business and Law", it has three major parts, viz. "Business & Management", "Economics, Politics & Tourism", and "Law". Obviously, in this new times, Business Administration has cut down Management to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the whole field, and brought back Economics and Politics together to form 2/3<sup>d</sup> of the field, and Law – a subfield of Politics originally, to another 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the field. This means, in this new trend, Economics and Politics (including Law) would comprise 5/9<sup>th</sup>—just a bit more than half of Business Administration as field. Remaining half or so, would be divided into Management in the traditional sense (i.e. 1/4<sup>th</sup> of the total Business Administration),— and other "Business", i.e. Applied Business studies (Accounting, Marketing etc.).

This raising back of Political Economy (Politics, Economics, Law) within the Business Administration field, is naturally reflected in the weightage given to Political Economy expertise in the governance of the Business Administration Faculty. Thus, the description of the academic background of the Deputy Head of one of the three parts of the Business Administration Faculty which runs as follows,

" [Dr.] Jim Jose

"Deputy Head of School ...

---

21 *Ibid.*

"Qualifications: BA (Hons), MA (Politics), PhD (Adel)

"Research Interests:

"1. Political theory and feminist political philosophy.

"2. Philosophy, imperialism and colonial discourse.

"3. Transformation of labour processes.

"4. Governance and political discourse",

and includes – after that description – a long list of publications, of which virtually all focus on political themes, some also on historical, but none at all, to the traditional areas of the "Management" in the traditional, narrow sense.<sup>22</sup> Even a quick look at the above portion of the curriculum vitae of this one of the six Heads & Deputy Heads at the Faculty of Business – and the long list of publications on the web - shows a heavy emphasis on a discipline like Political Science, and none at all in what used to be regarded as traditional Management.

### **Old Management Continues Within the Broadened "New"**

This is not to say that all areas of traditional Management have been totally divorced from the new Management—or "Business Administration"—nor that academics with expertise in those traditional areas of Management have been driven out of import at Business Administration faculty altogether. By no means, as there are other Heads/ Deputy Heads in the Faculty who specialize in some of those fields. In fact, the highest authority in the Faculty of Business, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty-Head), Professor Stephen Nicholas, BA (Syracuse), MA (Iowa), is an expert in Management in the narrower sense – as clear from his published "Research Interests", i.e. "International business strategy; strategic management; MNEs and FDI in Australia, China and Japan; business history; diversity management", and from the list of his recent publications on the faculty's website.<sup>23</sup> The point made here is that, the genesis-fields of Management/Business Administration e.g., Political Science (and Public Administration,)and Economics (Commerce) are being brought back to prominence in the field as a whole, at the expense of a monopoly of the few traditional areas of Management in the narrow sense only. And this seems to be going the healthy trend for the future.

### **Conclusion**

---

22 The University of Newcastle Australia, Faculty of Business and Law, "Dr. Jim Jose", <http://www.lib.newcastle.edu.au/faculty-old/business-law/staff/staff%20profiles/jimjose.html>.

23 The University of Newcastle/ Faculty of Business and Law, <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty-old/business-law/staff/staff%20profiles/stephannicholas.html>

The lessons from the study so far – so far, because, this is a vast area, and needs further, on-going study – are, as follows:

1. Management education can not rely on such bodies or "standards" indexes, primarily and essentially external to the academia as foreign accreditation bodies, or ISO Standards, for achieving, retaining and/ or monitoring its quality, or the performance of academic staff entrusted with its teaching, and maintaining its quality;
2. The quality benchmark-standards would, and should, be derived from the overall trends at average good universities in academically advanced nations across the world, as emerging as distillation of cumulative achievement over decades of academic work and leadership exercised by academicians across decades and across the globe;
3. Indication from such distillation, as reflected in average good universities like Newcastle, is that, an essential aspect of the trend in quality-assurance and quality-development in Management education at university-level is to broaden the scope of subjects taught under the rubric of "Management", giving it an increasingly multidisciplinary shape (including much more many courses from related fields, such as Economics, Politics, Public Administration, Law, Communication, International Law, Communication, Psychology, Literature, Languages) ; and a shift away from narrow commercial supervisory concerns to wider, political economy aspects of business-leadership, to produced intellectually stimulated business leaders rather than shop-keeping policing supervisors as model managers.
4. The above concept of broadened, participatory leadership styled new political economy oriented management, as shifted away from the narrow, shopkeeping-policing stance of management, needs to be reflected in actual management practice in the marketplace, as well–and improvement in quality, like charity, must begin at home: in actual management in the running of the Business schools, as a source for students–and future managers, of unconsciously learnt model management-behaviour .So be it!