

Determinants of Faculty Orientation toward Research-Oriented Teaching: Evidence from Indian Management Institutions

Dr. Pranay Karnik^{1*}, Dr. Deepti Bajpai², Dr. Jaya Jaisinghani¹, Dr. Deepak Jaroliya²

¹ Assistant Professor, PIMR Indore, India.

² Professor, PIMR Indore, India.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Pranay Karnik^{1*}

Abstract: The introduction of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India has garnered renewed interest and has led to discourses that suggest integration of research into teaching in higher education. However, the extent to which faculty orientation towards research-oriented teaching in everyday classroom practice continues to remain largely unexplored. The present study attempts to examine the orientation of management faculty towards research-oriented teaching and analyses how demographic and professional variables influence this orientation. Data was collected from 258 faculty members teaching in Indian management institutions using a structured questionnaire consisting of 25 Likert-scale items. The overall reliability of the scale was found to be satisfactory (Cronbach's alpha = 0.80).

Inferential statistical techniques, including independent sample t-tests and one-way ANOVA, were utilized to evaluate differences in orientation scores across gender, domain area, teaching experience, highest qualification, research publications, and industry experience. The results disclose significant differences based on gender, domain area, teaching experience, and highest qualification, while no significant differences were observed for research publications and industry experience. Female faculty members, early-career teachers, and faculty from HR and Marketing domains displayed comparatively higher orientation toward research-oriented teaching.

The findings from the study evidently state that the emerging role of pedagogical inclination and institutional environment on research-oriented teaching rather than by traditional indicators of academic or professional achievement. The study accentuates the need for institutions to concentrate on faculty development, pedagogical support, and policy alignment to effectively transform the vision of NEP 2020 into classroom practice.

Keywords: Research-oriented teaching, faculty orientation, higher education, management education, National Education Policy 2020, Structural Equation Modelling.

INTRODUCTION

The discipline of Management had always required the integration of research into teaching. Earlier this integration was primarily out of a practical necessity, rather than an academic one. The need to develop future professional in classrooms, requires aligning them to real world organizational scenarios and not just the established theories in classrooms. The students also need to cultivate critical thinking and evidence-based reasoning in this respect. Research-oriented teaching provides such a platform. It inspires students to engage with real life business problems, data, and ideas by integrating it with real research contexts (Healey & Jenkins, 2009). Management faculty have often believed in this shift. However, lack of statutory guidelines across institutions makes faculty orientation toward research-based pedagogy difficult to execute...

Existing research indicates that research-informed pedagogy boosts student engagement, conceptual understanding, and long-term learning outcomes (Kuh, 2008; Freeman et al., 2014). However, the mere presence of research activity and orientation within an institution does not automatically translate into research-oriented classroom practices. Prince et al. (2007) claim that the real educational value of research-based teaching remains largely untapped unless it is intentionally embedded within curriculum design and teaching strategies. Similarly, Brew and Boud (1995) highlight the role of institutional priorities, reward structures, and faculty perceptions in determining the success of research as a meaningful component of teaching.

The orientation of faculty towards research-oriented teaching therefore, transpires as a critical factor. The perception of teacher towards teaching as a scholarly and reflective activity is crucial for them to incorporate inquiry-based and research-driven methods in their classrooms (Åkerlind, 2008). Consequently, faculty often operate within an ecosystem that is marred by significant constraints such as intense teaching loads, insufficient time for pedagogical innovation, feeble institutional support, and inadequate training in research-based teaching practices (Major & Palmer, 2006; Prince et al., 2007). Subsequently, the adoption of research-oriented pedagogy tends to vary widely across institutions, disciplines, and individual educators.

The implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 makes this issue particularly prominent in the Indian higher education context as the policy rests on a strong emphasis on research, innovation, multidisciplinary learning, and experiential education. Higher education institutions are envisioned as centres of inquiry and creativity through initiatives such as the establishment of the National Research Foundation, Research and Innovation Cells, and the integration of research components into undergraduate and professional programs (Government of India, 2020; British Council, 2020). The NEP thus marks a tectonic shift from content-heavy, examination-oriented instructions to inquiry-driven and application-oriented learning environments.

While the policy and its direction are clear, its successful implementation depends largely on faculty readiness and institutional capacity. Recent studies indicate that although faculty members broadly back the vision of research-integrated education, faculty concerns regarding workload, infrastructure, training opportunities, and institutional preparedness are evident (Ali & Abbas, 2024; Sanmathi & Shekhar, 2024). As Management education necessitates industry relevance and employability-focused learning outcomes, Research-oriented teaching can be the bridge to address these expectations by linking classroom learning with real-world problem solving, industry data, and applied research projects.

Despite the acknowledged pedagogical value of inquiry-based learning and the need to integrate it under NEP 2020, empirical studies examining faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching in Indian management institutions remain narrow. The focus of prevailing research on student outcomes or consideration of policy reforms at a conceptual level leave a gap in comprehending how faculty perceive, adopt, and operationalize research-oriented pedagogy in practice. This gap is examined by this study by addressing faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching and identifying the institutional, pedagogical, and personal factors that influence it. With data collected from 258 management faculty members across different functional areas, the study utilizes descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to explore how variables such as institutional support, faculty alignment, student engagement, and teaching practices shape research-oriented pedagogy. This study by situating its findings within the broader framework of NEP 2020, aims to contribute in the fields of policy implementation, institutional development strategies, and faculty professional development initiatives in Indian higher education.

Literature Review (Human Academic edition)

The intertwined nature of research and teaching landscape has long been considered a topic of discussion in higher education. Most scholars accede that meaningful learning occurs when research becomes an essential part of classroom practice instead of both research and teaching when they are perceived as separate academic pursuits. One of the most influential frameworks in this area was devised by Healey and Jenkins (2009) by identifying four ways in which research can be embedded into teaching: research-led, research-tutored, research-oriented, and research-based learning. The model aids in clarifying that the scope of research-oriented teaching is not limited to exposing students to research findings but providing them an avenue that involves engaging them in inquiry, problem formulation, and analytical reasoning. This marks a shift in the perspective role of students from consumers of information to active participants in knowledge creation.

Determinants of Faculty Orientation toward Research-Oriented Teaching: Evidence from Indian Management Institutions

In order to secure enhanced levels of student engagement, persistence, and academic achievement at undergraduate level are pinned to inquiry-based learning practices as per the study of Kuh (2008). According to Freeman et al. (2014) significant improvement in student performance in applied and professional disciplines can be achieved through research-based learning methods. Therefore, research-oriented teaching can be proven to augment both cognitive and professional competencies, rendering it especially apt for management education.

Prince et al. (2007) state that research excellence may not translate into effective teaching unless faculty intentionally integrate research processes into pedagogy, therefore, assuming a direct link between faculty research and productivity may not be viable. Åkerlind (2008) underscores the decisive role of faculty belief about teaching as he believes that educators who conceptualize teaching as an intellectual and scholarly activity are more likely to experiment with inquiry-based methods, whereas faculty that view teaching principally as content delivery tend to incline towards traditional approaches. Therefore, *faculty alignment* is a key construct that in the present study.

Institutional support transpires as one of the most cited enablers of research-oriented teaching as stressed by Brew and Boud (1995) universities need to instate systems where teaching innovation is valued alongside research output. Teaching pedagogy that integrates research is perceived as unsustainable by faculty unless it is backed by supportive reward structures, professional development opportunities, and realistic workload policies. Austin (2011) and Neumann (1994) have identified institutional culture and governance frameworks as strong influencers that lead to teaching–research interconnection in practice. All these studies lend strong justification for treating *institutional support* as a central explanatory variable.

Another vital component is student engagement according to Healey and Jenkins (2009) is that research-oriented teaching flourishes on the willingness of students to participate in inquiry-based tasks and also on curiosity of students toward problem-solving activities. Active involvement in research projects along with experiential learning improves the motivation and learning outcomes of students as opined by Kuh (2008). This reciprocal relationship proposes that there is a good likelihood of faculty to undertake research-oriented practices when students' response is positive thereby, endorsing the inclusion of *student engagement* in this study.

In professional education, particularly management education, there is additional purpose that research-oriented teaching serves: it aids in transferring academic learning to industry and organizational practice. This is further confirmed by the findings of Freeman et al. (2014) and Vescio et al. (2008) that in order to enhance the analytical and decision-making abilities of students an inquiry-driven and collaborative learning approach seems to be the most effective. Literature in management education likewise further accentuates the role of live projects, case analysis, data-based problem solving, and industry-linked research assignments in supporting students to develop job-ready competencies. Variables like domain knowledge, industry exposure, and teaching experience are important for understanding faculty orientation towards research-based pedagogy.

The launch of The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marks a historic shift in educational philosophy by positioning research, innovation, and multidisciplinary learning at the centre of higher education reform (Government of India, 2020). Structural changes like the establishment of the National Research Foundation, the formation of Research and Innovation Cells, and the integration of research components into undergraduate and professional programs further adds an important policy dimension to this discussion. The British Council (2020) highlights how NEP 2020 posits research as the bedrock for teaching excellence and global competitiveness. This policy framework necessitates exploring not just how faculty perceive but also adopt research-oriented teaching practices.

Conversely, primary studies and policy commentaries express numerous practical challenges that the implementation of NEP 2020 faces. Ali and Abbas (2024) explain that while research-oriented teaching improves student engagement and performance, faculty require institutional backing and training to adopt such methods effectively. Sanmathi and Shekhar (2024) exemplify the support NEP reforms receive from Indian faculty, but remain apprehensive with regard to workload, infrastructure, and professional development opportunities. (India Today, 2023; The Rise, 2024) further highlight lack of readiness across institutions and the need for sustained capacity building. These findings imply that mere policy intent is not sufficient without equivalent investment in faculty preparedness and institutional systems.

There are several structural and personal barriers to research-oriented teaching that have been identified by literature just like the study of Major and Palmer (2006) that expresses the constant struggle of faculty to maintain balance between teaching responsibilities with research and pedagogical innovation. Brew and Boud (1995)

identify that institutional reward systems that prioritize publication output in turn discourage experimentation in teaching. Prince et al. (2007) signal at that lack of time, resources, and pedagogical training end up restricting faculty adoption of inquiry-based methods. (Sanmathi & Shekhar, 2024) indicate that these challenges are augmented in the Indian context by infrastructural inconsistencies and limited access to research funding and training opportunities.

Madsen et al. (2015) reveal that for faculty to adopt of research-based assessment practices, peer interaction and collaborative reflection need to be encouraged. Gerken, Beausaert, and Segers (2016) demonstrate that social and informal learning activities tend to enhance faculty employability and pedagogical competence. These findings and studies underline the importance of sustained and continuous professional development and informal learning for faculty helps in fostering research-oriented teaching cultures.

Overall, literature recommends that research-oriented teaching is a systemic practice moulded by faculty beliefs, institutional support structures, student responsiveness, and policy frameworks and is not solely a pedagogical technique. In the Indian context especially under the aegis of NEP 2020, education stands at a threshold of an unique opportunity to operationalize these ideas at national scale. However, there remains a dearth of empirical research that directly examines faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching in Indian management education. The present study therefore, seeks to address this gap by exploring how institutional support, faculty alignment, student engagement, and teaching practices collectively shape faculty orientation toward research-based pedagogy.

Methodology

In the present study, a quantitative, cross-sectional research design was adopted to examine faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching in Indian management education. The objective was to understand how demographic and professional characteristics, along with institutional and pedagogical factors, shape faculty inclination toward integrating research into teaching practices. During the data collection phase, several faculty members informally shared that integrating research into regular classroom teaching was challenging due to time constraints and curriculum rigidity. Although these reflections were not formally recorded, they reinforced the need for a structured assessment of research-oriented teaching orientation.

Sample and Data Collection

The target population of the study comprised faculty members teaching in management institutions across India. A purposive convenience sampling technique was employed, as the study specifically required respondents who were actively engaged in teaching management subjects and were familiar with academic and pedagogical practices in higher education. This approach allowed access to a relevant and information-rich sample while ensuring feasibility within the given time frame.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire administered through Google Forms between July 2024 and December 2024. The online mode facilitated wider geographical reach and enabled participation from faculty members belonging to different functional domains such as Marketing, Human Resources, Finance, and Operations/IT. A total of 258 complete and usable responses were obtained and included in the final analysis, which was considered adequate for the statistical techniques employed in the study.

Instrument Design

The data collection instrument consisted of 25 statements measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from:

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

The statements were designed to capture multiple dimensions of research-oriented teaching, including:

Institutional Support

Determinants of Faculty Orientation toward Research-Oriented Teaching: Evidence from Indian Management Institutions

Faculty Alignment toward research-oriented pedagogy

Student Engagement

Teaching Practices related to inquiry and research integration

Care was taken to frame the statements in a neutral and indirect manner so that respondents could express their perceptions without feeling personally evaluated or judged. This helped in reducing social desirability bias and encouraged more honest responses.

Reliability of the Scale

The internal consistency of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The overall reliability coefficient was found to be **0.80**, which exceeds the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.70 suggested in social science research. This indicates that the scale demonstrates satisfactory internal consistency and is reliable for measuring faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was carried out using SPSS. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were applied to address the research objectives.

First, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were computed to understand the overall orientation of faculty members toward research-oriented teaching.

Second, inferential statistical tests were employed to examine whether significant differences existed in faculty orientation based on demographic and professional variables:

Independent sample t-test was used for:

Gender

Highest Qualification (Master's degree vs. Ph.D.)

One-way ANOVA was used for:

Domain Area (Marketing, HR, Finance, IT/Operations)

Teaching Experience

Research Publications

Industry Experience

These tests were selected because they are appropriate for comparing mean differences across two or more independent groups and are widely used in educational and behavioral research.

A level of significance of 0.05 was adopted for all statistical tests. Wherever statistically significant differences were observed, the results were interpreted in the context of Indian management education and existing literature.

Ethical Considerations

Participation in the study was completely voluntary. Respondents were informed about the academic nature of the research and assured that their responses would be used only for scholarly purposes. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the data collection and analysis process, and no personal identifiers were recorded.

3. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study is based on four key dimensions, guided by the work of Healey & Jenkins (2009) and Prince et al. (2007):

Teaching Practices: Integration of research into teaching materials and classroom activities, aligning with Healey and Jenkins' research-led and research-based approaches.

Institutional Support: Resources, policies, and incentives provided by institutions to facilitate research-oriented teaching (Prince et al., 2007).

Student Engagement: Student responsiveness and participation in research-driven learning, as emphasized by Healey and Jenkins' research-tutored model.

Faculty Alignment: Alignment between personal teaching philosophy and research-oriented practices, ensuring the realization of potential synergies (Prince et al., 2007).

4. Research Objective

This study aims to:

Assess faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching in management education.

Explore how demographic and professional factors influence faculty orientation.

Identify challenges and enablers for the adoption of research-oriented teaching.

5. Research Methodology

Research Design: Descriptive cross-sectional study.

Data Collection Tool: Structured questionnaire with 25 Likert-scale items across four dimensions.

Sampling: 258 faculty members from management disciplines using convenient sampling.

Reliability: Cronbach's Alpha = 0.818, indicating high internal consistency.

Analysis: Descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, and one-way ANOVA, Structural Equation Modelling.

Discussion

The present study and its results denote personal teaching philosophy, institutional environment, and student responsiveness as indispensable variables through which faculty approach inquiry-based pedagogy and orientation toward research-oriented teaching instead of conventional academic markers such as publication output or industry experience as earlier assumed. Therefore, research-oriented teaching is more about pedagogical intent and contextual support less about academic status. In the context of Indian management education, where faculty function under disparate institutional conditions, this distinction becomes particularly poignant and meaningful.

With female faculty members in the present study reporting higher composite orientation scores compared to their male counterparts, the significant difference observed on the basis of gender suggests that gender-related perspectives and teaching approaches may influence the adoption of research-oriented practices. This finding is intriguing as it aligns with earlier educational research that advocates female educators tend to demonstrate stronger engagement with reflective and student-centred pedagogical approaches. Female faculty in the Indian context display greater openness toward innovative teaching practices and collaborative learning models. Interpreting this difference in competence can be viewed as a difference in pedagogical orientation and responsiveness to inquiry-based methods.

Another result indicates that the nature of the subject also plays an important role in determining the feasibility and acceptance of research-oriented teaching. Disciplines like Marketing and HR, with their reliance on case studies, behavioural analysis, and real-world problem solving, naturally gravitate to inquiry-driven pedagogy. On the contrary, domains such as Finance and Operations often perceived as more technical and structured encounter challenges in integrating research-based classroom activities. This observation is supported by Neumann's (1994) argument that nature of academic and disciplinary cultures influences how the teaching–research nexus is enacted in practice through the teaching and learning that students experience. The domain area also emerged as a significant factor influencing faculty orientation.

Teaching experience has proven to show statistically significant impact on orientation scores, advocating that professional maturity shapes pedagogical receptiveness. In addition to this, faculty in early stages of their careers demonstrated higher orientation toward research-oriented teaching as compared to their more experienced counterparts. This can be ascribed to contemporary exposure to latest pedagogical training, doctoral coursework, and institutional expectations that value innovation and research integration. Young faculty members are more tech-savvy and likely to be more comfortable with digital tools, data-driven teaching methods, and interdisciplinary approaches, thereby, undertaking inquiry-based learning. However, with the progress of their

Determinants of Faculty Orientation toward Research-Oriented Teaching: Evidence from Indian Management Institutions

careers, administrative responsibilities and workload pressures constrain them from experimentation with new pedagogical strategies. Research-oriented teaching showed significant influence with respect to highest qualification, with non-Ph.D. faculty leaning more towards inquiry-based pedagogy. This can be rationalised by the argument that Ph.D. holders to prioritize research output more rather than pedagogical experimentation. On the contrary, faculty with master's degrees frequently focus more intensively on teaching responsibilities and classroom innovation. This finding Prince et al.'s (2007) reinforce this argument by stating that being research-active does not necessarily transition into research-integrated teaching.

Conversely, a particularly notable finding states that research publications do not show a significant relationship with faculty orientation, challenging the conventional assumption that greater research productivity inherently culminates into research-oriented teaching. This absence of a significant difference implies that publication activity and pedagogical practice may function parallelly rather than reinforcing each other. Therefore, it is evident that there is need to connect research with teaching through institutional incentives and professional development.

Industry experience, on the other hand was not found to have considerable influence on faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching, although often contemplated to be valuable in management education, industry exposure does not automatically lead to the adoption of inquiry-driven pedagogical approaches. Industry experience may contribute in enhancing practical examples and case-based discussions, but research-oriented teaching demands methodical alignment with inquiry processes, data analysis, and reflective learning, thereby, highlighting professional experience and pedagogical orientation as conceptually different constructs.

The findings largely suggest that pedagogical alignment, institutional support, and faculty motivation influence research-oriented teaching more than established indicators like professional success like publication count or industry exposure. Brew and Boud's (1995) study offers support to this argument that teaching innovation is contingent to institutional culture and reward structures rather than individual research achievements alone.

The results further bolster the impact of NEP 2020 in the Indian context by providing a compelling vision for the integration of research into teaching, its success, however, hinges on how faculty interpret and operationalize this vision. The variation observed across gender, domain area, teaching experience, and qualification is indicative that a uniform implementation strategy may not be effective. Instead, institutions may need to focus on creating differentiated faculty development programs with regard to disciplinary contexts, career stages, and pedagogical readiness.

To sum up, this study establishes faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching to be a multidimensional construct moulded by demographic characteristics, professional positioning, and institutional environments. The findings underline the importance of transcending from policy-level declarations to more pragmatic, context-sensitive strategies that empower faculty to root research meaningfully into teaching.

Key Findings

Impact of Gender: Significant difference ($p = 0.000$); female faculty showed higher orientation.

Domain Area: HR and Marketing faculty had significantly higher orientation than IT/Operations and Finance ($p = 0.000$).

Teaching Experience: Early-career faculty (1-5 years) showed higher orientation compared to senior faculty ($p = 0.000$).

Highest Qualification: Master's degree holders had higher orientation than Ph.D. holders ($p = 0.000$).

Non-Significant Factors: Research publications and industry experience did not significantly impact orientation.

This study beyond its empirical findings, contributing to the broader literature on the teaching–research nexus by moving the narrative from institutional policy to faculty-level orientation. While prior research may have converged on student outcomes or institutional reform frameworks, significant attention needs to be paid to how faculty interprets and enacts research-oriented teaching in everyday classroom settings. As a measurable construct, faculty orientation and examining its variation across demographic and professional characteristics, adds an empirical dimension to discussions. Research productivity does not significantly predict teaching orientation as a finding of the present study, furthermore, opposes the prevailing postulations within higher education that equate research excellence with pedagogical innovation. As a result, the study broadens existing literature by

differentiating between research output and research-integrated teaching as related but independent constructs.

Conclusion

The findings of this study in hindsight, indicate that it is everyday teaching realities rather than formal academic achievements that mould faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching. Data is suggestive with regard to student's response to inquiry-based learning as the principal driving force as to how faculty perceive their role as educators, the extent to which their institutions encourage experimentation in teaching, and how. As a consequence, research-oriented teaching emerges as less of a fixed skill and more as a developing practice that thrives within supportive academic environments. In the context of Indian management institutions, where teaching responsibilities are often diverse and draining, this aids in shifting attention from credentials and output measures to pedagogical mindset and institutional culture.

With *Faculty Alignment* and *Institutional Support* playing pivotal roles in the study, research-oriented teaching becomes a logical progression of classroom practice reflected in faculty members personally valuing inquiry, reflection, and research-driven learning. Institutions support to these values through training opportunities, academic freedom, and recognition systems also brings about substantial benefits. This finding corroborates with Healey and Jenkins (2009), who claim that the amalgamation of research and teaching requires deliberate pedagogical intent. Brew and Boud's (1995) further reinforce the view that institutional culture and academic identity are bedrock of sustainable innovative teaching practices.

With demographic patterns in the study like early-career faculty, female educators, and those teaching in HR and Marketing domains demonstrating higher orientation scores, receptivity to research-oriented pedagogy is linked closely to disciplinary culture, recent pedagogical exposure along with teaching style preferences. Åkerlind's (2008) observation states when faculty regard teaching as an intellectually engaging and stimulating activity, they are more inclined towards adoption of research-informed approaches.

The assumption however, that research productivity naturally translates into research-oriented teaching is challenged by the absence of a significant relationship between research publication count and teaching orientation. Instead Prince et al.'s (2007) argument advocates that unless research activity is consciously connected to pedagogy, the two often operate in mutually exclusive domains. This prompts institutions to rethink how they can conceptualize the link between research excellence and teaching quality.

In the context of India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 research, innovation, and experiential learning across higher education is gaining greater prominence. While the policy envisions transformative pedagogy, the present study reveals that successful implementation depends largely on faculty interpretation and action in classrooms. Faculty orientation therefore, serves as a critical conduit between policy intent and educational practice.

The study also underlines the role of institution thinking in promoting research-oriented teaching. Instead of focusing on narrow output-based indicators such as publications or credentials, institutions need to invest in building supportive ecosystems that embolden pedagogical experimentation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and student-centred inquiry. As the findings suggest, research-oriented teaching is ultimately an amalgamation of systemic harmony, contextual awareness and progressive pedagogy rather than isolated individual effort.

In conclusion, this research contributes to both theory and practice by expounding that faculty motivation, institutional culture and pedagogical commitment are the bedrock of research-oriented teaching. Empirical evidence in the study stipulates a need to strengthen faculty orientation toward inquiry-based teaching for the realization of the broader goals of contemporary higher education reforms, particularly those envisioned under NEP 2020.

Limitations and Future Research

As is the case with all empirical investigations, this study also has certain limitations. First, the use of purposive convenience sampling technique confines the generalizability of the findings to Indian management institutions. Although the sample size of 258 faculty members provides sufficient statistical data for analysis, it may be incapable of portraying variations across different types of higher education institutions, such as public universities, private universities, or autonomous colleges. Second, the cross-sectional design bounds the researches to examine how faculty orientation toward research-oriented teaching evolves over time, particularly

in after the advent of NEP 2020. Longitudinal studies could help to get insights into how institutional changes gradually shape pedagogical practices. Third, the study relies on self-reported perceptions, which may have an underlying social desirability bias.

In the future research could be complementary by evaluating the underplay of survey data with classroom observations, teaching portfolios, or student feedback to obtain a more holistic understanding of research-oriented teaching behaviours and practices. Disciplines beyond management education could be included to conduct comparative studies to help determine whether the patterns observed in this study are germane to management education or whether they reflect broader trends in higher education.

10. Implications of Research

1. For Institutions

Educational institutions are at the centre of influencing and shaping teaching culture and pedagogical progressions. To foster research-integrated teaching, institutional policies need to move beyond rhetorical backing and translate into visible action. This can be achieved through provisioning of dedicated time for faculty to engage in research infused curriculum design. Access to research databases and pedagogical material, financial or administrative support for innovative teaching projects, recognition of research-oriented teaching in performance appraisal systems can aid faculty to invest in inquiry-driven pedagogy. Institutional values at encourage experimentation and reflection can turn research-oriented teaching into a sustainable practice rather than an isolated initiative.

2. For Faculty

Pedagogical transformation is propelled by faculty members and therefore, continuous professional development would boost their confidence and competence in adopting research-oriented teaching methods. Workshop participation, faculty development programs, interdisciplinary research groups, and teaching innovation forums can help faculty stay aware and aligned with emerging pedagogical trends. Faculty perception of harmony between their personal teaching philosophy and research-driven pedagogy will solidify the use and reach of such approaches consistently and meaningfully. Encouragement of utilizing reflective teaching practices and peer collaboration can further deepen this alignment.

3. For Students

From the student perspective there are substantial academic and professional benefits as inquiry-based learning enhances critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and independent problem-solving abilities. Activities such as live projects, case analysis, data interpretation, and guided research tasks prepare students to deal with real-world business challenges more knowledgeably. These learning experiences also cultivate a sense of adaptability and intellectual curiosity, qualities that are quintessential requirements in the dynamic professional space. Embedding research into everyday teaching, institutions can empower students to be reflective, innovative, and workplace-ready..

References

- Åkerlind, G. S. (2008). Growing and developing as a university teacher: Variation in meaning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802211810>
- Ali, S., & Abbas, S. (2024). Research-oriented teaching and academic performance: Faculty perspectives. *European Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 25–40.
- Austin, A. E. (2011). *Promoting evidence-based change in undergraduate science education*. National Academies Press.
- Brew, A., & Boud, D. (1995). Teaching and research: Establishing the vital link with learning. *Higher Education*, 29(3), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384493>
- British Council. (2020). *India's New Education Policy 2020: Highlights and opportunities*. <https://opportunities-insight.britishcouncil.org/features/indias-new-education-policy-2020-highlights-and-opportunities>
- Chegg India. (2023). *New Education Policy 2020: A complete overview*.

<https://www.cheggindia.com/general-knowledge/new-education-policy-2020/>

Curriculum Magazine. (2024). Higher education better off under NEP 2020.

<https://curriculum-magazine.com/higher-education-better-off-under-nep-2020/>

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in STEM. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410–8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>

Gerken, M., Beusaert, S., & Segers, M. (2016). Working on professional development of faculty staff in higher education: Investigating the relationship between social informal learning activities and employability. *Human Resource Development International*, 19(2), 135–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1116241>

Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Human Resource Development.

https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

Healey, M., & Jenkins, A. (2009). Developing undergraduate research and inquiry. Higher Education Academy.

India Today. (2023, September 22). Empowering minds: New Education Policy's vision for research and innovation.

<https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/featureophilia/story/empowering-minds-new-education-policys-vision-for-research-and-innovation-2438945-2023-09-22>

International Journal of Academic & Business Studies (IJABS). (2024). Navigating challenges in implementing India's NEP 2020 in higher education. *International Journal of Academic & Business Studies*.

<https://ijabs.niilmuniversity.ac.in/>

Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Madsen, A. M., McKagan, S. B., Martinuk, M., Bell, A., & Sayre, E. C. (2015). Research-based assessment affordances and constraints: Perceptions of physics faculty. *arXiv preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.03440>

Major, C. H., & Palmer, B. (2006). Reshaping teaching and learning: The role of institutional factors. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(4), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-006-9007-9>

Neumann, R. (1994). The teaching–research nexus: Applying a framework to university students' learning. *Higher Education*, 27(3), 247–264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384795>

Prince, M. J., Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2007). Does faculty research improve undergraduate teaching? *Journal of Engineering Education*, 96(4), 283–294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2007.tb00939.x>

Sanmathi, M. S., & Shekhar, B. (2024). Perspectives of teaching faculty towards the implementation of NEP 2020 in Karnataka: An opinion survey. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(9), 853–860. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuvey.v30i9.9681>

The Rise. (2024). Policy vs. practice: NEP 2020's unimpressive rollout.

<https://therise.co.in/19651/policy-practice-nep-2020-unimpressive/>

Times of India. (2025, June 27). NEP aims to transform Indian education amid low university enrolment. *The Times of India*.

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com>

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004>

Zouein, C., Nehme, M., & Matar, S. (2023). Students' perception of faculty research integration into teaching: Evidence from Lebanon. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 122, 101911. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101911..>