

# Study on the Significance of Research in Organisations as an Emerging Trend

Mrs. Jennifer D'Cruz.<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Satyanarayan Nomula<sup>2</sup>, Ms. Riya Sena<sup>3</sup>, Ms. Ankita Kanojia<sup>4</sup>

I/C Principal, Lilavati Lalji Dayal Night College of Commerce, Charni Road, Mumbai<sup>1</sup>

Bachelor's in Commerce Telangana, Hyderabad<sup>2</sup>

SYBMS, Lilavati Lalji Dayal Night College of Commerce, Charni Road, Mumbai<sup>3</sup>

FYBMS, Lilavati Lalji Dayal Night College of Commerce, Charni Road, Mumbai<sup>4</sup>

**Abstract:** *Is it truly accurate to assert that there has been minimal change in over two decades? In the present moment, it is noteworthy that management schools have recently obtained the findings of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework. Consequently, they have transitioned from a condition of anticipation, as described by Oliver, wherein management schools were awaiting the outcomes of the 1996 Research Assessment Exercise. There are still numerous exceptional management instructors who do not actively participate in research to a major degree. Additionally, new organisations generally engage in research activities that are more focused on practical application and teaching, and are still perceived as less valued. The debates around the workload pressures faced by management academics, the role of students as customers, and the vocational nature of management are so well-known to me that it is difficult to fathom that they were written almost two decades ago - a year before to the commencement of my management degree. The ongoing arguments have undergone a transformation, resulting in a more intricate and nuanced view of management education, research, and teaching. Furthermore, it may be argued that there have been significant transformations in both the Higher Education scene and the management services industry. The objective of this chapter is to question Oliver's assumptions regarding research and teaching. Unlike Oliver, I do not consider teaching and research to be entirely separate and conflicting activities. I do not perceive the same conflicts between them in terms of administration, and I see no justification for preventing even the most vocationally focused course (or student) from being guided or influenced by research.*

**Keywords:** Management education, research, Curiosity Technology, digital entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurship, emerging trend

## I. INTRODUCTION

The amalgamation of pedagogy and scholarly inquiry within the management faculty

*“Although the notion of the university as a collective of scholars dedicated to the impartial quest for truth may not have aligned precisely with actuality, it appears that any remnants of this concept have become obsolete as the market assumes a prominent role and governments endeavor to utilize universities for utilitarian purposes.”*

The market has undeniably assumed dominance. Oliver's writing was influenced by a decrease in funding from HEFCE for research, which may result in many departments, especially in new universities, not receiving any funding at all. Additionally, there has been a notable decline in research activity in new universities compared to old universities. Furthermore, there has been an increase in a consumer culture, which has been linked to a decline in the quality of the learning experience. Oliver also highlights a shift in focus from acquiring substantial knowledge to prioritizing breadth and memorization. In addition, she observes the rise in student population and the influence of staff-to-student ratios, together with the implementation of fees and the significant burdens on academic workload. We are already acquainted with the most, if not all, of those worries.

Curiosity: Diverse Perspectives on Pedagogy and Scholarly Investigation

Oliver's lecture lacks a comprehensive elucidation of her comprehension regarding the interplay between research and teaching. She is cognizant (and possibly concurs) that some perceive education as a hindrance to our primary endeavor

- research. In today's higher education economy, as well as in the past, this is completely illogical. While the equilibrium may be incorrect, research and teaching are integral components of academic pursuits and the purpose of universities. From my perspective, in a society where the market is paramount and ethical conduct is expected rather than merely expected, it is incumbent upon us, as management educators, to incorporate research into our courses. We should ground our arguments and teachings on thoroughly researched and well-considered evidence, in order to counter the information age where any question can be readily answered with a simple click, yet often remains elusive. It is our responsibility to demonstrate the effects of management, both beneficial and detrimental, and to cultivate analytical thinking. One method to achieve this is by incorporating research into our teaching. Nevertheless, even if your perspectives on our responsibilities differ from mine, including research into teaching exposes students to the intellectual pursuits we excel in and the inquisitiveness we feel when we come across something intriguing that we have not yet comprehended completely.

Prior to proceeding, it is imperative to establish a precise understanding of the concept of integrating research and teaching. "There is a belief that the connection between teaching and research is what sets university education apart." Oliver appears to acknowledge this point, but she does not delve deeper into it, which has consequences for the arguments she presents. It is important to acknowledge that the question of whether management academics should conduct research and what qualifies as such research has always been a subject of intense debate. In the United States, Tamanaha has proposed that management schools have been plagued by a long-standing trend since their establishment in universities until the present day. The purpose of management school is to provide management education and training for aspiring managementyers. Management professors are considered scholars in the academic realm. This matter is not uncommon in the English setting, but it may be less severe due to the disparities in management education between the two jurisdictions. Cownie, for instance, determined that:

*"Research has become increasingly significant in the academic management culture, and there seems to be a shift in the type of research that is appreciated, with less emphasis on research focused on practitioners."*

Research is a crucial component of university management schools and is often regarded as one of the two highest points of excellence, alongside teaching. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the involvement of an organization, such as a management school, in several activities, namely teaching and research, does not necessarily imply a direct correlation between these activities. Hence, the inquiry that necessitates consideration is as follows:

*"What are the underlying reasons for the convergence of teaching and research? Is this only an attempt by research-intensive universities to support the research organization, or a plea from schools with less emphasis on research to prevent a division between research and teaching organisations??"*

In other words, what is the rationale behind the reciprocal influence between our teaching and research?

Initially, it is important to acknowledge that the literature in this field predominantly evades the question. According to Cretchley et al., the concept that teaching and research are mutually supportive activities is deeply rooted in academic history and ideology. Coate et al., upon reviewing the existing literature in this field, assert that the current body of research primarily focuses on rhetoric rather than empirical evidence regarding the relationship between teaching and research. The authors also observe that the absence of explicit strategies to foster the synergy between teaching and research is intriguing, given the assertions made by many participants regarding their inseparability. It is evident that the connection between research and teaching is highly intricate, a complexity that Oliver fails to acknowledge in her lecture. The aforementioned statement by Oliver raises several underlying assumptions regarding the advantages of integrating research and teaching, the difficulties associated with establishing such connections, and the administrative concerns that emerge as a result. She engages in a similar practice as numerous others, wherein she conflates research-led teaching and researcher-led teaching, or at the very least, fails to expressly differentiate between the two. However, she fails to differentiate between research-led teaching and research-informed teaching. However, these distinctions hold significance as they can indicate contrasting expectations to both faculty and students regarding the conceptualization, connection, and appreciation of activities conducted inside management schools. As correctly pointed out by Coate et al:

*"Teaching and research can coexist in many partnerships, which are influenced by the value orientation of academic personnel and the allocation of resources."*

The dynamics of relationships are intricate and necessitate negotiation by scholars in the field. Schapper and Mayson (year) highlight a significant disparity between the rhetoric of research-led teaching within organisations and the actual experiences of academic staff who strive to establish meaningful connections between these two domains. This disparity can be attributed, in part, to our failure to adequately acknowledge or embrace the intricate implications of these relationships.

In order to establish stronger connections between research and teaching, it is important to possess a comprehensive and well-researched comprehension of the concept of research-led teaching within various university settings.

Healy (2005a) has said that students perceive distinct advantages from staff research, such as passion, credibility, and the perceived prestige of being instructed by academics who are recognized both nationally and worldwide.

One argument in favor of promoting researcher-led teaching, which involves instruction offered by individuals who are actively engaged in research within a certain topic, is the positive reception it receives from students. However, this does not serve as a justification for promoting alternative connections between research and teaching that do not rely on the researcher personally presenting the education according to their specialized subject matter. There exist supplementary and maybe superior rationales for the significance of establishing connections between research and education.

According to Bradney, the reason why human beings engage in study is due to their inherent capacity for thinking. The author introduces the concept of "beings" and proposes that promoting reasoning and research skills provides pupils with the optimal opportunity to assert their own intellectual autonomy, as stated by Nussbaum. According to Nussbaum, the human spirit flourishes through the process of exploration and exploration. It is vital to incorporate exploration into every facet of the learning process. One rationale for establishing connections between research and teaching, and for acquainting students with research, whether it be our own, that of colleagues, or published work, or even the concept of research, is that as individuals, we will flourish via the revelations that arise from such introductions. According to Cownie's findings, a significant proportion of participants in her study expressed active engagement in research activities and displayed a strong enthusiasm for it, particularly due to the perceived intellectual gratification it offers.

The individuals who participated in her study exhibited a strong inclination towards inquiry. It is imperative that we disseminate this information to pupils.

Healy, as mentioned earlier, found that students react to expressions of enthusiasm. In addition to facilitating the academic success of our students, active involvement in research endeavors has the potential to enhance their overall engagement with their studies and foster a sense of enjoyment in their intellectual pursuits. It has the potential to cultivate their inquisitiveness. Incorporating research into pedagogy, whether through our own scholarly endeavors or the contributions of others, enables us to demonstrate to students the dynamic and progressive nature of management, highlighting our limited knowledge and the existence of unresolved inquiries. It can demonstrate to students that the majority of management domains are subject to intense debate, that there is no definitive solution, and that the study of management, rather than seeking a correct answer, involves engaging in argumentation and critical thinking.

In addition, actively participating in research enables students to directly observe the requirements of the pursuit of academic studies necessitates a high level of intellectual rigor. We promote extensive reading, meticulous argument construction, and the inclusion of supporting evidence in our students' writing. Our criteria for producing instructional materials and delivering teaching sessions vary. Employing research and explicitly citing it in our materials and delivery serves as a commendable model. Research, as Bradney observes, reflects the tasks we assign to students:

*"The research conducted within the liberal management school imposes similar expectations on academics as they do on students, with the distinction that academics are responsible for formulating their own inquiries and possessing a permanent residency within the management school, which enables them to provide more comprehensive and elaborate responses. Both teaching and learning, as well as research, require a liberal education that primarily focuses on cultivating curiosity."*

If you agree with the notion that we should provide a liberal management education, then research should have an impact on our teaching. This is because students gain a comprehensive understanding of management that extends beyond the mere acquisition of management principles and their practical application.

In an era characterized by the rapid accessibility of information through digital means, it is imperative to emphasize the significance of academic research and elucidate the underlying methodology employed in such investigations. The exposure to research has the potential to cultivate within students a more comprehensive and intricate comprehension of management concepts and their practical implementation. Additionally, the nature of the study can provide light on the influence of these management requirements within specific contexts.

According to Ian Ward, who cites both Bradney and Dawn Oliver herself, the following statement is made:

*“There is a contention that a liberal management education should aim to actively involve the sensibilities of management students. It is imperative that a management student possesses not only knowledge and skills, but also a comprehensive understanding of the underlying reasons for existing circumstances and the potential for alternative approaches.”*

This is especially true if we acknowledge that the university is one of the few guardians of cultural excellence and intellectual longevity and profundity. However, it is possible that you may not concur that this is the essence of management schools. The significance of a liberal management education may be deemed insignificant, leading individuals to adopt a vocational approach to management education that prioritizes the training of attorneys. If that is indeed the situation, it is possible that students may not require an understanding of the reasons behind current circumstances and the potential for change. Merely possessing knowledge and skills may be plenty for them to function as insignificant employees in giant corporations. Nevertheless, I am skeptical as the resolution of intricate management issues necessitates managementyers to employ a combination of logical reasoning, clarity, and creativity. Merely being instructed in management principles and their application, rather than cultivating the ability to critically analyze them, is likely to result in a deficiency of the requisite creativity.

There exists an additional persuasive rationale for advocating students' involvement in research, which is closely associated with my personal inclination towards socio-management research. In his work, Ian Ward explores the intersection between terrorism, our management response, and our understanding of civil freedoms.

This paragraph possesses the potential to be applicable to a wide range of significant management difficulties that confront us in contemporary times. These challenges encompass climate change, economic crises, the erosion of human rights, and the escalating securitization of our daily existence. Without exposing kids to a diverse array of cognitive processes, it is unrealistic to anticipate their ability to tackle intricate challenges that will be passed down to future generations.

Healy, as mentioned earlier, also highlights the drawbacks of research and teaching connections. These drawbacks include students reporting issues such as staff unavailability, limited involvement in research activities, and staff prioritizing research over their own learning. The demands on our time are numerous and diverse, necessitating a method to determine how we should prioritize our work. For several scholars, this unquestionably implies that research work is given priority above other tasks, including those that help students. The distribution of academic workload varies with time, both in general and for particular academics during their careers and academic year. However, the significance of research remains constant. Coate et al state that the levels and significance of academic activities are not fixed and have changed over time, although the emphasis on research has been a noticeable trend for at least fifty years. Schapper and Mayson contend that academics may have to cater to multiple masters: "From a policy standpoint, academics face conflicting demands: universities and other academics assign value based on someone's research profile, while the communities they serve are more concerned with what they provide to students." The presence of tensions necessitates effective management.

The assertion that proficient researchers will inevitably excel as educators has been characterized as a fallacy within the realm of higher education (Terezini and Pascarella, 1994). Similarly, the notion that research inherently improves teaching has also been questioned. Despite the fallacy surrounding the notion that research inherently enhances teaching, it remains imperative to establish a connection between research and teaching, as elucidated in the preceding explanation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider the manner in which we establish a connection between these two tasks. Does this imply that there is no longer a position for academics who solely contribute through research, or for academics who choose not to engage in research but instead prioritize educating students? This is illogical. Not everyone possesses proficiency in both areas, and it is not necessary to excel in one in order to excel in the other. Management schools have the authority to determine the extent to which they can and do require their researchers to

teach based on their research, or request their teachers to base their teaching on research (whether it is their own or not), or to introduce students to the concept of research within the curriculum. This decision should not be only reliant on resources, although resources will undoubtedly play a role. The matter at hand pertains to the core purpose and value of a management degree, as well as the ethos and culture that should be upheld by management schools. When making such judgments, it is crucial to bear in mind that 'Academic Freedom' refers to the liberty we have to carry out our academic tasks. It also entails granting other scholars the autonomy to pursue their work. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that teaching and research hold significance in all management schools, but the connection between these activities is expected to be flexible and highly dynamic, differing from one management school to another.

This observation potentially provides insights about the significance attributed to the activities. This observation implies that research holds a position of superiority. This aligns with the experience of academics, especially those who are aiming for advancement. If research is given greater importance and incentives than teaching, academics may be less motivated to dedicate time to curricular advancements or pedagogical methods. This poses a problem for two primary reasons. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the incorporation of research into teaching is intricate and requires careful consideration in order to be successful. This requires a significant amount of time, which academics who are aiming for career progression may believe is more effectively utilized by engaging in research rather than contemplating how it may be seamlessly integrated into teaching. Furthermore, this phenomenon engenders a dichotomy between academics who prioritize research and those who prioritize teaching, so placing people who attempt to pursue both roles in an unfeasible predicament. The hierarchy it sets is misplaced. The aforementioned hierarchy is not solely applicable within organisations, but also extends to inter-organisational comparisons, wherein organisations that attain notable ratings in the prevailing research assessment process are regarded as more esteemed and generally superior to those that do not. Dawn Oliver proposes that research money should be focused in specific organisations, enabling them to prioritize research while others concentrate on teaching. In the US context, Tamanaha explicitly states that students should not be required to shoulder the expensive responsibility of faculty research, particularly at lower-ranked schools whose graduates have lower anticipated income. While I concur with the notion that students should not bear the financial burden, this is not the contention I intend to present in this context. The focal aspect is to the differentiation between schools of varying rankings and the pupils encompassed within each. Based on the aforementioned argument advocating for the incorporation of research into pedagogy, it becomes apparent that all management students should derive advantages from this approach, rather than solely those who, primarily via chance, attain admission to prestigious management schools. It is imperative to emphasize that involvement in research should not be limited just to individuals pursuing postgraduate degrees. Research incurs significant costs and resources are limited. In addition to the fact that students are currently financing their higher education (not their degrees), and that other sources of income, especially income specifically allocated for management research, are severely restricted, it is imperative to address significant inquiries regarding research funding and, more broadly, the funding of universities. Regrettably, the paper does not have the capacity to address this significant subject.

Not all management educators have research capabilities. Even individuals who are engaged in research may not necessarily conduct research in the same fields they teach or teach in fields they actively study. Consequently, incorporating our own findings into teaching might be challenging. Furthermore, if we are instructing in fields where we are not actively engaged in research, there may be minimal motivation to seek out research literature for the purpose of incorporating it into our instruction. There is a possibility that our lack of interest in the subject matter or limited availability of time may be contributing factors. The era in which we solely focused on instructing our specialized subjects, assuming such subjects ever existed, has come to an end. A significant number of us instruct core undergraduate courses, and many of us believe that there is limited opportunity to incorporate research into such instruction.

According to the premise, students now lack the knowledge to comprehend the research. Prior to comprehending the research, it is vital for them to get a deeper understanding of management. Oliver appears to endorse this position. Nevertheless, it appears to be defective.

Utilizing research can be included into many aspects of our teaching. It is not necessary for us to do our own research; any research on the topics we aim to teach is acceptable. Additionally, management research is not the only option, since there are numerous fields where work is conducted that is relevant to management students



Effective teaching necessitates surpassing the confines of a textbook and acquainting ourselves with the arguments, issues, and research pertaining to a specific subject. While it may not be necessary for us to attain expertise in every area, it is imperative that we adhere to the expectations we set for our students: engage in extensive reading and substantiate our views with the available evidence, which encompasses research. According to Coate et al's study, a senior undergraduate engineering student proposed that non-research-active faculty members should be responsible for teaching students how to pass tests, while research-active faculty members should be responsible for teaching students the subject matter. Undoubtedly, our objective should be to instruct our students in the subject matter.

The proposition that undergraduate students, particularly those in their first year, lack sufficient management knowledge to comprehend research is illogical. By extending this argument to its logical implication, it suggests that management research should exclusively be undertaken by individuals who possess management degrees and possess a comprehensive understanding of the specific field of management. That is nonsensical. Conducting research can enhance the appeal and appeal of management, hence increasing its accessibility to students. Interacting with research might generate inquiries for students or illuminate matters that they can investigate further, ultimately resulting in an enhanced comprehension of management. This implies that we may need to reassess our curriculum by considering learning as the connection between research and teaching. This is especially important because the ability to read journal articles and comprehend research is a skill that our students do not naturally acquire or enhance simply by being provided with a journal article to read. Hence, it is imperative to meticulously consider the research we expose them to, the published content we request them to peruse, and the manner in which we convey knowledge to them. We must elucidate the concept of research, the reasons for our enthusiasm for it, its significance, and the insights it can provide. Without such knowledge, students are unlikely to develop a comprehensive understanding of the distinction between engaging with a scholarly research paper on the subject of the rule of management and perusing a Wikipedia item pertaining to the same topic.

## II. CONCLUSION

The notion that research should ideally be confined to prestigious organisations and cantered around postgraduate instruction has been called into question. It has accomplished this by elucidating the significance of research-informed/led teaching and its relevance across all educational levels. The chapter has also emphasized crucial inquiries that the higher education community must tackle, particularly on the future funding of higher education to ensure the protection of all university activities. If higher education, including management education, is focused on comprehensive learning, it is imperative that we devise a method to cultivate our students' interest and enable them to pursue it in a manner akin to our own pursuit. It is imperative that we express our inquisitiveness to them and cultivate enthusiasm for our collective learning. According to Brown and Atkins, the concept of research may be characterized as a form of "organized curiosity," whereas teaching can be understood as a form of "organized communication." Nevertheless, I contend that education and research are fundamentally driven by curiosity and communication. As Einstein aptly stated, the crucial aspect is to persist in inquiring. Curiosity possesses an inherent purpose for its existence.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Thornton, M. (2012). *Privatising the Public University: The Case of Management*. Routledge.
- [2]. Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). Research-led teaching: moving from a fractured engagement to a marriage of convenience. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 29(6), 641-651 at 644. See also Brown, R.B. (2005). Why Link personal research and teaching? *Education and Training*. 47(6), 393-407
- [3]. Bradney, A. (2003). *Conversations, Choices and Chances: The Liberal Management School in the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: Hart Publishing at 109
- [4]. Tamanaha, B.Z. (2012). *Failing Management Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press at 54
- [5]. Cownie, F. (2004). *Management Academics. Culture and Identities*. Oxford: Hart Publishing at 141
- [5]. Brew, A. (2003). 'Teaching and research: new relationships and their implications for inquiry-based teaching and learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 22(1), 3-18 at

- [6]. Cretchley, P.C., Edwards, S.L., O'Shea, P. Sheard, J., Hurst, J and Brookes, W. (2014). Research and/or learning and teaching: a study of Australian professors' priorities, beliefs and behaviours. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 33(4), 649-669 at 650
- [7]. Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001). Relationships Between Teaching and Research in Higher Education in England. *Higher Education Quarterly* 55(2), 158-74 at 159
- [8]. Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 162
- [9]. Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010) at 646.
- [10]. Samarasekera, I. (2005). Installation Address. Edmonton: Office of the President, University of Alberta. Cited in Wuetherick, B. and McLaughlin, L. (2010). Exploring Students' Perceptions of Research in the Learning Environment: A Partnership to Enhance Our Understanding of the Undergraduate Student Experience. In..at 185 19 Cownie, F. (2004) at 202
- [11]. Ward, I. (2009). Management Education and the Democratic Imagination. Learning in Management Annual Conference Keynote Address. At 3. Original footnotes omitted but see Bradney, A. Liberalising Management Education in Cownie, F.(ed) and Oliver, D. Teaching and Learning Management: Pressures on the Liberal Degree' in Birks, P. (ed) at 78
- [12]. Pillay, G. (2009). Valuing higher education. *Higher Education Review*. 42. 64 – XX at 71
- [13]. Healy, M. (2005). 'Linking teaching and research: exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of enquiry based learning. In Barnett, R. (ed). *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. 67-78
- [14]. Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 1163
- [15]. Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010) at 646
- [16]. Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 172. Terezini, P.T. and Pasarella, E.T. (1994). Living with Myths. *Undergraduate Education in America*. Change. 28-32
- [17]. Bradney, T. (2003). On Academic Freedom. *The Reporter*. No 26 Spring 2003, 1-2
- [18]. Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). 646. Elton, L. (2001). Research and teaching: Conditions for a positive link. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 6(1), 43-56
- [19]. Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 170. See also Cownie, F. (2004).
- [20]. Wuetherick, B. and McLaughlin, L. (2010)at 194-195. Brew, A. (2006). *Research and Teaching: Beyond the Divide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- [21]. Brown, G and Atkins, M (1998). *Effective Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Routledge, at 5