



# Business school culture: customer-focused, virtual and cooperative

Peter Lorange

*Lorange Institute of Business Zurich, Horgen, Switzerland*

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to examine and question aspects of the culture of the modern business school, and to investigate the possibilities for a more student oriented, more responsive, more flexible and performance-driven culture.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The paper is a critical discourse on the cultural conservatism of contemporary business schools, analysing the impediments to change, and examining the transformation in the business education market and among students, that demand greater responsiveness.

**Findings** – The paper finds that while the traditional culture of business schools is deeply embedded in professional practices and axiomatic disciplines, the seismic changes occurring in technology and social practices beyond the business school are impelling business schools to adapt and become more agile.

**Research limitations/implications** – While recognising the significance of the changes that are already occurring, it also acknowledged that there is a deeply embedded set of professional and cultural practices in university business schools that are long established and will not be readily changed, with more likely an ongoing tension between modernity and tradition.

**Practical implications** – The paper provides insights into how a more flexible and responsive business school would operate and engage students.

**Originality/value** – The paper provides a fresh assessment of where the business schools are, and where they will have to go to continue to engage the changing demands of business and managers.

**Keywords** Culture, Business schools, Customers, Virtual cooperative

**Paper type** Research paper

## Diagnosis of the classical business school and its culture

In this paper we shall examine various aspects of culture as this relates to the modern business school. Let me already here offer the caveat that there the ideal business school that I have in mind in many ways is similar to the Lorange Institute – more student orientation, more responsive to business needs, more flexible, more performance driven, and so on. It has been suggested by several (Thomas, 2007; Thomas and Fragueir, 2011), that business schools might be disaggregated into types and levels of achievement. For instance, some business schools have adopted an essentially economies-of-scales-driven model to maintain high student throughput and large revenues. Others have focused on research, combined with reputation building, and so on.

There are several dysfunctionalities associated with the classical business school and its culture which may make such institutions less well equipped to adapt to emerging customer[1] needs, and to make it difficult for them to develop a more virtual and cooperative culture to achieve their aims. We acknowledge that leading change may be difficult (Kotter, 2007). Let us, however, briefly review where the classical business school is coming from with its typically rather well-defined culture, and highlight basic strengths. Let us then point out areas that might have to change. But before getting to this let us remind ourselves about the following. We know that culture measures relate to performance (Denison, 1990). Admittedly, the research on culture focused on for-profit business organizations. We might, however, assume



---

that culture might impact performance in business schools, too, i.e. that business school culture matters. And we have seen that the leadership of an organization might have significant impact on its culture (Schein, 2010; Majeed *et al.*, 2010). Again by implication we might assume that the leadership of a business school is important. Recent research has shown how difficult it typically might be to change culture (Denison *et al.*, 2012). Denison *et al.* point out, however, what might be key elements in building a culture for the future (Denison *et al.*, 2012, Chapter 8). And Katzenbach *et al.* (2012) identifies aspects of cultural change that are claimed to stick. Ben-Hur (2009) has found that a more customer-oriented culture in business schools tends to lead to higher performance.

The classical business school tends to be organized in ways similar to what was prescribed by Alexander von Humboldt when he developed the blueprint for the restructuring of Berlin University in 1809 (Ruegg, 2005); academic departments falling into disciplinary, axiomatic categories, professors appointed within each of these departments with the aim to be in-depth experts in their specialized fields, and with research and teaching to give in-depth cutting-edge coverage of each specific axiomatic area. Many business schools have adopted this type of structure, which encouraged in-depth knowledge within each given discipline. But this structure seems to be relatively less well equipped to cope with issues that might span various axiomatic disciplines, i.e. relatively less well equipped to deal with cross-functionality – a requirement that seems to be called for rather loudly in today’s societal and business context. Khurana (2007), among others, has given a comprehensive review of evolutionary factors that have led to today’s typical business school. He focuses on the need for more cross-functionality. Canals (2011) has highlighted in particular several potential directions regarding the future of management development, again stressing the call for cross-functionality. Another seminal contributor to this is Iniguez and De (2011). Pettigrew and Hommel (2013) have reported on how future developments in research are likely to reshape the classical business school. There are thus a multitude of sources of foci for business schools, with typical roots in given countries – the USA vs UK vs France vs Germany, and so on, see, for instance Amdam, 1997), or Engwall (2000). It would perhaps be outside the scope of this paper to delve further into general design issues for business schools – I shall instead refer to the recent book by Thomas *et al.* (2013).

One additional key source of influence must be mentioned, namely what came out of the report commissioned by Ford Foundation in 1958 (Gordon and Howell, 1998). This report stresses the importance of research – and ideally by making use of quantitative means – and publication of original research, preferably in single-authored, refereed scholarly journals. The impact that this has had on our field has been formidable, with a “booster” effect on research and a “publish or perish” culture in many of today’s business schools. What primarily seems to count would be single-authored articles, in refereed scholarly journals, reporting on typically rather narrow axiomatic research findings. Again we see a focus on in-depth disciplinary pursuit, rather than on cross-disciplinarity. And practical, managerial relevance might typically be hard to find!

### Today’s demands

Why is this in-depth axiomatically/disciplinary focused approach and business school culture less able to address the issues and questions raised by today’s customers, in today’s modern society? Professor Dan Denison of IMD has stated this as follows as a succinct dilemma: “It is all about discipline versus demand – client demand is for general management and for contextual knowledge – industry, channel, etc. Business schools keep spoon-feeding them discipline, when the demand is for big helpings of knowledge in context.

Somebody will build a school based on executives and their knowledge, and put all of the rest of us in the shade. But it's hard to do, because contextual knowledge has a short half-life" (Denison, 2012). Several others have also recently discussed various aspects of this: in addition to comprehensive discussion in Thomas *et al.* (2013), we shall mention Antunes and Thomas (2007), Bennis and O'Toole (2005), Bennis (2012), Datar *et al.* (2010), Mintzberg (2004) and Pfeffer and Fong (2004). They all argue for a cultural shift in business schools – to better cope with today's increasing calls for relevance. There are at least two separate strains of customer analysis that might lead us to this conclusion, each to be discussed in the following sections:

- The emergence of a different customer today relative to in the past, with particular focus on today's young student as a multi-tasker. And, many of these younger consumers come from developing countries.
- The call for more flexibility and modularity in offerings, with more practical relevance, higher speed of learning, and fuller use of modern pedagogy – all called for by today's hard-pressed business sector. The changing work situation of many in today's world is generally tight; it might typically be difficult to find new jobs. The job situation is typically more demanding, so no-one would want to give up their jobs to go back to business school today. At the same time there seems to be a growing acknowledgement that new knowledge is key to avoid burn-out or becoming obsolete – hence, a conundrum!

Let us briefly discuss each of these forces impacting on the business schools.

### **The modern student**

That the typical modern, emerging, student is different is clear. Do we truly understand him/her? Here it should be pointed out that we may not necessarily like him/her, but we shall nevertheless have to adopt. Let us as an example consider one such emerging student multi-tasker; who at the same time:

- has a preference for status;
- likes to be seen;
- swipes his/her iPhone;
- works on his/her personal computer;
- watches TV;
- listens to music;
- reads a newspaper;
- drinks a cup of coffee; and
- (unbelievable, what an honour!) talks with me!

As I said, we may not like these people, but they seem to be central stakeholders now. Modern computer-based technology may have had a profound impact on this emerging student archetype when it comes to communication. And one thing is clear – the call is primarily for cross-functional understanding, not the traditional in-depth axiomatic focus. In particular, they seem to demand more of an interactive focus regarding marketing, together with modern web-based IT, and also together with modern communication (social media), all taken together! Ecology, logistics and operations management also seem to become one. Behavioural science and certain areas of finance

---

seem to become closer. And there are many other examples of such emerging “new” disciplines, based on cross-functionality, for better or worse.

### **Business’ emerging needs**

Most of today’s corporations face unprecedented competitive pressures. Top employee performance is key. All work more effectively, and harder! Every employee is expected to excel – no slack! This means that it might be increasingly hard for any employee to take time to be away on training, at least for extended periods of time. The key is thus for executives to be able to function well in their jobs and to receive at the same time, new, intellectual inputs – to continue to grow intellectually and avoid “burn-out”. Learning on-the-job and at business school becomes key (Clarke and Rollo, 2001). And there seems to be an ever-tighter even more intensive process at work here. This is a modularized approach, based on shorter, intensive workshops with clear practical relevance. This seems to be what might be increasingly called for. Here are some emerging new learning process characteristics:

- The modular course offerings (workshops; blocks). In today’s economic environment it is normally not easy to land a good job. Those who have one are of course holding on to this. They do not want to take time off to go back to school on a full-time basis. But, the dynamism of change is faster than ever. The context of business, for instance, is changing fast. At the surface, we might thus be faced with a dilemma: on the one hand – stick to the job, do not be absent, and on the other hand, the need to go back to school – for lifelong learning updating. One answer to this conundrum might be a flexible modularized approach to the curriculum – say, through a series of shorter workshop and blocks, offered on weekends, too. This would allow students to maintain their full-time jobs. And, it would allow for a more real two-way iteration regarding learning on the job and learning at school. It goes without saying that the delivery of all of this might emphasize practical usefulness.
- And, this might, in particular, focus the student to better appreciate emerging customer needs, and how to deliver relevant innovations to this segment. The ability to listen might be particularly key – and the school should encourage the development of such “active listening skills”.
- The latest in pedagogy. Piaget (1992) has pointed out that the context where learning takes place is key – light (i.e. many windows) space (i.e. height under the roof) and beauty. In addition, the so-called “flat-room” pedagogy is key. “Flat-rooms”/auditoriums are places, where the professor might bring across the latest dilemmas and in a finite period of time, typically relatively short, say, 20 minutes, to be followed by group discussions – the participants may be pre-seated in groups of seven at round tables – length of group work, say, 20 minutes, to be followed by a plenary discussion of, say, around 20 minutes. Our experience is that in two full days of following this workshop style we might cover as much materials as we might have been able to cover in, say, five days in “normal” auditorium settings. The major keys are involvement by all, high intensity, dynamics and no boredom – all are involved. Participation is key for learning!
- It goes without saying that the basics might be covered through independent distance learning. There are impressive technological developments at hand when it comes to this – so that the basics might be covered in a rigorous, time-effective way – without requiring use of scarce classroom time.

- The meeting place. As we can infer from the above, the classroom sessions would then ideally become what we might label “meeting place” sessions, focused on shedding light on various sides of cutting-edge dilemmas. Interaction becomes key! The professor’s role typically becomes quite similar to the one of an orchestrator, a facilitator, a catalyst, a synthesizer!
- The faculty. It goes without saying that it might be a different type of faculty to be called for in this type of learning context. Each faculty member must of course possess cutting-edge updated expertise in his/her field. And, this expertise must build on practical applicability! The professor must also be comfortable with the “modern” pedagogy! The “old style” professor, with lengthy monologues from the pulpit, based on old lecture notes and often with a lot of u-graph/beamer images, would typically not be effective. Many of the “new” faculty would come from different career backgrounds than what might have been typical for professors in the past – now, say, from business, consulting, entrepreneurial roles, etc. The teaching must of course be research-based. This would imply that it is founded on the latest facts – teaching and research are two sides of the same coin! But, large parts of what might be categorized as classical research might not necessarily “quality” as building relevance in these “new” classroom settings.
- The emerging faculty member would typically be part time. He/she would be custodian of such rare cutting-edge insights that he/she would typically be called on to share this among several institutions – other business schools, businesses, consulting, etc. And, to stay current might require a more conducive environment than the classical axiomatic, silo oriented, discipline-based business school. A stable network of part-time faculty might be what to strive for.
- An action-oriented context. It goes without saying that speed and action would be key! The focus must be on doing things, on achieving results. Bureaucracy can only slow one down – and should be minimized. Administrative routines should be kept to a minimum. This should not be misinterpreted as allowing for sloppiness. There would be no conflict between minimalism and rigor.

The above calls for a different approach regarding how business schools provide value – a different business school culture – not a small-order shift in forms and tasks. There is clearly resistance to be expected, with many vested interests to be dismantled. But, before addressing this, let us first remind ourselves of how two great philosophers/leaders have considered the task of making change happen:

- “First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win”. Mahatma Gandhi.
- “New thoughts and new ideas typically go through three stages: First they are ridiculed. Then they meet strong resistance. At the end, they are accepted as truths!” Arthur Schopenhauer.

So, why is it that the culture of many business schools resist such changes – why do we need to go through such evolutionary nightmarish steps as laid out by Gandhi and Schopenhauer?

### **Major reasons for cultural resistance in business schools**

Cultural change has been discussed by many, see, for instance Denison *et al.* for a summary (2012). We shall of course not give a comprehensive discussion of the

---

complex issue of cultural change here, but rather offer four factors that might decrease resistance to change, or at least slow this down. Two factors are primarily internal to the business schools – the faculty itself, and the school’s leadership. Two other factors are mainly external to the business schools – the phenomenon of ratings/rankings and government’s regulatory and/or ownership influence:

- The faculty: a typical faculty member will have invested a lot of time and energy – blood, sweat and tears – in his/her professional career. Understandably he/she is therefore not about to easily give up his/her axiomatic focus – he/she might even defend this as the “right” way; general business practice “does not understand us”! There may be a clear case of disconnectivity here, and the bottom line might be this: the faculty, cum entranced professors might typically have a relatively strong saying when it comes to how business schools are governed – courses offered, appointments, promotions, identifying committees, even choosing the dean. We might label this a strong bottom-up power, typically with a major aim to be conserving the past. It may be rare to find leaders – deans, presidents – who can effectively counterbalance this in a top-down way.
- The business school’s leadership. Many academic leaders are elected by their peers – the faculty. Others are appointed by boards-of-overseers. Common for both would be that one typically should normally not be picking/electing a new leader that is expected to “rock the boat”. Rather most academic leaders – deans or presidents – tend to have a mandate, perhaps typically implicit but at times also explicit not to make unnecessary changes. The past is good enough! So, change is typically not driven from the top either.

Rating agencies and rankings. In the world of business schools we have several rating agencies. There seems to be a trio of the most prominent ones:

- AACSB – headquartered in Florida;
- EFMD – with EQUIS and EPAS ranking approaches, located in Brussels; and
- AMBA – Association of MBA programs, based in London.

Also, we have published rankings such as the one conducted by *Financial Times* each year. There is also a plethora of perhaps somewhat less prominent rankings, we might say, such as those conducted by *the Economist*, the World Association of Recruiters, etc.).

While all of these institutions, the accreditation associations and the ranking agencies, seem to fulfil important roles, the shortcomings are also apparent. Above all, this might be stemming from the following dilemma:

Criteria for what might be best practice need to be evolving – but, how can this be done while preferring some stability, i.e. without cementing practices that may be reflecting the past – no longer well suited for the future? So, how can the need to come up with innovations at business schools be better factored in? For assessor-teams appointed by accreditation agencies – it might be rather easy to simply reaffirm established practices, rather than to have to argue for why they have approved new ones. And, ranking institutions, such as *the Financial Times*, may want to keep relatively similar criteria for quality assessment over time, so as to allow for statistical time series analysis. And, smaller business schools, often with different business models, might not qualify to be ranked – the larger ones may offer sample stability not found when allowing smaller schools – there will typically be more instabilities in terms of entering/exiting schools among the smaller size group. A little conservatism

might come in here, too. Thus far, this dilemma has not been resolved – and the result seems to be a tilt toward conservatism – preserving the status quo.

It goes without saying that the arguments applied in the strategic substance regarding what business schools deliver also applies to the embedded culture of the business school. Innovations may typically call for a change in culture.

Government's influence. Governments play a legitimate role when it comes to safeguarding the quality of offerings to students, with an acknowledgement that this group perhaps might be relatively less well positioned to judge what is of high quality or not. They are faced with the dilemma that judgements on quality can typically only be passed after a particular program has been taken. Hence government regulation to safeguard quality is called for. But, regrettably, most governments tend to have a different type of influence, too – what has worked in the past must be best for the future, also. The result might be that innovations that, for instance, would point towards virtuality and a cross-disciplinary cooperative culture might be “disallowed”, or at least discouraged! Legislation that a government might pass, or rules that might be enforced by government-installed agencies might easily lead to such dysfunctionalities. After all, cutting-edge expertise called for to lead path-breaking academic innovations may not be present in government's bureaucracy. It follows that the government, too, might impact business school's culture in a conserving way – preserving the established culture (of the past).

### **Virtuality – another key**

As we have touched upon, it seems important that a business school fully embraces a business model that builds on virtuality today, and that the business school's culture should allow for this! Let us here discuss some of the key implications that this might imply. Let us focus on cultural aspects relating to faculty, the participants (students) and the school's own administration, respectively, when it comes to this.

The Faculty. We have already discussed that the faculty might no longer prefer to be attached to a business school with solely offers permanent full-time contracts. We have pointed out that both pedagogical quality and speedy ability to undertake innovation might benefit from virtuality. There might also be cost savings, although quality enhancement factors should be key drivers – not cost minimization.

Virtuality is key when it comes to faculty governance, too. The classical business school shall typically orchestrate faculty meetings several times per year, where faculty typically meet, to debate key governance issues. With no permanent faculty, i.e. none in residence, these faculty “meetings” might perhaps rather be virtual. Skype, e-mails and the phone might offer an equally good way for the faculty members to discuss key issues – a key dimension of governance is still in faculty's hands, even though it is all virtual.

Coordination among faculty members when it comes to courses – to avoid overlaps as well as gaps – is also key. Here, e-mails and memos can be of great support – there is no reason that virtuality might lead to less coordination, assuming that the various faculty members have brought in regarding this way of working. Even large projects might be supervised virtually. Again, this would work well with faculty members who are willing to coordinate!

The participants (students). Internalization of basic background materials, through independent studies, is today almost always done on a virtual basis – so-called distance learning! For this to work well, there might be a deliberate focus on the materials that are being made available, and also on tests that would be handed in virtually, with virtual feedback. There is plenty of evidence that this can work well!

---

There would perhaps no longer be a meaningful class cohort concept – given that the various students go through the program at their own pace, taking the various workshops/modules at different points in time. But, the “class” is held together through virtuality! Even though participants may not know each other physically – at least not well – they might link up via the web, in a networked way. Experiences may be exchanged. “Help” might be given from one student to another, and so on (Bell *et al.*, 2004).

The business school’s administration might be facing up to virtuality, too. To keep a business school’s staff lean seems to be a key to flexibility, adoptability and to keep speed. Outsourcing represents a way to do this – i.e. virtuality. Why maintain capabilities in-house to develop and maintain a good web site, for instance? Why keep a full-fledged financial staff? Brochures and other printed materials might be outsourced, too. Even various aspects of marketing/sales might be outsourced, say, telephone-based sales. Some employees that are on a school’s pay-roll might find it easier and better to carry out their work from elsewhere, say, from home. Preparation of materials for accreditations, for example, might fall into this category – again, virtuality.

So, in total, virtuality would typically represent a key part of a modern business school’s business model. A virtual approach becomes to the preferred one. The cultural implications for a business school might be formidable. To practice virtuality might require a truly fundamental cultural shift, perhaps, above all to embed the realization in the culture that virtuality might be a thing to welcome, something good. Regrettably, most business schools’ cultures seem to resist the virtuality concept, however.

### **Another aspect of culture: what about cooperation?**

Many of today’s business schools are, as discussed, heavily influenced on conventional professors’ axiomatic focus on specialized research and on “publish or perish”. In essence this can be seen as a manifestation of a “me, me, me” culture; what is important for many of the leading actors in such business schools would be: “how can I best get ahead, by doing things in such-and-such a way”? Sadly this implies that cooperation may be difficult – it is “my” course, rather than a course offering belonging to the academic institution, and given more eclectically based on inputs from several professors. Or it may be “my” research project, with “my” research associates working on it, my own sole-authored article, where I alone publish the results of research, rather than as a multi-authored publication. At the extreme “help” a colleague, with aspects of research or teaching, may not benefit me – it might only lead to this colleague moving ahead, potentially detrimental to me! Regrettably this type of individuals – centred culture might not be uncommon.

However, it goes without saying that this “me, me, me” – focused culture might be dysfunctional today – to cooperate with others to de facto achieve more multidisciplinary relevance seems key! Such emphasis on cooperation probably also calls for a revision of faculty members’ incentive structures – teaching might count towards bonus and/or promotion, too, and so might multi-authored articles, even publications in more practitioner-oriented journals. Do we have examples of this type of focus in the business school world? Yes, this was essentially the way that the former Carnegie Institute of Technology (“Carnegie Tech”, now Carnegie-Mellon) business school was working. The Sloan School of Management at MIT was also shaped this way in its formative years. At Yale the predecessor to the new business school there was the Department of Administrative Sciences, which had more or less equal numbers of operations researchers and organization behaviour faculty on its staff. For a discussion of this, see Lorange (2002).



### **What is needed for a business school of the future – today?**

We have so far already discussed the critical importance of an open-minded, innovation prone culture, based on virtuality and cooperation. What more is there? (Lorange, 2012) – Let me point out three such additional challenges:

- Back to the leading customer, with innovations that he/she appreciates! We have already discussed the emerging new lead customer – we labelled him/her the “multi-tasker”! To come up with innovations that he/she appreciates is key! For the multi-tasker such innovations might typically be particularly appreciated, if they make the multi-tasking easier and more effective: better technology, more user-friendly format, the acoustics, a more condensed – even telegraphic messaging style, etc (Clarke and Clarke, 2009). And, innovations that might strengthen the student’s sense of “being part of it”, of “belonging” would be key – certain designs, particular brands, colour, etc.

And, to communicate these innovations – to the multi-tasker target group – would be equally key. Traditional ads, brochures, radio and/or TV commercials might not be all that effective. Rather, blogs, the web, apps, etc. might be it! Modern communication, based on modern IT, has become an integral part of the innovation process, and communication of innovations have become the essential pillar of modern marketing – now relevance/value based, and no longer the low-cost discounting focus.

Are we typically talking about large innovations, paradigm shifts? No, the typical innovations tend to be incremental, focused on making the basic prototype function event better. And, it is the line organization that typically comes up with these innovations – we might perhaps simply label these improvements! The line is closest to the modern consumer – not the traditional central R&D lab! Many of these central labs are consequently disappearing.

The culture of the modern business school should be more customer-centric – more reflecting the realities of the modern student consumer. This is certainly the case when it comes to how teaching is “delivered”. Perhaps even more fundamental would be the call for an effective new culture for enabling better communication with the modern student consumer.

- (1) Talent management: to find the relevant talents becomes key – as we have already discussed. Many classical business school cultures might not be conducive to attracting, and keeping, such relevant talents. As noted, the classical business school culture tends to encourage in-depth axiomatically focused research, done single-handling, and published in discipline – based referred academic journals. Success tends to be measured almost singularity on this criteria; “research, publish, or perish”. This becomes the basic for promotions, for allocation of financial resources and/or assistants, as well as for salary increases (and bonuses). The more practitioner-oriented professor might typically become rather peripheral in this culture. And, many of this class of talents may ultimately thus also leave. No wonder that much of this type of cutting-edge thinking comes from other sources than the classical business school setting – consulting firms, industry, associations, think tanks, etc. A strive for more relevance might thus imply a need for a shift in business school’s culture, away from a unilateral classical academic research focus. Above all perhaps a more tolerant, inclusive culture is to be called for.

- (2) This “New Culture” – connectivity: we thus amply see from the above that the culture of the business school might need to change – and there might even be a strong sense of urgency regarding this. An “outward-open” culture, *vis-à-vis* the “customers” is what we might call for, i.e. a shift away from the more classical, more academic “inward oriented” culture:
- A culture that connects with the modern student – with an attempt to meet his/her demands! This is equally true for the individual student as for the corporation.
  - A culture that connects faculty in a new way – a “we, we, we” culture – not “me, me, me”.
  - A culture that connects all in the team. Speed is key, and this implies more open communication! No one “owns” particular sets of information – less – even no politicking! This implies an urgency-based culture.
  - A culture that connects with outside stakeholders. With a head-count, the business school might be able to embrace change faster. Outsourcing can help. But this again calls for connectivity capabilities. The culture must be networked.

### Conclusions

The modern business school might be in for large cultural changes. The so-called axiomatic, discipline-based culture of the past may definitely have to be revised! The culture has to become more open, broader, more inclusive – so that, above all, a more practitioner-oriented direction might be part of such a revised culture. What may be called for now is flexibility, explicitness for the customer and speed – a “we, we, we” culture. The classical business school, solidly founded on “economies of scales”, axiomatics, and inward orientation might be up for a tough ride. Virtuality and cooperation shall soon become key nowadays cultural pillars nowadays.

### Note

1. There are often different meanings to the words “customer” and “client”. Customers are often associated with fast moving consumer goods, while clients are often associated with the delivery of professional services. Sometimes in education we consider students to be “customers”, and employers, who send or receive the students, as “clients”. However in the cultural world of this paper, students might be much more engaged in “co-creation” of the subject and perhaps the word client might be nearer to this reality. However, in this paper we shall nevertheless use the term customer to relate to students or participants.

### References

- Amdam, R.P. (1997), “The business school in European perspective”, *Business History*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 183-184.
- Antunes, D. and Thomas, H. (2007), “The competitive (dis)advantages of European business schools”, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 382-404.
- Bell, M., Martin, G. and Clarke, T. (2004), “Engaging in the future of e-learning: a scenarios-based approach”, *Education and Training*, Vol. 46 Nos 6/7, pp. 296-307.
- Ben-Hur, S. (2009), “Culture and performance of European business schools”, doctoral dissertation, Humboldt University, Berlin.

- Bennis, W.G. (2012), "Have business schools found their way?", available at: [www.businessweek.com](http://www.businessweek.com) (accessed 12 July 2012).
- Bennis, W.G. and O'Toole, J. (2005), "How business schools lost their way", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 96-104.
- Canals, J. (Ed.) (2011), *The Future of Leadership Development*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Clarke, T. and Clarke, E. (2009), "Born digital? Pedagogy and computer assisted learning", *Education and Training*, Vol. 51 Nos 5/6, pp. 395-407.
- Clarke, T. and Rollo, C. (2001), "Capitalising knowledge: corporate knowledge management investments", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 177-188.
- Datar, S.M., Garvin, D.A. and Cullen, P.G. (2010), *Rethinking the MBA*, Harvard Business Press, Boston, MA.
- Denison, D. (1990), *Corporate Culture, Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Denison, D. (2012), "Private correspondence", IMD Lausanne.
- Denison, D., Hooijberg, R., Lane, N. and Lief, C. (2012), *Leading Culture Change in Global Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Engwall, L. (2000), "Foreign role models and standardization in Nordic business education", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Gordon, J. and Howell, M. (1998), "The future of business education", Ford Foundation, New York, NY.
- Iniguez, S. and De, O. (2011), *The Learning Curve – How Business Schools are Reinventing Education*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Katzenbach, J.R., Steffen, I. and Kronley, C. (2012), "Cultural change that sticks", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 89, July-August.
- Khurana, R. (2007), *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Kotter, J.P. (2007), "Leading change: why transformational efforts fail", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 84, January-February.
- Lorange, P. (2002), "The industry view of collaborative research", in Hirsch, W.Z. and Weber, L. (Eds), *As the Walls of Academia are Tumbling Down*, Economica, London, pp. 204-212.
- Lorange, P. (2012), "The business school of the future: the networked-based business model", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 424-430.
- Majeed, K., Bhatti, A.M., Nemati, A.R., Rehman, I.U. and Rizwar, A. (2010), "Can cultural change with different leadership styles enhance the organizational performance?", *Research Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 17, pp. 102-132.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004), *Managers, not MBAs*, Pearson Education, London.
- Pettigrew, A. and Hommel, U. (Eds) (2013), *The Institutional Development of Business Schools*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Pfeffer, J. and Fong, C.T. (2004), "The business school business: some lessons from US experience", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1501-1520.
- Piaget, J. (1992), *Piaget's Theory – Prospects and Possibilities*, City University of New York, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Ruegg, W. (2005), *History of the European University*, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schein, E. (2010), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 4th ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Thomas, H. (2007), "An analysis of the environment and competitive dynamics of management education", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 33-42.

- 
- Thomas, H. and Fragueir, F. (2011), *Strategic Leadership in Business Schools: Keeping one Step Ahead*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Thomas, H., Lorange, P. and Sheth, J. (2013), *The Business School in the 21st Century: Emergent Challenges and New Business Models*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

### Further reading

- Hawawini, G. (2005), "The future of business schools", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 770-783.
- Heine, S. (2008), *Cultural Psychology*, Norton, New York, NY.
- Howard, T. (2007), "An analysis of the environment and competitive dynamics of management education", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 33-42.
- Howard, T. (with Fragueiro, F.) (2011), *Strategic Leadership in Business Schools: Keeping one Step Ahead*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y.T. (2012), "Global leadership in multicultural teams", in Canals, J. (Ed.), *Leadership Development in a Global World*, Palmgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 183-195.
- Lorange, P. (2008), *Thought Leadership Meets Business: How Business Schools Can Become More Successful*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Sánchez-Runde, C., Nordon, L. and Steers, R.M. "Accounting for culture in the development of global leaders", in Canals, J. (Ed.), *Leadership Development in a Global World*, Palmgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, pp. 212-223.
- Steers, R., Sánchez-Runde, C. and Nandon, L. (2010), *Management Across Cultures*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

### About the author

Peter Lorange is President and owner of the Lorange Institute of Business Zürich, formerly known as GSBA Zurich. He was previously President of the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) and President of the BI Norwegian Business School. He has taught at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania and at the MIT Sloan School of Management. He received his undergraduate education from the Norwegian School of Economics, was awarded an MA degree in operations management from Yale University, and his Doctor of Business Administration degree from Harvard University. Peter Lorange can be contacted at: [p.lorange@lorange.org](mailto:p.lorange@lorange.org)