You reap what you sow: 'Are management educators responsible for declining employability of students in Indian B Schools?'

Vinod Sharma
Jeanne Poulose
Christ Institute of Management, Ghaziabad, India

Fr. Sunny Joseph
CHRIST(Deemed to be University), Bangalore &
Christ Institute of Management, Ghaziabad India

Keywords

Abstract

A study by ASSOCHAM in 2016 revealed that most B schools in India, except the IIMs, are producing sub-par management graduates who are either unemployable or are earning less than Rs.10,000 per month with the campus placements falling by 45 percent. Data from AICTE shows the number of management colleges has dropped from 3609 in 2014-2015 to 3264 in 2017-2018. Thus Corporate India's declining demand for students is affecting admissions resulting in the closure of Institutions. There are several reasons for this trend but a significant one is the delivery of course curriculum. It appears that management institutions are sowing orange seeds and expecting to reap apples wanted by the Industry.

This study tries to answer three questions. What is used by management educators, why and to what extent? Literature review helped identify the ideal teaching methodologies for adult learners in B-schools. Then 10,000 questionnaires were circulated both online and offline using purposive sampling and snowballing technique amongst educators from Management Institutions across the country of which 776 responses were finalised. Triangulation technique was applied to check for content validity, expert's opinion for face validity and construct validity by developing them on the basis of the Literature Review. The data was then analysed using factor analysis to reconfirm the structure of the items and their interrelationship. Subsequently, Reliability Test was applied to check for consistency of the instrument and multiple regression analysis to test the hypotheses.

The study revealed that management educators are focussing on quantity sacrificing quality and a gap exists between 'what is' and 'what ought to be'. It should help educators introspect and reflect on their role in shaping the future of thousands of young students and remind them of their responsibility to ensure that they sow only what Institutions wish to reap for the Industry.

Acknowledgement

Introduction

India is the world's largest provider of management education(Economist, 2016). This picture changes drastically when it comes to the quality of the graduating students of these institutions. While the number of institutions struggling to remain afloat is on the rise,the students being churned out of the remaining few are either without jobs or are forced to accept jobs with frugal pays. The Industry in particular and the nation, in general, seems to be gaining very little from the students passing out of management institutions. The industry, academia and all those interested in seeing our country grow are of the opinion that graduates are amassing their degree certificates despite the absence of skills needed to be a productive part of the Indian economy(Chakrabarthy, 2016).

Questions have also been raised on the work ethics and values of these management graduates, which is captured in the quote by Late. Prof Sumantra Ghoshal, "The worst excesses of recent

management practices have their roots in a set of ideas that have emerged from business-school academics over the last 30 years" (Ghoshal, 2005). Even more alarming is that more than 50% of the passing graduates in India failed to secure jobs through campus placements in 2016- 2017. While the unemployment situation in India is a major cause, the fact that management students from B and C grade schools lack creativity, confidence and practical knowledge(ET online, 2017)are additional reasons for this state of affairs.

This leads us to the question, why are we seeing this drop in the quality of graduates?There are several reasons, including the quality of intake of the students, the outdated curriculum, the quality of faculty, the infrastructure support offered in B schools etc. The researchers feel that the delivery of curriculum is the key because ultimately what we sow is what we reap. Thus if management institutions sow oranges and nourish them like apples, they will get neither oranges nor apples.

This paper explores 'What do they use and to what extent?' and 'Why'? Traditionally it has been observed that educators inmost B schools use pedagogical tools. Pedagogy is the art and science of teaching children and is derived from Greek word 'peda' or 'paid' translated as a child(Knowles, 1973). Lecture-based teaching, regular written tests that check rote learning skills of the students are all pedagogical tools of learning and teaching used extensively in Institutions. The methodology of teaching young adults is referred to as Andragogy. Andragogy is based on a Greek word 'aner', meaning man, implying that this is an art and science of helping adults learn(Knowles, 1996).

The authors undertook an extensive literature review with the primary objective of understanding the benefits of each teaching methodological tool and the secondary objective of analysingwhether each teaching methodology is appropriate for adult learners. Once these two aspects are established we would compare what ought to be against what is being done in management institutions in India and understand the reasons for the same. This study should hold a mirror to educators and enable us to do what is very often asked of students, which is to challenge assumptions and beliefs and open ourselves up to change and transformation.

Literature Review

Since the study is based on 15 items developed in a previous study(Poulose & Sharma, 2018) that explored and identified various tools used in classrooms, in this paper we tried to explore and document the specific advantages of each method through literature review.

Table 1: Summary of the LR onthe identified teaching methodologies

S. No	Andragogy	Reference	Features & Benefits
1	Projects	(Hansen & Randall, 2006) (Aggarwal & O'Brien, 2008)	Exposes students to the real world, fostering higher level learning as outlined in Bloom's taxonomy, critical thinking and responding to the critical feedback from peers, to work with diverse team members
2	Case Method	(Athanassiou, Mc Nett, & Harvey, 2003) (Graham, Morecroft, Senge, & Sterman, 1992)	Draw from functional knowledge gained in the classroom to analyse and process case Organises available information, critically analyse data and come up with solutions on their own
3	Simulation	(Poulose & Sharma, 2018) (Savery, 2006) (Salas, Wildman, & Piccolo, 2009)	Problem-based learning (PBL) process, an instructionallearner-centred approach that empowers learners to conduct research, integrate theory and practice and apply knowledge and skills to develop a viable solution to a defined problem
4	Role Plays	(Gartmeier, et al., 2015) (Janis & King, 1954)	Overt verbalisation induced by roleplay tends to augment the effectiveness of persuasive communication and students displayed a relatively great amount of improvisation in their talk and felt satisfied with their speaking performance.
4	Industrial Visits	(Benefits of industria visits to studentsl, 2017)	Practical knowledge and hands-on experience
5	Flipped Classroom	(Tucker, 2012)	Frees up the class time for much more productive learning Offers student a lot of freedom to learn independently
7	Student Presentation	(Andrews & Higson, 2008) (BBC British Council, 2006)	An extremely crucial communication skill & a medium for students to share with others what they have learnt and give them a chance to challenge their understanding of the topic.
8	Group Discussion	(DeLozier & Rhodes, 2017) (Hazari, North, & Moreland, 2009)	Benefitted the performance of students and helped improve conceptual understanding of applied principles Build on each other's knowledge by forming participatory

9	Storytelling Method	(Maddalena, 2015)	The sharing of personal experiences results in the creation of a bond between the educator and student and creates a rapport that facilitates the transfer of knowledge The student learns from the stories of success and failures of the educator and people whose experiences documented in books, articles or other such sources, are shared in the classroom
10	Peer-group Learning	(Roock, et al., 2016) (Astin & Alexander, 1993)	Work in small groups of four to eight results in greater creativity and better outcomes than when students worked alone Peer groups are the single most influential source of student's academic and personal development and the amount of interaction has far-reaching effects on almost all the areas of student development
11	Seminars	(Tumwebaze, 2016)	Helps build networks, communication skills and the interactive environment ensures a much deeper understanding of a chosen content
12	Guest Lectures	(Harvard Initiative for learning and teaching, 2016)	If prepared well in advance and the speaker is carefully selected then they provide depth and granularity
13	Research Sharing	(Wang & Noe, 2010) (Cummings, 2004) (Davis, 2009)	The provision of task information and know-how to help others and to collaborate with others to solve problems, develop new ideas or implement policies or procedures
14	Audio Visual Media	(S & M, 2001)	Reinforcing what the learner has heard in a lecture, helps retain the information in memory and increases enjoyment in the process of learning
15	Lecture-based Teaching	(Grey, 2012) (Horgan, 2003) (Ellis, 1993)	Provides background information, clarify concepts prior to engaging the students in interactive activities in the classroom. Student control and participation are minimal in this form of teaching.

Studies have shown that adult learning is characterised by self-directed learning, fostering critical thinking, experiential learning, the immediacy of application of knowledge, allows responsibility for decisions and the instructor is expected only to be the facilitator (Brookfield, 1995); (Rismiyanto, Saleh, Mujiyanto, & Shofwan, 2017). Thus based on the benefits of the tools tabulated above and understanding of conditions of adult learning, student involvement and practical instead of theoretical based learning come across as being essential elements of Andragogy. This is in line with the findings of a previous study by (Poulose & Sharma, 2018) where the two dimensions identified were student engagement (SE) and application-based learning (AL). As such all the tools can be classified into HH, HL, LH or LL wherein H stands for high and L for low on the two dimensions. Simulation, Projects and Case Method came out to be the most ideal andragogical tools belonging to the HH category followed by Flipped classrooms, student presentation, guest lecture, seminar and role play, Industrial visits, GDs and peer group learning of the HL/LH category that should be used extensively in Management Institutions. With 'what ought to be' clear now, the study should reveal 'what is and why'?

Research Methodology

To answer the questions raised in the literature review this study adopted both exploratory and descriptive research methods. Ivankova et al., (2006) confirms that when we use the combination of both exploratory and descriptive research techniques, they help in bringing out more vigorous results. The exploratory research technique was used to reconfirm the various andragogical tools identified through literature and the descriptive research technique was used to generalize the findings through appropriate statistical tools.

The structured and self-administered questionnaire was developed based on the analysis of related literature and other secondary source data, such as news articles and journals (Siniscalco & Auriat, 2005) & (Meadows, 2003). There were sixteen different sections, where section one captured the demographic profile of the respondents and the remaining fifteen sections focused on andragogical tools identified through literature review. These fifteen sections were further divided into two parts wherein the first part captured 'what' component (as the independent variable) and the second part was designed to confirm the reasons of usages (as the dependent variable) of the tool. The pilot study was conducted before finalizing the questionnaire on 47 educators through which we found that 7 questions were not

clear and 4 questions were repetitive in nature. These 11 questions were removed and 8 new questions were included in the final instrument.

This study used a purposive and snowballing sampling technique for data collection. The questionnaire was circulated to around 10,000 faculty members of various B/C grade management institutions in the country through online and offline method, out of which, we finalized 776 responses for the analysis. Hair *et al.,*(2010) & Chawla & Sondhi, (2011) too concluded in their study that 5:1 ratio among the items is appropriate for getting the precise results in multiple regression analysis.

Validity and Reliability

The validity of the instrument was checked to measure the accuracy of the scale (Polit & Hungler, 1993). It is anticipated that the scale should confirm the content, face and construct validity. The objective of content validity of the questionnaire is to get the consensus of the subject experts on the constructs, concept, and content of the items selected in the tool. This study applied triangulation technique to check the content validity of the scale. The focused group discussion method, expert opinion method and discussion techniques were applied to ensure the content validity of the constructs used. Based on the comments of the experts on each and every item the scale was further improved. This research also confirms face validity by ensuring that the scale appeared to be measuring what it was supposed to measure (Benson & Clark, 1983). To ensure the face validity of the scale, expert's opinion (such as senior professors of various B-schools & managers from the industry) were taken into consideration. Finally, the construct validity was checked through the construction of the items used in the scale based on the concepts of the constructs which was developed through in-depth literature review.

The data was first checked to see if it was normally distributed, and it meets all the assumptions of multicollinearity and homoscedasticity (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The second stage was to apply a factor analysis to reconfirm the structure of the items and their interrelationship (Malhotra, 2010). This study found all the factors coming out to be appropriate with the KMO (0.916) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity (0.000), for further analysis. We found 15 factors with 74% variances. The Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation was applied to examine the dimensions of the instrument. Identified andragogical tools through factor analysis were retested through reliability analysis to check the internal consistency. TheCronbach's Alpha values closer to 1.0 is considered more reliable but the value above or equals to 0.70 is also considered good (Zikmund, 2004); (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994, p. 265); (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991, pp. 12-13) & (Nunnally J. C., 1978). The values of fifteen different constructs were found to be well within the limits (Please refer Table 2).

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

S. No.	Tools	No of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Sig
1	Projects	6	0.817	0.000
2	Case Method	8	0.916	0.000
3	Simulation	5	0.845	0.000
4	Industrial Visits	5	0.911	0.000
5	Flipped Classroom	7	0.905	0.000
6	Role Plays	7	0.882	0.000
7	Student Presentation	6	0.861	0.000
8	Group Discussion	8	0.798	0.000
9	Story telling Method	5	0.784	0.000
10	Peer-group Learning	7	0.917	0.000
11	Seminars	4	0.812	0.000
12	Guest Lectures	7	0.795	0.000
13	Research Sharing	7	0.851	0.000
14	Audio Visual Media	5	0.835	0.000
15	Lecture-based Teaching	7	0.898	0.000

Data Analysis

The universe of this study consists of B/C grade management institutions from across the country. As discussed above 776 responses were finalized for the statistical analysis out of which 53.2% (n=412) were male and 46.8% (n=364) were female respondents. Average experience of the respondents was 12.6 years and 69.8% (n=542) respondents had doctorate degree 37% (n=287) respondents were from marketing specialization, 28% (n=217) respondents were from finance specialization, 21% (n=163) respondents were from HR specialization and rest 14% were from other specializations such as IT & operations.

The data from the study revealed the answer to our first question, which is 'what do educators use'? The results revealed that 'project', 'case study', 'student presentation', 'GDs', 'Audi-Visual mode' and 'lecture-based teaching' are tools used by over 90% of the educators. A second set of tools including 'Role Play', 'Peer group learning', 'Industrial Visit', 'Research Sharing' and 'Guest Lectures' are used between 60% to 90% and the remaining andragogical tools including 'Simulation'., Flipped classroom', 'Seminar method', and 'Storytelling' are used the least, which is 40% to 60%.

After the demographic analysis, the multiple regression analysis was applied to test the proposed hypotheses (see Table2). This helped answer the second research objective, which is 'Why do educators use what they use?'

Hypotheses Testing

From the Table3, it is evident that all 15 hypotheses are rejected as the p-values (<0.05) are well within the limit.

H₀₁:There is no significant effect of the components, 'real-time learning', 'easy to use', 'high on application-based teaching', 'high student's involvement', 'bridge the gap between industry & academia' and 'creative thinking'on the usage of project andragogy.

The results (see Table 3) clearly indicate that the hypothesis stands rejected and there is, in fact, significant effect of the components on the decision of the educator to use project Andragogy. Further it is also seen that the 'Real-time learning (B=0.201; p-value=0.000)', 'High on application-based teaching (B=0.139; p-value=0.000)' and 'Easy to use (B=0.218; p-value=0.000)' are seen to influence significantly the decision to use project while the components 'High student involvement', 'bridge the industry-academia gap' and 'creative thinking' are having an insignificant influence on the decision to use project methodology.

H₀₂:There is no significant effect of 'real-time learning', 'high students involvement', 'access to repository', 'high on application-based teaching', 'peer pressure', 'creative thinking', 'decision making' and 'institute insists' on the usage of case study andragogy.

The regression output values lead us to reject the hypothesis (see Table 3). The components influence the decision of the educator to use Case study. 'Real-time learning (B=0.128; p-value=0.000)', 'High students involvement (B=0.482; p-value=0.002)', 'High on application-based teaching (B=0.316; p-value=0.003)', 'Institution insists (B=0.360; p-value=0.010)' and 'Peer Pressure (B=0.077; p-value=0.030)' have a significant influence on the educator's decision to use case study while 'Access to repository', 'creative thinking' and 'decision making' are components that are insignificant.

H₀₃: There is no significant effect of 'real-time learning', 'high students involvement', 'access to repository', 'high on application-based teaching' and 'decision making' on the usage of simulation andragogy.

The values indicate (see Table 3) that there is a significant effect of the components on the usage of simulation Andragogy. Educators use Simulation mostly because of the 'high level of student involvement (B=0.290; p-value=0.000)' and 'real-time learning (B=0.094; p-value=0.041)' involved. Of all the components 'the access to repository', 'high on application-based teaching' and 'decision making' are seen to be insignificant.

H₀₄: There is no significant effect of 'Real-time learning', 'High students involvement', 'High on application-based teaching','Institution insists' and 'Bridge the gap between industry & academia' on the usage of industry visit andragogy.

The hypothesis stands rejected (see Table 3) hence there is a significant effect of the components on the usage of industry visit Andragogy. Further it is seen that except for 'High application-based teaching (B=-0.053; p-value=0.225)' all others including 'Institution insists (B=0.496; p-value=0.000)', 'Real-time learning(B=0.102; p-value=0.005)', 'High students involvement (B=-0.146; p-value=0.002)' and 'Bridge the gap between industry and academia (B=0.146; p-value=0.000)' are seen to be of significant value.

H_{05}: *There is no significant effect of 'It is quite innovative, 'Creative thinking', 'Decision Making', 'Enhances leadership skills among students', 'Enhances team building skills among students', 'Enhances conceptual knowledge' and 'Helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry' on usage of flipped classroom andragogy.*

The values from Table 3 clearly indicate that the hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant effect of the components on the usage of the flipped classroom. The ability to foster creative thinking (B=-0.383; p-value=0.000), innovation (B=0.362; p-value=0.000) and decision making (B=0.411; p-value=0.000) are found to be significant and the remaining components are insignificant.

H_{06}: *There is no significant effect of 'Real-time learning', 'High students involvement', 'Decision Making', 'Improves Soft skills', 'Develops Team Spirit', 'Learning while playing', and 'Students appreciate it more' on the usage role play andragogy.*

With this hypothesis getting rejected there is said to be a significant effect of the components on the usage of role play Andragogy (see Table 3). Results point to the fact that of all the components 'learning while playing' is the only one that is insignificant, while the others such as 'Real time learning(B=-0.139; p-value=0.000)', 'High students involvement (B=0.418; p-value=0.000)', 'Decision Making (B=-0.107; p-value=0.009)', 'Improves Soft skills (B=0.382; p-value=0.000)', 'Develops Team Spirit (B=-0.204; p-value=0.000)' and 'Students appreciate it more (B=-0.100; p-value=0.002)'are seen to have significant effect on the usage of role play andragogy.

H_{07}: *There is no significant effect of'High student's involvement', 'Peer Pressure', 'Creative thinking', 'Institute insists', 'Improves Soft Skills', and 'Easy to use' on the usage student presentation andragogy.*

The hypothesis is rejected and the individual component 'high student involvement' is seen to have insignificant influence on the usage of the student presentation (see Table 3) Andragogy, while all others including 'Peer Pressure (B=-0.087; p-value=0.005)', 'Creative thinking (B=0.091; p-value=0.000)', 'Institute insists (B=0.126; p-value=0.000)', 'Improves Soft Skills (B=0.078; p-value=0.000)', and 'Easy to use (B=0.174; p-value=0.000)'factors studied are having a significant value.

H_{08}: *There is no significant effect of 'decision making', 'institute insists', 'improves soft skills', 'enhances leadership skills among students', and 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry' on the usage of group discussion andragogy.*

Since the hypothesis is rejected (see Table 3), looking further into the individual components it is found that 'decision making (B=0.477; p-value=0.000)', 'institute insists (B=0.216; p-value=0.000)' and 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry (B=0.178; p-value=0.005)'are significant and the remaining insignificant.

H_{09}: *There is no significant effect of 'access to repository', 'decision making', 'critical thinking', 'easy to use' and 'helps change the thinking and behaviour' on the usage of story-telling andragogy.*

The rejected hypothesis reflects that there is a significant effect of the combined components on story-telling Andragogy (see Table 3). Data also reveals that 'decision making' and 'helps change thinking and behaviour' are factors that are found to be insignificant, while all the others such as 'access to repository (B=-0.196; p-value=0.000)', 'critical thinking (B=0.268; p-value=0.000)' and 'easy to use (B=0.118; p-value=0.002)' have a significant effect on the usage of story-telling Andragogy.

H_{10}: *There is no significant effect of 'helps change the thinking and behaviour', 'creative thinking', 'decision making', 'enhances leadership skills among students', 'enhances team building skills among students', 'enhances conceptual knowledge', and 'it connects with that age group' on the usage of peer group learning andragogy.*

The Table 3 values indicate that there is a significant effect of the factors on the use of peer group learning Andragogy. 'Decision making' is seen to be the only component that is insignificant while all the others such as 'helps change the thinking and behaviour (B=0.166; p-value=0.000)', 'creative thinking (B=-

0.128; p-value=0.015)', 'enhances leadership skills among students (B=0.130; p-value=0.031)', 'enhances team building skills among students (B=0.319; p-value=0.000)', 'enhances conceptual knowledge (B=-0.196; p-value=0.000)', and 'it connects with that age group (B=-0.080; p-value=0.051)' have significant values indicating their influence on the usage of the peer group learning Andragogy.

H_{11}: *There is no significant effect of 'institute insists', 'bridge the gap between industry & academia', 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry' and 'students appreciate it more' on the usage of seminar andragogy.*

Like all another hypothesis this too is rejected (see Table 3) and further it is found that 'student appreciates it more (B=0.213; p-value=0.000)' and 'bridges the industry-academia gap (B=0.131; p-value=0.004)' are having a significant value, whereas 'Institute insists' and 'Helps improve knowledge of current happenings in the industry' are seen to be insignificant indicating that they are not substantially significant reasons why educators use seminar Andragogy.

H_{12}: *There is no significant effect of 'real-time learning', 'expert knowledge sharing', 'peer pressure', 'I have good industry connects', 'institute insists', 'bridge the gap between industry & academia' and 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry' on the usage of guest lecture andragogy.*

The hypothesis is rejected which (see Table 3) goes to prove that there is a significant effect of 'real-time learning (B=-0.200; p-value=0.000)', 'expert knowledge sharing (B=0.201; p-value=0.000)', 'I have good industry connects (B=0.268; p-value=0.000)', 'bridge the gap between industry & academia (B=-0.283; p-value=0.000)' and 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry (B=0.133; p-value=0.000)' components on the usage of guest lecture Andragogy. 'Peer pressure' and 'Institute insists' are found to be the insignificant effect on the usage of the guest lecture Andragogy.

H_{13}: *There is no significant effect of 'access to repository', 'peer pressure', 'creative thinking', 'enhances conceptual knowledge', 'students appreciate it more', and 'it connects with that age group' on the usage of research sharing andragogy.*

Rejection of the hypothesis implies (see Table 3) that there is a significant effect of the factors on the use ofresearch sharing Andragogy. The components, 'Access to repository (B=-0.526; p-value=0.000)', 'Creative thinking (B=0.898; p-value=0.000)', 'Students appreciate it more (B=-0.172; p-value=0.008)' and 'It connects with that age group (B=-0.205; p-value=0.000)' are seen to be significant while the rest of the components are having an insignificant effect on the usage of research Andragogy.

H_{14}: *There is no significant effect of 'access to repository', 'peer pressure', 'institute insists', 'visual learning' and 'students appreciate it more' on the usage of audio-visual andragogy.*

With this hypothesis being rejected it is clear that the components have a significant effect on the decision of the educator to use audio-visual Andragogy (see Table 3). Further analysis reveals that 'institute insists (B=0.241; p-value=0.000)', 'visual learning (B=0.264; p-value=0.000)' and 'students appreciate it more (B=0.090; p-value=0.003)'component significantly influences the usage of audio-visual Andragogy, while the rest are insignificant.

H_{15}: *There is no significant effect of 'enhances conceptual knowledge', 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry', 'decision making', 'institute insists', 'students appreciate it more', 'easy to use' and 'helps change the thinking and behaviour' on the usage of lecture-based andragogy.*

Tests showed (see Table 3) that the components do influence the usage of lecture-based Andragogy. Further it is seen that of all the seven components only 'helps improve knowledge of current happenings of the industry' is seen to be insignificant, whereas, 'enhances conceptual knowledge (B=0.474; p-value=0.006)', 'decision making (B=0.166; p-value=0.000)', 'institute insists (B=-0.118; p-value=0.000)', 'students appreciate it more (B=0.087; p-value=0.000)', 'easy to use (B=0.168; p-value=0.000)' and 'helps change the thinking and behaviour (B=-0.136; p-value=0.000)' have a significant impact on the usage of lecture based Andragogy.

Table 3: Regression Output

S. No.	Tools	R²	Adjusted R²	F- Value	Sig
1	Projects	0.421	0.417	93.357	0.000
2	Case Method	0.501	0.496	98.841	0.000

3	Simulation	0.255	0.245	26.411	0.000
4	Industrial Visits	0.099	0.091	11.697	0.000
5	Flipped Classroom	0.346	0.333	27.768	0.000
6	Role Plays	0.437	0.43	59.406	0.000
7	Student Presentation	0.239	0.233	38.251	0.000
8	Group Discussion	0.367	0.363	82.964	0.000
9	Story telling Method	0.259	0.249	28.049	0.000
10	Peer-group Learning	0.325	0.317	41.735	0.000
11	Seminars	0.118	0.11	15.283	0.000
12	Guest Lectures	0.298	0.291	41.8	0.000
13	Research Sharing	0.361	0.351	38.016	0.000
14	Audio Visual Media	0.307	0.302	61.871	0.000
15	Lecture-based Teaching	0.135	0.127	16.244	0.000

Discussion&Conclusion

The first question this study answers is, what is used by educators and to what extent. The results are in line with the assumption that we began with, that Pedagogy and not Andragogy is used the most. Results show that Institutions continue to base their teaching extensively on pedagogical tools like lecture-based teaching and audio-visual method. Except 'Simulation', Flipped classroom', 'Seminar method', and 'Storytelling' all the other tools are used by over 60% of the respondents extensively. This implies that 11 tools are used by the majority of the educators for their courses. Though impressive, one must not overlook the fact that all the respondents follow the semester or trimester system that mandates completion of course content in 30-45 hours. This being the case if educators are using all these tools for a course within the allotted hours then the quality of their delivery is questionable! Due to personal and professional compulsions, educators are focusing on quantity sacrificing quality of methodology. It also shows that some very important andragogical tools like simulation, flipped classrooms, seminar method are not being used enough. Thus it becomes evident that gap exists between what should be used to teach and what is being used to teach.

This study also provides detailed insight into why educators use what they use. It was found that easy to use (21.8%) and Real-time learning (20.1%) have the most influence on the decision to use project Andragogy. This is not in line with our understanding gained from literature review of the benefit of Projects. A component as significant as application based learning came across as being insignificant. During interaction with faculty for filling of the questionnaire, we realised that most educators are considering assignments given in class as Projects instead of live projects students undertake in organisations. The case method is used mostly because educators believe that they are 'High on application-based teaching (31.6%), High student involvement (48.2%) and a majority are seen using it because Institution insists (36%). This is reinforced by our own personal experiences and observation of Institutions insisting on the case method. A few government universities have pre-defined case studies assigned for each course, which must be mandatorily taken up by the educators.

The results for simulation are not in confirmation with the results of the Literature review. Past studies have shown that simulation is highly application based and helps students in fostering their decision-making skills in a risk-free environment (Salas, Wildman, & Piccolo, 2009) & (Poulose & Sharma, 2018). But these components were found to be insignificant in our studies. Student engagement increases with use of simulation were the only result that was in line with past studies. Based on the outcome of the study for this component and our personal observation while administering this questionnaire we are compelled to attribute this to the quality and mindset of the faculty. We came across several educators who were not aware of this particular tool. This is reinforced by the fact that merely 50.5% of the respondents were found to be using this tool.

Educators agreed that bridges the industry-academia gap component increased with every Industrial visit, however, the results also showed an inverse relationship between industry visits and student engagement & application based learning, implying that industrial visits reduce student

engagement and learning. This reflects their lack of confidence in this tool and yet 69% of the respondents were found to be using this tool. This is probably because Institution insists (50%) on the usage of this tool as this component was found to be very significant. The respondents believed that the innovativeness of Flipped classrooms is what influences its usage. But the inverse relation that came up for the component fosters creative thinking and the finding that all the other components are insignificant again raises questions on the awareness of the educator and their openness to experiment with new tools. The fact that only a meagre 48.5% of the respondents use this tool validates our opinion.

The results of role play confirmed our belief that educators perceive it to influence student involvement (41.8%) and helps develop their soft skills (38.2%). Student presentation as a tool again surprised us as the findings were not in alignment with the findings of past studies. None of the components was seen to be greatly influencing the usage of this tool. This is probably an indicator of the way this tool is used and the quality of the students. GDs were found to be used by educators mostly because of their belief that students 'decision-making skills improve (47.7%) and the institution insists (21.6%). Most institutions across the country use GDs to impart placement training for the students. Both tools are used by over 90% of the respondents.

'Story-telling' and 'audio-visual media', literature review established as mostly pedagogical tools (Maddalena, 2015). Our study reveals that audio-visual media is used extensively by educators while storytelling did not find much favour with educators, though the few who use it believe that this influences the students critical thinking. The study revealed that peer group learning as a tool is used the most due to its influence on team building skills (31.9%). But other components that were found to be significant in previous studies were either found to be insignificant or having an inverse relation with the variable (Astin & Alexander, 1993) & (Roock, et al., 2016). For instance, creative thinking is seen to have an inverse relation, implying that more peer group learning will reduce creative thinking. This could be attributable to the quality of the students and the lack of confidence of the educator to let the tool be learner-centric.

The results for seminar Andragogy brings out an interesting fact that Institutions are not insisting on seminars as this is seen to have an insignificant influence on the variable. This raises questions about the willingness and ability of institutions to offer the educators the support they need to use Andragogy. Substantially high number of respondent are seen using guest lecture for their courses (89.7%) and the reason why they are using this appears to be due to its influence on network building and knowledge sharing. A tool like research sharing that is crucial for management students is seen to be used by only 69% of the educators and the most influencing factor attributed for its usage is 'creative thinking (89.8%)'. Several other significant factors like 'access to repository' and 'it connects with the age group' showed an inverse relation with the variable. This we attribute to the lack of research inclination of the educators that is evident from the quantum of research contribution from the educators in B and C grade institutions. Lecture-based teaching, the tool which is used extensively for children and has its obituary written several times continues to be used extensively by educators (94.8%). The study also shows that almost all the components are found to be significantly influencing the variable implying that the educator attributes several benefits to the usage of this lecture tool.

From the above results, we may conclude that gap does exist between what is and what ought to be. Students continue to be trained using several pedagogical tools and a few andragogical ones and educators are currently using too many methodologies in the limited sessions allotted for each course. The study also reveals that educators are using the methodologies they use because of their perception and understanding of their benefits in addition to the limitations imposed on them by external factors like the Institution, Trimester/Semester system, quality of students evidenced by the usage of tools like Industrial visit and Guest lectures, which the educator feels contributes very little to student learning. Additionally, a few internal factors like quality of the educator, training received on usage, mind-set and beliefs they hold are what we believe, responsible for their using pedagogical tools like lecture-based teaching extensively and not using a few andragogical tools that belong to the HH category.

Employability of students is linked to their knowledge, skill and attitude (KSAs). Management Institutions are meant to be the training centres where the educator is entrusted with the responsibility of honing these KSAs. However, our study shows that selection of tools meant for such training is being

done due to beliefs on perceived benefits and certain limitations imposed on the educators. This is then bound to impact the employability of the students. Too much nourishment forced on a seedling does more harm than good, similarly, too many tools in too short a period can instead of honing, harm the student's abilities. Educators' selection of the tool to be used should be on the basis of the need and objective of the students but now it is on the basis of the need and beliefs of the educator and the Institution. Hence it would not be wrong to conclude that educators are one of the primary reasons for the declining employability of the management students. The results of this study hold a mirror to the educators specifically and other important stakeholders, which we hope would force them to initiate drastic changes and bring in more accountability to the entire process of delivery of course curriculum. In short, this study should cause stakeholders to pay attention to what they sow and how, so as to reap employable industry-ready students.

Limitations and Scope for Future study

While we strongly stand by the results of our study, we also feel that there could be minor variations in the results due to a few limitations like the sincerity with which the educators answered the questionnaire, the length of the questionnaire, time & resources, educators understanding of terms or the lack of it to name a few. Further, this study does not measure directly the impact of the current methodologies on the employability level of the student. Also, it would be unfair to lay the blame fair and square on the educator without trying to understand their reasons for not using andragogical tools. Hence in our next study, we would be asking the educators 'why they do not use what they do not use'. We would also like to explore if their decision to use a tool is influenced by factors such as experience, gender, specialisation etc. To establish clearly the role of the educator in the employability it is also essential to explore other factors responsible like the quality of the students, the infrastructural and resource support from the management and isolate their influence from the total impact on employability. Finally to understand the effectiveness of the execution of current methodologies it is important to explore the level of training received in each methodology by the educators and study the KSA level of students at the time of joining the Institution and comparing it after they acquire their degrees.

References

Aggarwal, P., & O'Brien, L. C. (2008, 12). Social Loafing on Group Projects. *Journal of Marketing Education, 30*(3), 255-264.

Andrews, J., & Higson, H. (2008). Graduate Employability, 'Soft Skills' Versus 'Hard' Business Knowledge: A European Study. *Higher Education in Europe, 33*(4), 411-422.

Astin, & Alexander, W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education, 79*(4), 4-18.

Athanassiou, N., Mc Nett, J. M., & Harvey, C. (2003, 10). Critical thinking in the management classroom:Bloom's taxonomy as a learning tool. *Journal of Management Education, 27*(5), 533-555.

BBC British Council. (2006). *Student Presentations*. Retrieved 05 25, 2018, from
https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk:https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/student-presentations

Benefits of industrial visits to students. (2017, 11 20). Retrieved 06 03, 2018, from www.wishill.com: https://www.wishill.com/benefits-industrial-visits-students

Benson, J., & Clark, F. (1983). A guide for instrument development and validation. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36*, 789-800. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5014/ajot.36.12.789

Brookfield, S. (1995). Adult Learning: An Overview. *International Encyclopedia of Education.*, 1-11.

Chakrabarthy, R. (2016, 07 13). *Only 7 percent engineering graduates employable: What's wrong with India's engineers?* Retrieved 05 22, 2018, from https://www.indiatoday.in: https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/featurephilia/story/engineering-employment-problems-329022-2016-07-13

Chatterji, S. (2017, 01 21). *Do we need our IITians to sell detergents: Pranab urges students to aim higher*. Retrieved05,24,2018,fromhttps://www.hindustantimes.com:https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/do-we-need-our-iitians-to-sell-detergents-president-mukherjee-urges-students-to-aim-higher/story-9Jd3L6WWwxE2LAMESO3HcM.html

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Workgroups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management Science, 50*(3), 352–364.

Davis, B. G. (2009). *Tools for Teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.

DeLozier, S. J., & Rhodes, M. G. (2017). Flipped Classrooms: a Review of Key Ideas and recommendations for practice. *educational psychology review*, 145.

Economist, T. (2016, 01 26). *The future of Indian business education*. Retrieved 05 22, 2018, from https://www.economist.com/:https://www.economist.com/whichmba/future-indian-business-education

Ellis, R. E. (1993). *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*. UK: Taylor& Francis.

ET online. (2017, 11 25). *India's MBA crisis: Why fresh graduates are not getting jobs*. Retrieved 05 22, 2018, from www.economictimes: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/jobs/indias-mba-crisis-why-fresh-graduates-are-not-getting-jobs/articleshow/61794456.cms

Gartmeier, M., Bauer, J., Fischer, M. R., Hoppe, s. T., Karsten, G., & Kiessling, C. (2015). Fostering professional communication skills of future physicians and teachers: Effects of e-learning with video cases and role-play. *Instructional Science*.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(1), 75-91.

Graham, A. K., Morecroft, J. D., Senge, P. M., & Sterman, J. D. (1992, 05 26). Model-Supported Case Studies for Management Education. *European Journal of Operational Research, 59*(1), 151-166.

Grey, C. (2012). What are business schools for? On silence and voice in Management Education. *Journal of Management Education*.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective* (7th ed. ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hansen, & Randall, S. (2006). Benefits and Problems With Student Teams: Suggestions for Improving Team Projects. *Journal of Education for Business*, 11-19.

Harvard Initiative for learning and teaching. (2016, 10 31). Retrieved 05 24, 2018, from https://hilt.harvard.edu: https://hilt.harvard.edu/guestspeakers

Hazari, S., North, A., & Moreland, D. (2009). Investigating Pedagogical Value of Wiki Technology. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 20*(2), 187-198.

Horgan, J. (2003). A handbook for teaching & learning in higher education. Great Britain & US: Kogan Page.

Janis, I. L., & King, B. T. (1954). The influence of role-playing on opinion change. *The Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 211-218.

Knowles, M. (1973). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*. Houston, USA: Gulf Publishing Company.

Knowles, M. (1996). *Education for Adults: Volume 1 Adult Learning and Education* (Vol. 83). (M. Tight, Ed.) Routledge.

Maddalena, L. (2015, 07). *What is Andragogy?* Retrieved 05 24, 2018, from www.mtmcoach.com: www.mtmcoach.com

Malhotra, N. K. (2010). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Meadows, K. A. (2003). So you want to do research? 5: Questionnaire design. *British Journal of Community Nursing, 8*, 562-570.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Polit, F., & Hungler, B. P. (1993). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraisal and utilization (3rd ed.)*. Pennsylvania, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.: Prentice Hall.

Poulose, J., & Sharma, V. (2018). Identifying the Perceptual Differences on the Pedagogical Mix amongst the Stakeholders in Management Education. *International Conference on Emerging Global Trends in Humanities, Science, Technology, Commerce and Management Education*, (p. 14). Rajkot.

Rismiyanto, Saleh, M., Mujiyanto, J., & Shofwan, A. (2017). Andragogy and pedagogy:learning method orientations for EFL adult learners. *Asian Journal of Educational Research, 5*(2), 32-41.

Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). *Criteria for Selection and Evaluation. In John P. Robinson, Phillip R. Shaver and Lawrence S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes (Vol. 1, pp. 1-16)*. San Diego, Calif: Academic Press.

Rock, R. d., Ferguson, R., Gaved, M., Sharples, M., Herodotou, C., Koh, E., . . . Wong, L. H. (2016). Innovating Pedagogy. *Open University Report 5*.

S, C., & M, M. (2001). Interactive Multimedia and Learning: Realizing the Benefits. *Innovations in Education and teaching*, 156-164.

Salas, E., Wildman, J. L., & Piccolo, R. F. (2009). Using Simulation-Based Training to Enhance Management Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8*(4), 559-573.

Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of Problem-based Learning: Definitions and distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 1.

Siniscalco, M. T., & Auriat, N. (2005). Questionnaire design. Quantitative research methods in educational planning. *UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris*.

Tucker, B. (2012). *The flipped classroom*. Retrieved 05 25, 2018, from educationnext.org: http://www.msuedtechsandbox.com/MAETELy2-2015/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/the_flipped_classroom_article_2.pdf

Tumwebaze, P. (2016, 10 19). *Why should every school encourage seminars?* Retrieved 05 24, 2018, from www.newtimes.co.rw: http://www.newtimes.co.rw/section/read/204576

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*, 115-131.

Zikmund, W. G. (2004). *Business Research Methods* (7th ed.). Singapore: Thomson Asia Pvt. Ltd.