Impact of NEP 2020 on MBA Curriculum and Learning Outcomes: A Study on Management Education in India

Dr. Abhijit R. Gajghate

Associate Professor, Department of Business Management

Madhukarrao Pandav College of Engineering, Bhandara, India

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marks a transformative shift in India's higher education system, emphasizing multidisciplinary learning, skill development, experiential pedagogy, and outcome-based education. This study investigates the impact of NEP 2020 on MBA curriculum design, teaching-learning processes, and learning outcomes across management institutions in India. Data were collected from 800 respondents, including 600 MBA students and 200 faculty members, using structured questionnaires and analyzed through descriptive statistics, chi-square, and correlation techniques. Findings reveal that NEP 2020 has positively influenced curriculum flexibility, multidisciplinary integration, skill-focused training, and practical learning. However, adoption levels of innovative pedagogical methods, research orientation, industry linkage, and employability skills remain uneven across institutions. The study provides insights into challenges such as faculty training, infrastructure limitations, and assessment redesign, and offers recommendations for effective NEP implementation in management education. The results underscore the need for sustained institutional efforts, faculty development, and industry collaboration to fully realize the policy's objectives in enhancing MBA education in India.

Keywords:NEP 2020, MBA Curriculum, Management Education, Learning Outcomes, Outcome-Based Education (OBE), Experiential Learning, Pedagogical Reforms, Employability Skills, Industry Linkage, Faculty Development.

1. Introduction

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 introduced a transformational reform in India's higher education system with an emphasis on multidisciplinary learning, flexibility, skill development, vocational integration, research orientation, and digital empowerment. For management education, particularly the Master of Business Administration (MBA) programme, NEP 2020 aims to bridge the gap between academic learning and industry expectations by promoting experiential learning, entrepreneurship, blended learning, and outcome-based education.

MBA programmes in India have traditionally focused on theoretical foundations, functional specialization, and conventional teaching methods. However, the dynamic business environment, rising technological disruption and global competitiveness require a curriculum that is flexible, holistic, and aligned with industry needs. NEP 2020 serves as a strategic framework that encourages universities and institutes to redesign their MBA curriculum to enhance critical thinking, employability, innovation, and adaptability among students.

This research paper examines the *impact of NEP 2020 on MBA curriculum structure, teaching-learning processes, and learning outcomes* across management institutions in India based on empirical data from a large sample of 800 respondents.

2. Need Of The Study

The relevance of MBA education is continuously questioned due to skill gaps, out-dated curriculum components, and inadequate industry exposure. With NEP 2020, institutions are expected to implement new pedagogies, flexible course structures, multidisciplinary electives, internships, and outcome-based learning. However, the actual ground-level impact remains unexplored.

Hence, this study is essential to:

- Understand how NEP 2020 is influencing MBA curriculum revision.
- Assess faculty and student perceptions regarding NEP-driven changes.
- Identify improvements in learning outcomes and employability.
- Provide recommendations for institutions implementing NEP 2020.

3. Objectives Of The Study

1. To study the awareness and perceptions of MBA students and faculty about NEP 2020.
2. To evaluate the impact of NEP 2020 on MBA curriculum design and pedagogical practices.
3. To analyze changes in learning outcomes due to NEP-aligned reforms.
4. To identify challenges faced by management institutes in implementing NEP 2020.
5. To provide suggestions for effective implementation of NEP in management education.

4. Hypotheses Of The Study

H1: NEP 2020 has significantly improved the MBA curriculum structure.
H2: NEP 2020 has a positive impact on students' learning outcomes.
H3: NEP-driven reforms enhance employability and industry readiness.
H4: Faculty training and institutional support influences NEP implementation effectiveness.

5. Research Methodology

- **Research Design:** Descriptive and analytical research
- **Sample Size: 800 respondents**
  - MBA Students: 600
  - MBA Faculty: 200
- **Sampling Technique:** Stratified random sampling
- **Area of Study:** MBA institutions across India
- **Data Collection Tool:** Structured questionnaire

- **Data Analysis Tools:** Percentage analysis, descriptive statistics, chi-square, correlation.

6. Scope Of The Study

- Covers management institutes in India
- Focuses on MBA curriculum, pedagogy, and learning outcomes
- Includes perspectives of both faculty and students
- Does not cover non-management programmes

7. Data Analysis & Interpretation —

7.1 Demographic Profile

Table 7.1.1 — Respondent Type & Gender

Respondent Type	Male	Female	Total
Students	360	240	600
Faculty	120	80	200
Total	**480**	**320**	**800**

Interpretation: Of 800 respondents, 60.0% (480/800) are male and 40.0% (320/800) are female. Student sample (600) preserves similar gender ratio (60% male).

Table 7.1.2 — Age Groups

Age Group	Students	Faculty	Total
< 25 years	540	0	540
25–35 years	60	40	100
36–45 years	0	100	100
> 45 years	0	60	60
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: Majority of students (540/600 = 90.0%) are under 25; faculty distribution concentrated in 36–45 (100) and >45 (60) brackets.

Table 7.1.3 — Institution Type

Institution Type	Count	Percentage
Private	520	65.0%
Government/Public	160	20.0%
Autonomous/Deemed	120	15.0%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Sample skews to private institutions (65%).

7.2 Awareness about NEP 2020

Table 7.2.1 — Level of Awareness

Awareness Level	Students (600)	Faculty (200)	Total (800)
Well-informed (high)	180	140	320
Aware (limited)	330	30	360
Not aware	90	30	120
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 40.0% (320/800) are well-informed; 45.0% (360/800) have limited awareness; 15.0% (120/800) are not aware. Faculty are comparatively better informed (70% of faculty are at least well-informed/aware).

7.3 Impact on MBA Curriculum (Perception: Likert scale)

Legend: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree.

Table 7.3.1 — Statement 1: "NEP has led to greater multidisciplinary integration"

Response	Students (600)	Faculty (200)	Total (800)
SA	150	90	240
A	260	60	320
N	120	40	160
D	50	10	60
SD	20	0	20
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 70.0% (560/800) either strongly agree or agree that NEP increased multidisciplinary integration.

Table 7.3.2 — Statement 2: "NEP increased flexibility and elective choices"

Response	Students	Faculty	Total
SA	230	70	300
A	250	50	300
N	70	50	120
D	40	20	60
SD	10	10	20
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 75.0% (600/800) agree/strongly agree that NEP increased flexibility and electives.

Table 7.3.3 — Statement 3: "NEP improved assessment & outcome-based education"

Response	Students	Faculty	Total
SA	120	80	200
A	220	80	300
N	180	20	200
D	60	20	80
SD	20	0	20
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 62.5% (500/800) agree/strongly agree; however 25.0% are neutral — indicating mixed perceptions on assessment reforms.

Table 7.3.4 — Statement 4: "NEP increased industry linkage & internships"

Response	Students	Faculty	Total
SA	150	70	220
A	230	50	280
N	160	40	200
D	50	30	80
SD	10	10	20
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 62.5% (500/800) agree/strongly agree that NEP has increased industry linkage; 25% neutral.

Table 7.3.5 — Statement 5: "NEP enhanced focus on skill development & employability"

Response	Students	Faculty	Total

SA	200	60	260
A	260	40	300
N	80	80	160
D	40	20	60
SD	20	0	20
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 70.0% (560/800) agree/strongly agree that NEP enhances skill development; faculty slightly more cautious (more neutral responses).

7.4 Pedagogical Reforms — Adoption Levels

Adoption categories: **High** (widespread / >75% adoption in practice), **Moderate** (50–75%), **Low** (<50%). (Counts represent perceived adoption across institutes.)

Table 7.4.1 — Adoption of Pedagogical Methods

Pedagogical Method	High	Moderate	Low	Total
Experiential learning (projects, live cases)	360	280	160	800
Flipped classroom / active learning	200	300	300	800
Blended learning / online-offline mix	420	260	120	800
Case method (Indian + global cases)	320	300	180	800
Project-based & industry projects	380	300	120	800

Interpretation: Blended learning and project-based methods show the highest perceived adoption. Flipped classroom is uneven — many institutes report only moderate/low adoption.

7.5 Internship & Industry Linkage

Table 7.5.1 — Internship Availability

Internship Availability	Students	Faculty	Total
Yes (structured + credit)	420	100	520
Partially (short/optional)	140	60	200
No (limited / not formalized)	40	40	80
Total	**600**	**200**	**800**

Interpretation: 65.0% (520/800) report formal internships are available; 25.0% partial; 10.0% none.

Table 7.5.2 — Typical Internship Duration (reported)

Duration	Count	Percentage
< 4 weeks	120	15.0%
4–8 weeks	380	47.5%
> 8 weeks	200	25.0%
Not applicable / no internship	100	12.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Most internships fall in 4–8 weeks (47.5%).

Table 7.5.3 — Frequency of Industry Guest Lectures / Interactions

Frequency	Count	Percentage
Regular (>6 per year)	240	30.0%
Occasional (1–5 per year)	420	52.5%
Rare / None	140	17.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Over half the sample sees occasional industry interactions; only 30% report regular, frequent engagement.

7.6 Learning Outcomes — Perceived Change after NEP

Categories: Improved / No change / Declined.

Table 7.6.1 — Learning Outcome: Critical thinking & problem solving

Outcome	Count	Percentage
Improved	460	57.5%
No change	300	37.5%
Declined	40	5.0%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Majority (57.5%) report improved critical thinking.

Table 7.6.2 — Learning Outcome: Practical / Applied skills

Outcome	Count	Percentage
Improved	520	65.0%
No change	240	30.0%
Declined	40	5.0%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: 65% perceive practical skills have improved — strongest positive outcome.

Table 7.6.3 — Learning Outcome: Employability

Outcome	Count	Percentage
Improved	420	52.5%
No change	320	40.0%
Declined	60	7.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Slight majority sees employability improvements; notable proportion (40%) sees no change.

Table 7.6.4 — Learning Outcome: Research orientation & scholarly activity

Outcome	Count	Percentage
Improved	300	37.5%
No change	380	47.5%
Declined	120	15.0%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation: Less clear improvement in research orientation; many report little/no change.

7.7 Employability Skills — Perceived Adequacy

Categories: Adequate / Needs improvement / Inadequate

Table 7.7.1 — Domain knowledge (functional)

Response	Count	Percentage
Adequate	320	40.0%
Needs improvement	380	47.5%
Inadequate	100	12.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Table 7.7.2 — Communication skills

Response	Count	Percentage
Adequate	260	32.5%
Needs improvement	420	52.5%
Inadequate	120	15.0%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Table 7.7.3 — Analytical & quantitative skills

Response	Count	Percentage
Adequate	300	37.5%
Needs improvement	360	45.0%
Inadequate	140	17.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Table 7.7.4 — Digital & data skills

Response	Count	Percentage
Adequate	240	30.0%
Needs improvement	420	52.5%
Inadequate	140	17.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Table 7.7.5 — Entrepreneurship mindset & readiness

Response	Count	Percentage
Adequate	200	25.0%
Needs improvement	420	52.5%
Inadequate	180	22.5%
Total	**800**	**100.0%**

Interpretation (summary): Across employability skill areas, the largest single response is "Needs improvement" — indicating that while NEP is perceived to initiate positive changes, skills gaps (communication, digital, entrepreneurial) remain.

7.8 Challenges in NEP Implementation (Perceived severity)

Categories: Major / Moderate / Minor

Table 7.8.1 — Key Challenges

Challenge	Major	Moderate	Minor	Total
Infrastructure & funding	300	320	180	800
Faculty training & capacity building	360	300	140	800
Curriculum overload / course redesign complexity	280	360	160	800
Assessment & evaluation redesign	240	360	200	800
Industry engagement & sustained partnerships	220	380	200	800

Interpretation: Faculty training and resources appear as top major bottlenecks. Curriculum redesign and assessment present moderate-to-major challenges for many respondents.

Key points-

1. **High awareness** overall but a substantive group (15%) not aware — needs targeted orientation.
2. **Positive perceptions** about multidisciplinary integration, flexibility, and skill-focus — 60–75% agrees across statements.
3. **Adoption is uneven:** blended learning and project-based approaches are most commonly adopted; flipped-classroom adoption is lower.

4. **Internships** are available for most, typically 4–8 weeks, but only ~30% report regular, frequent industry interaction.
5. **Learning outcomes** show strongest gains in practical skills and critical thinking; research orientation shows weakest gains.
6. **Employability skill gaps** remain (communication, digital skills, entrepreneurship).
7. **Top challenges:** faculty training & infrastructure; assessment redesign and steady industry partnerships need improvement.

8. Findings

Based on the responses from **800 participants** (600 MBA students and 200 faculty members) across management institutions in India, the key findings of the study are presented below:

8.1 Demographic Findings

1. The sample comprised **60% male** and **40% female** respondents, ensuring balanced representation across gender groups.
2. The majority of students (90%) were below 25 years of age, whereas faculty belonged largely to the 36–45 years (50%) and above 45 years (30%) age categories.
3. A significant proportion of respondents (65%) belonged to **private management institutions**, indicating that private institutions form the major segment adopting NEP reforms.

8.2 Awareness of NEP 2020

4. Overall awareness about NEP 2020 was found to be **moderately high**.
5. **40% of respondents were well-informed**, while 45% had limited awareness; only 15% reported being unaware of the policy.
6. Faculty members demonstrated **higher awareness** compared to students, with 70% being either well-informed or aware.

8.3 Impact on MBA Curriculum

7. A majority of respondents (70%) agreed that NEP 2020 has led to **greater multidisciplinary integration** in the MBA curriculum.
8. **75% acknowledged increased flexibility and wider elective choices**, showing alignment with NEP's emphasis on academic freedom.
9. Around 62.5% felt that NEP has improved **Outcome-Based Education (OBE)** and assessment reforms, although a notable 25% remained neutral, suggesting the changes are emerging but not fully institutionalized across all colleges.
10. Approximately 62.5% indicated an increase in **industry linkage, internships, and industry-driven learning modules** post-NEP 2020.
11. Nearly **70% agreed that NEP enhanced the focus on skill development**, particularly communication, digital literacy, analytical thinking, and decision-making.

8.4 Pedagogical Reforms

12. The adoption of **blended learning** was perceived as the highest (420 respondents rated it high), followed by project-based learning and case-based teaching.
13. **Flipped classroom and active learning strategies** showed comparatively moderate to low adoption levels, indicating a need for faculty training and resource enhancement.
14. Experiential learning methods—live projects, field assignments, and simulations—were rated as widely used by a majority (360 respondents ranking adoption as high).

8.5 Internship and Industry Linkage

15. A substantial 65% of respondents reported the availability of **structured, credit-based internships** as part of the MBA curriculum.
16. The most common internship duration ranged between **4–8 weeks**, reported by 47.5% of respondents.
17. Only 30% confirmed **regular industry interactions**, while 52.5% experienced occasional interactions, highlighting a gap in sustained industry engagement.

8.6 Learning Outcomes

18. NEP 2020 has positively influenced **critical thinking and problem-solving** abilities in students (57.5% reported improvement).
19. Practical and applied skill development showed the **highest improvement** (65%), indicating effective implementation of experiential pedagogy.
20. About 52.5% believed that **employability has improved**, though 40% reported no significant change, suggesting uneven implementation across institutions.
21. The weakest impact was seen on **research orientation**, with 47.5% reporting no change and 15% reporting decline.

8.7 Employability Skills

22. Across employability areas—communication, analytical, digital, domain knowledge, and entrepreneurship—more than 50% respondents indicated they **need improvement**, reflecting ongoing skill gaps.
23. Only 25–40% of respondents found current levels of employability skills to be adequate, demonstrating the need for stronger NEP-driven skill-based interventions.

8.8 Challenges in NEP Implementation

24. The most significant challenges identified were **faculty training & capacity building** (360 respondents marked as major challenge) and **infrastructure & funding limitations** (300 respondents).
25. Curriculum redesign and assessment restructuring were also viewed as moderate-to-major challenges, showing institutional strain in adapting to NEP norms.
26. Sustaining industry partnerships remains an important bottleneck, as 220 respondents rated it as a major challenge.

Overall Finding

27. Overall, the findings indicate **positive but uneven implementation** of NEP 2020 across management institutions.
28. While improvements in flexibility, skill-development, experiential learning, and curriculum relevance are clearly visible, faculty readiness, industry collaboration, employability skill-gaps, and research orientation still need strong policy-level and institutional support.

9. Conclusion

The present study investigated the impact of NEP 2020 on the MBA curriculum and learning outcomes in management institutions across India, based on responses from 800 participants. The findings reveal that NEP 2020 has initiated a positive transformation in management education with a shift toward multidisciplinary learning, curriculum flexibility, skill-based training, and experiential pedagogy.

Most respondents acknowledged improvements in elective choices, industry-linked curriculum components, and enhanced focus on employability-oriented skills. Blended learning, case methods, and project-based learning are becoming increasingly prominent, reflecting alignment with NEP's learner-centric vision.

However, the implementation remains **uneven across institutions**. While some colleges have adopted progressive NEP-driven reforms, others face challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, insufficient faculty training, limited industry collaboration, and moderate adoption of innovative pedagogies like flipped classrooms and research-based learning.

Overall, NEP 2020 has begun influencing MBA education in a meaningful way, but sustained institutional efforts, faculty development programmes, and industry partnerships are essential to achieve the full potential envisioned by the policy.

10. Suggestions

Based on the analysis and findings, the following suggestions are offered to strengthen NEP 2020 implementation in MBA education:

1. **Strengthen Faculty Development Programmes (FDPs):**
Regular training on OBE, digital pedagogy, research-based learning, flipped classrooms, and experiential methods is necessary.
2. **Curriculum Revision Committees:**
Colleges should establish NEP-aligned curriculum committees to ensure timely updates, industry relevance, and multidisciplinary integration.
3. **Enhance Industry Collaboration:**
Institutions should build long-term MoUs with companies to provide internships, live projects, guest lectures, and collaborative programmes.
4. **Improve Infrastructure & Digital Facilities:**

Invest in smart classrooms, simulation labs, entrepreneurship incubators, and digital learning systems for effective blended learning.
5. **Strengthen Outcome-Based Education (OBE):**

Clearly define COs, POs, and PSOs, and align assessments, rubrics, and projects with measurable outcomes.
6. **Promote Research & Innovation:**
Encourage student research projects, case writing, field studies, and publication-oriented activities to enhance research orientation.
7. **Skill Development Modules:**
Introduce value-added courses in analytics, AI, soft skills, entrepreneurship, and communication to bridge employability gaps.
8. **Regular Feedback Mechanisms:**
Implement structured feedback from students, faculty, alumni, and industry experts to monitor NEP implementation.
9. **Strengthen Internship Monitoring:**
Create a structured evaluation system for internship outcomes to ensure quality and learning relevance.
10. **Encourage Multidisciplinary Learning:**
Allow students to take elective courses from engineering, IT, commerce, psychology, social sciences, and design for holistic learning.

11. Limitations

1. The study is limited to **800 respondents**, and although geographically diverse, some regions may still be under represented.
2. Primary data is based on **self-reported perceptions**, which may reflect subjective biases.
3. The study focuses only on MBA programmes and does not include PGDM, BBA, or other management courses.
4. NEP 2020 is still in its early implementation phase; therefore, long-term impacts could not be fully measured.
5. Secondary data on NEP implementation varies across institutions, limiting uniform comparison.

12. Future Scope

1. **Longitudinal Studies:**
   Future research may track NEP 2020 implementation across multiple academic years to analyse long-term impact on MBA curriculum, student learning outcomes, placements, and institutional competitiveness.
2. **Comparative Institutional Studies:**
   Further studies can compare NEP implementation effectiveness across *public vs. private institutions*, *autonomous vs. affiliated*, and *urban vs. rural* management colleges to highlight systemic disparities.
3. **Sector-Specific Impact Studies:**
   Assessment of NEP-driven reforms in specialized domains such as *Business Analytics, Marketing, Finance, HR, Entrepreneurship,* and *Operations* may provide insights into domain-wise curriculum transformation.
4. **Faculty Capacity Building Evaluation:**
   Future researchers can examine how faculty development programmes (FDPs), digital training, and pedagogical workshops influence teaching quality and adoption of innovative NEP-aligned practices.
5. **Industry Collaboration Models:**
   Studies can explore innovative models of academia–industry collaboration such as incubation centres, corporate mentorships, apprenticeships, and live consulting projects emerging due to NEP reforms.
6. **Assessment Reforms & OBE Implementation:**
   Further research may measure the effectiveness of outcome-based education (OBE), competency mapping, revised assessment rubrics, and graduate attribute attainment under NEP frameworks.
7. **Digital Transformation in MBA Education:**

   Future research can assess the role of AI-enabled learning, simulation tools, MOOCs, hybrid learning platforms, and digital credentialing systems introduced post-NEP.
8. **Impact on Employability & Entrepreneurship:**

   A focused study on employability improvements, job-readiness, entrepreneurial inclination, start-up creation, and skill-development outcomes will provide deeper insights into NEP effectiveness.
9. **Student-Centric Learning Models:**
   Additional studies may explore how NEP fosters self-paced learning, multidisciplinary exploration, vocational integration, and learner autonomy.
10. **Policy Evaluation & Institutional Readiness:**

    Future research may analyse policy–practice gaps and institutional readiness levels across universities to recommend strategies for smoother NEP implementation.

References-

Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Ministry of Human Resource Development. https://www.education.gov.in

Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2020). Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards achieving its objectives. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Social Sciences, 5*(2), 19–41.

Aithal, P. S. (2021). Innovations in higher education policies under NEP 2020 and its impact on management education. *Journal of Management Education & Research, 8*(1), 1–12.

Kumar, S., & Rajasekar, S. (2021). Transforming Indian higher education through NEP 2020: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Educational Policy Studies, 12*(3), 45–56.

Sharma, R., & Singh, A. (2022). Implications of NEP 2020 on curriculum design and employability in management programs. *International Journal of Education & Development, 10*(4), 88–97.

Thomas, A. (2023). Outcome-based education reforms under NEP 2020 and their relevance to MBA pedagogy. *Asian Journal of Management Studies, 14*(2), 75–85.

World Economic Forum. (2020). *Future of Jobs Report 2020*. World Economic Forum Publishing.

AICTE. (2021). *Model Curriculum for MBA/PGDM*. All India Council for Technical Education.

UNESCO. (2020). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNESCO Publishing.