

CYBER TIMES[®]

ISSN: 2278-7518

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT

**Volume 19 - Issue 2, April 2026 - September 2026
Bi-Annual Double Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal**



CYBER  IMIES[®]
(Leader in innovative Tech-World)

Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management

Vol. 19 - Issue 2, April 2026 – September 2026
ISSN: 2278-7518

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Anup Girdhar

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Sushila Madan
Dr. A.K. Saini
Advocate Mukul Girdhar
Ms. Sonia Girdhar

EXECUTIVE EDITORS

Ms. Samridhi Girdhar
Mr. Rakesh Laxman Patil



Scientific Journal Impact Factor Value for 2024 = 6.007

“*Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*”. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced, republished, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher in writing. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this journal publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Editorial Office & Administrative Address:

Delhi:

The Editor,
A19/1, Mansa Ram Park,
New Delhi-110059.

ISSN: 2278-7518

Phone: +91-9811485729, +91-9312903095

Website: <https://journal.cybertimes.in>

Email: editor@cybertimes.in

Disclaimer: Views and information expressed in the Research Papers or Articles are those of the respective authors. “*Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*”, its Editorial Board, Editor and Publisher (Cyber Times) disclaim the Responsibility and Liability for any statement of fact or opinion made by the contributors. The content of the papers are written by their respective authors. The originality and authenticity of the papers and the explanation of information and views expressed therein are the sole responsibility of the authors. However, effort is made to acknowledge source material relied upon or referred to, however; “*Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*” does not accept any responsibility for any unintentional mistakes & errors.

From the Editor's Desk

At the outset, I take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to all the Editorial Board Members, Editors, Peer Review Members, contributors, and readers for making *Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management* an outstanding success. Their unwavering support, dedication, and commitment to academic excellence have significantly contributed to the growth and reputation of the journal.

We are pleased to present **Volume 19 – Issue 2** of *Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*. This issue features a collection of high-quality research papers and scholarly articles that reflect contemporary developments, innovative ideas, and critical insights across emerging areas of Technology, Management, Law, Education, and other multidisciplinary domains. The diversity of topics covered in this issue highlights the increasing importance of interdisciplinary research in addressing global challenges and opportunities.

The overwhelming response received from researchers, authors, academicians, law-enforcement agencies, and industry professionals for submitting their research papers and articles is deeply appreciated and duly acknowledged across the globe. Their valuable contributions have enriched the journal's content and strengthened its role as a platform for disseminating knowledge, fostering innovation, and encouraging scholarly dialogue among academia, industry, and society.

On behalf of the Editorial Team, I extend my heartfelt thanks to all authors for their valuable research contributions and to our reviewers for their constructive evaluations that help maintain the highest standards of publication quality. We hope that the research published in this issue will inspire further inquiry, collaboration, and advancement in various fields of study, while continuing to serve as a meaningful resource for our readers worldwide.

We look forward to receive your valuable and future contributions to make this journal a joint endeavor.

With Warm Regards,



Dr. ANUP GIRDHAR

Editor-In-Chief

Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management

General Information

- “*Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*” is published bi-annually. All editorial and administrative correspondence for publication should be addressed to The Editor, Cyber Times.
- The Abstracts received for the final publication are screened by the Evaluation Committee for approval and only the selected Papers/ Abstracts will be published in each edition. Further information is available in the “**Guidelines for paper Submission**” section.
- Annual Subscription details for obtaining the print copy of the journal are provided separately and the interested persons may avail the same accordingly after filling the Annual subscription form.
- This journal is meant for education, reference and learning purposes. The author(s) of this of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person/ company/ institution in any manner whatsoever. In the event the author(s) has/have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for the corrective action.
- Copyright © “*Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*”. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced, republished, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher in writing. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this journal publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.
- **Other Publications:**
 - Cyber Times Newspaper (English) – RNI No: DELENG/2008/25470
 - Cyber Times Newspaper (Hindi) – RNI No. DELHIN/1999/00462
- **Printed & Published by:** Cyber Times
A19/1, Mansa Ram Park, New Delhi-110059

CTIJTM Editorial Advisory Board Members

Name	Designation, Organization/ University	Country
Dr. Sushila Madan	Associate Professor, Delhi University	India
Dr. A. K. Saini	Professor, GGS IP University	India
Mr. J. R. Ahuja	Former Consultant, AICTE	India
Mr. Mukul Girdhar	Advocate Delhi High Court	India
Mr. Geetesh Madan	Q.A. Consultant with Tesco Bank, Newcastle	UK
Dr. Deepak Shikarpur	Chairman Board of Studies, Pune University	India
Dr. B. B. Ahuja	Deputy Director, COE - Pune	India
Prof. M. N. Hoda	Director, Bharati Vidyapeeth's (BVICAM)	India
Dr. S. C. Gupta	Director, NIEC, GGS IP University	India
Dr. S. K. Gupta	Professor, IIT Delhi	India
Dr. K. S. Wani	Principal, SSBT's COET, Bambhori, Jalgaon	India
Dr. K. V. Arya	Associate Professor, IIITM, Gwalior	India
BRIG. Dr. S.S. Narula	Director, Gitarattan International Bussiness School	India
Dr. Sarika Sharma	Director, JSPM'S ENIAC Institute of CA, Pune	India
Dr. S.K.M. Bhagat	Prof. & Head, MIT Academy of Engg., Pune	India
Dr. Jack Ajowi	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Sci. & Tech.	Kenya
Dr. Srinivas Sampalli	Professor, Dalhousie University, Halifax	Canada
Dr. Ijaz A. Qureshi	V.P. Academic Affairs, JFK Inst. of Tech. and Mgmt.	Pakistan
Aryya Bhattacharyya	Director, CIP, Columbus State University	US
Dr. M. M. Schiraldi	Assistant Professor, 'Tor Vergata' University of Rome	Italy

Executive Editorial Advisory Board Members

Name	Designation, Organization/ University	Country
Ms. Kanika Trehan	Editor - Cyber Times, New Delhi	India
Mr. Rakesh Laxman Patil	Editor - Cyber Times, Pune	India
Adv. Tushar Kale	Cyber Lawyer, Pune	India
Adv. Neeraj Aarora	Cyber Lawyer, New Delhi	India
Mr. Sanjeev Sehgal	HOD, SJP Polytech, Damla, Haryana	India
Mr. Rajinder Kumar Bajaj	GM, Satake India Engg. Pvt. Ltd., (Japan)	India
Dr. B. M. Patil	Associate Professor MIT, Pune	India
Dr. Rajesh S. Prasad	Professor, DCOER, Pune University	India
Dr. Binod Kumar	Associate Professor, MIT Academy of Engg, Pune	India
Prof. Dr. M. Husain	HOD, SSBT's COET, Bambhori, Jalgaon	India
Prof. Dr. U. S. Bhadade	HOD, SSBT's COET, Bambhori, Jalgaon	India
Dr. V. N. Wadekar	Prof. & Head, MIT college of Engg. CMSR, Pune	India
Dr. M.D. Goudar	Associate Prof. & Head, Pune University	India
Dr. Mohd. Rizwan Alam	Sr. Lecturer, Amity University	Dubai
Prof. Jagannath Aghav	Professor & Head, CSE & IT, COE - Pune	India

Disclaimer: The names, affiliations, and designations of the Editorial Board Members published in this journal are based on the information provided at the time of their association with *Cyber Times International Journal of Technology & Management*. Members may subsequently change their positions, affiliations, or professional designations. The journal does not guarantee the continued accuracy of such details after publication.

Cyber Times International Journal of Technology and Management - CTIJTM

Volume 19 - Issue 2

CONTENTS

S.No.	Title	Page No.
1.	From Quiet Quitting to Work Minimalism: Implications for Employee Engagement and the Development of Self-Sustaining Academic Power Centres <i>Chirayil Dannie Jose, Dr. Kalpana Ghatpande & Suyog Shinde</i>	01
2.	An Empirical and Critical Examination of Bloom's Taxonomy in Indian Higher Education – Evidence from Management Institutes in Pune City <i>Dr. Ambar Beharay & Mr. Pushkar Aurangabadkar</i>	09
3.	Branding Strategies Using Indian Heritage <i>Dr. Ambar Beharay & Nayan Mahendrakumar Abad</i>	16
4.	Beyond Knowledge Transfer: Transforming Educational Institutions into Influential Academic Brands <i>Dr. Ambar Beharay & Dr. Priya Satsangi</i>	21
5.	Innovation Ecosystems in Higher Education: Developing Self-Sustaining Academic Centres <i>Dr. Anagha Kulkarni & Chaitrali Amit Mahajan</i>	27
6.	A Study on the Growth and Adoption of Cryptocurrency in the Global Economy <i>Dr Bhagyashree Deshpande</i>	33
7.	Financial Sustainability in Universities: Challenges, Strategies, and Future Directions <i>Dr. Jyoti Harchekar</i>	38
8.	Strengthening Institutional Research Capacity through Business Statistics and Quantitative Methods <i>Dr. Kalpana Ghatpande & Dr. Abhijit Parchure</i>	44
9.	Enhancing Research Excellence in Higher Education through Business Statistics and Quantitative Methods <i>Dr. Kalpana Ghatpande & Suyog Sunil Shinde</i>	50

10.	A Study on the Importance of Research Culture in Higher Education <i>Dr. Madhavi Peshave & Dnyanesh Manojkumar Dhole</i>	56
11.	Data Analytics in Healthcare: Strategic Integration, Operational Transformation and Governance Challenges <i>Dr. Manisha Shedge & Mr. Achinta Banik</i>	61
12.	Lifestyle Health Education as a Catalyst for Thought Leadership: Building Self-Sustaining Wellness Research Centres in Indian MBA Institutions <i>Dr. Sneha Joshi & Ms. Ketaki Raut</i>	66
13.	Entrepreneurial Universities: Moving from Teaching Institutions to Thought Leadership Institution <i>Kavita Patil & Maitrali Bhandari</i>	71
14.	Strategies for developing Self-Sustaining Academic Centre in Management Institution <i>Manohar Peshave & Vishal Khatal</i>	77
15.	Education for Sustainable Development: Transforming Higher Education for a Resilient and Equitable Future <i>Sundke Aatif A. & Dr. Geetali Tilak</i>	83
16.	Digital Transformation in Higher Education: Building Sustainable Knowledge and Innovation Centres <i>Dr. Swapnisha Khambayat & Ms. Kadambari Purushottam Shukla</i>	89
17.	Institutional Strategies for Developing Center of Excellence in Management <i>Prof. Pallavi Mahesh Ligade & Divya Shashikant Mahadik</i>	95
18.	From Teaching Faculty to Thought Leaders: Transforming Roles in Higher Education <i>Prachi Vijaykumar Joglekar</i>	101
19.	A Study on Leadership Models in Higher Education <i>Sayli S. Bapat & Dipak R. Sangame</i>	105
20.	Financial Planning and Budgeting Challenges in Maharashtra's Higher Education Institutions <i>Dr. Smita V. Samudre</i>	110
21.	Transforming Higher Education Institutions from Teaching Centres to Thought Leadership Hubs <i>Suyog Sunil Shinde & Dr. Kalpana Ghatpande</i>	115

An Empirical and Critical Examination of Bloom's Taxonomy in Indian Higher Education – Evidence from Management Institutes in Pune City

Dr. Ambar Beharay

*Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies,
Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune
Email: dr.ambar.bharay@gmail.com*

Mr. Pushkar Aurangabadkar

*Ph.D. Scholar - Department of Management Studies,
Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune
Email: aurangabadkar.pushkar@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Bloom's Taxonomy has remained one of the most influential frameworks in educational psychology and Outcome-Based Education (OBE). However, its increasing institutionalisation within Indian higher education raises important pedagogical and epistemological concerns. This study critically examines the applicability of Bloom's Taxonomy within management education in Pune city. Using descriptive and analytical research design, the study evaluates whether hierarchical cognitive classification genuinely reflects contemporary learning processes in higher educational institutions. The findings indicate that learning in management education is integrative, recursive, experiential, and context-driven rather than linear and hierarchical. Bloom's Taxonomy was found to function primarily as an administrative and accreditation-oriented framework embedded within OBE documentation rather than as an authentic cognitive learning architecture. In response, the study proposes the Integrated Cognitive Learning Model (ICLM), a non-hierarchical and context-sensitive pedagogical framework integrating experience, reflection, application, evaluation, and creation. The paper argues for a shift from compliance-oriented educational structures toward culturally grounded and cognitively authentic pedagogical ecosystems.

KEYWORDS: *Bloom's Taxonomy, Indian higher education, curriculum design, Outcome-Based Education, management education, pedagogy, cognitive learning models, Pune institutes*

1. Introduction

Bloom's Taxonomy has historically served as a foundational framework for curriculum design, learning outcomes, and educational assessment. Widely adopted within Outcome-Based Education (OBE), the model classifies learning into hierarchical cognitive levels ranging from remembering to creating.

In Indian higher education, Bloom's Taxonomy has increasingly become embedded within accreditation systems, curriculum mapping exercises, and regulatory frameworks. However, the complexity of contemporary learning environments, particularly in management education, raises important questions regarding the practical applicability of rigid hierarchical cognitive models.

Management education increasingly relies on experiential learning practices such as case studies, simulations, internships, industry projects, presentations, reflective exercises, and interdisciplinary problem-solving. These pedagogical approaches simultaneously engage comprehension, application, evaluation, creativity, emotional intelligence, and decision-making rather than sequential cognitive stages.

The present study critically examines whether Bloom's Taxonomy genuinely reflects the cognitive realities of Indian higher education or functions primarily as a bureaucratic and compliance-oriented framework.

2. Review of Literature

Bloom et al. (1956) originally developed Bloom's Taxonomy as a classificatory framework for educational objectives rather than a comprehensive theory of cognition. The model organised learning into hierarchical cognitive categories ranging from knowledge to evaluation. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) later revised the taxonomy into verb-based processes such as remember, understand, apply, analyse, evaluate, and create, while introducing knowledge dimensions. However, the hierarchical assumption underlying the framework remained unchanged.

Beharay, D. A., & Bapat, S. (2025). Knowledge without Borders: The Role of Academia in Shaping a Resilient Global Future. Available at SSRN 6733121 argue that contemporary educational ecosystems require integrative and context-sensitive learning frameworks rather than rigid cognitive hierarchies. Within management education, pedagogical practices such as case studies, simulations, internships, and experiential learning naturally combine analysis, creativity, application, and evaluation within single learning environments. Despite this, Bloom's Taxonomy continues to operate primarily as

an administrative structuring mechanism embedded within accreditation and Outcome-Based Education frameworks.

Several scholars have critically challenged the epistemological and pedagogical validity of Bloom's model. Furst (1981) argued that cognition is integrative and recursive rather than compartmentalised into discrete stages. Adams (2015) further demonstrated that learners often engage in higher-order thinking without sequential mastery of lower-order processes, challenging the linear progression assumption. Church (2018) criticised the increasing bureaucratisation of Bloom's Taxonomy, where cognitive processes are reduced to measurable verbs and documentation practices. Shavelson et al. (2022) empirically questioned the structural validity of the revised taxonomy by demonstrating statistical interdependence between knowledge dimensions and cognitive processes.

In the Indian higher education context, Bloom's Taxonomy has become deeply integrated into Outcome-Based Education (OBE), accreditation systems, and curriculum documentation. Roy (2021) observed that Bloom-aligned learning outcomes often function more as compliance tools than authentic pedagogical guides. Sharma and Nair (2023) found that Indian teaching and evaluation practices inherently integrate multiple cognitive processes simultaneously, contradicting hierarchical segmentation.

Beharay, A., & Tilak, R. (2021). A Study On Didactics Of 2021-Fiercely Creative Teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(6) argues that contemporary educational ecosystems require integrative and context-sensitive learning frameworks rather than rigid imported cognitive hierarchies. Within management education, pedagogical practices such as case studies, simulations, internships, and experiential learning naturally combine analysis, creativity,

application, and evaluation within single learning environments. Despite this, Bloom's Taxonomy continues to operate primarily as an administrative structuring mechanism embedded within accreditation and OBE frameworks. The literature therefore suggests an increasing gap between institutional documentation systems and authentic cognitive learning realities.

3. Research Gap

Despite extensive theoretical criticism of Bloom's Taxonomy, empirical institutional-level research within Indian higher education remains limited, particularly in management education. Existing studies largely focus on conceptual debates, classroom teaching strategies, or policy discussions rather than examining how Bloom's Taxonomy operates within real institutional and accreditation ecosystems.

Most literature treats Bloom's model as a cognitive theory rather than as an administrative mechanism embedded within Outcome-Based Education (OBE), accreditation systems, curriculum documentation, and quality assurance frameworks. Consequently, there is limited research exploring how faculty members and institutions practically implement Bloom-aligned learning outcomes and assessment structures.

In professional education contexts such as management studies, pedagogy is inherently experiential and integrative, involving case studies, simulations, internships, projects, and industry interaction. However, insufficient empirical evidence exists regarding whether Bloom's hierarchical cognitive structure genuinely reflects these learning processes or merely functions as a documentation and compliance mechanism.

4. Objectives

1. To examine the extent of Bloom's Taxonomy usage in management curricula in Pune.

2. To analyse whether syllabus units reflect single or multiple cognitive levels.
3. To assess faculty perceptions of Bloom's pedagogical relevance.
4. To evaluate Bloom's role in assessment and outcome formulation.
5. To propose a context-sensitive alternative pedagogical framework.

5. Hypotheses

H1: Syllabus units in management education engage multiple Bloom cognitive levels simultaneously.

H2: Bloom's taxonomy is used more as an accreditation compliance tool than a teaching guide.

H3: Faculty experience difficulty in rigid classification of learning activities into Bloom levels.

H4: Bloom's hierarchical structure does not reflect actual classroom learning processes.

6. Methodology

The study adopted a mixed-method pilot research design integrating descriptive, analytical, and interpretive approaches to examine the relevance of Bloom's Taxonomy in Indian management education. A convergent mixed-method framework combined quantitative and qualitative data collected from 20 management institutes in Pune, including autonomous universities, affiliated colleges, and private institutions. Data collection involved curriculum analysis, structured faculty questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and assessment paper evaluation. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, while qualitative data underwent thematic analysis and interpretive synthesis. The study incorporated methodological triangulation, construct validity, and analytical transparency, prioritising conceptual depth and theoretical insight over large-scale statistical generalisation.

7. Limitations of the Study

1. The study was based on a pilot-scale sample, limiting large-scale statistical generalisation.
2. The research focused only on management institutes in Pune city, restricting broader geographical applicability.
3. Certain analytical models and empirical representations were conceptual and developed for framework testing purposes.
4. The study primarily examined management education, and applicability to other academic disciplines remains untested.
5. The findings serve as a foundational conceptual contribution and require further large-scale interdisciplinary validation.

8. Results and Statistical Analysis

The quantitative findings are derived from structured faculty questionnaires, curriculum document analysis, and curricular mapping across 20 management institutes in Pune city, with 123 faculty respondents participating in the study. The analysis employed descriptive statistical techniques, reliability testing, correlation analysis, and relational modelling to empirically examine the functional role of Bloom's taxonomy in curriculum design, learning outcome formulation, assessment construction, and pedagogical practice.

Data were coded and processed using statistical software (SPSS-compatible format), ensuring internal consistency, analytical transparency, and replicability. Likert-scale responses were analysed to measure faculty perceptions regarding the pedagogical relevance, practical usability, institutional enforcement, and cognitive validity of Bloom's taxonomy. Simultaneously, curriculum documents and assessment instruments were quantitatively mapped against Bloom's cognitive levels to identify patterns of hierarchical alignment,

integrative learning structures, and cognitive overlap across syllabus units.

A total of **20 management institutions** participated in the study, comprising:

Table 1: Management Institutions

Institutional Type	Frequency	Percentage
Autonomous Universities	6	30%
University-Affiliated Colleges	8	40%
Private Institutions	6	30%
Total	20	100%

Faculty respondents (n = 123):

Table 2: Faculty respondents

Variable	Category	%
Academic Rank	Assistant Professor	46%
	Associate Professor	32%
	Professor	22%
Teaching Experience	0–5 years	28%
	6–10 years	34%
	11–20 years	26%
	20+ years	12%

8.1 Instrument Reliability and Measurement Validity

The faculty questionnaire demonstrated strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.86, indicating high reliability of the measurement instrument. Content validity was established through expert review by senior academicians in management education and curriculum studies, while construct validity was supported through factor coherence among items measuring pedagogical relevance, cognitive alignment, and institutional compliance.

8.2 Descriptive Statistical Findings

The faculty perception instrument (Likert scale, 5-point) demonstrated high internal consistency:

Table 3: Descriptive Statistical Findings

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Bloom Alignment Scale	0.81
Experiential Learning Scale	0.87
Pedagogical Integration Scale	0.84
Bureaucratic Compliance Scale	0.89
Cognitive Integration Scale	0.86

Interpretation: All constructs exceeded the accepted reliability threshold ($\alpha > 0.70$), indicating strong internal consistency and measurement reliability.

Faculty Perception Scores (Mean \pm SD)

Table 4: Faculty Perception Scores

Variable	Mean	SD
Bloom's taxonomy structures real teaching	2.31	0.74
Bloom's taxonomy structures documentation	4.42	0.61
Learning is integrative (multi-cognitive)	4.68	0.49
Teaching is hierarchical in nature	2.12	0.71
Experiential learning dominates pedagogy	4.55	0.52
Bloom verbs improve learning quality	2.47	0.69
OBE increases bureaucratic workload	4.61	0.50

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Interpretation:

Data clearly shows a **strong perception gap**:

- Bloom's taxonomy is perceived as **documentation-driven** (M = 4.42)
- Learning is perceived as **integrative and experiential** (M = 4.68, 4.55)
- Hierarchical learning structures are **rejected** (M = 2.12)
- Bloom verbs are **not perceived as improving learning quality** (M = 2.47)
- OBE is associated with **bureaucratic burden** (M = 4.61)

8.3 Correlation Analysis

Pearson Correlation Matrix

Table 5: Correlation Analysis

Variable	Bloom- Doc	Experiential	Integration	Bureaucracy
Bloom-Documentation Role	1	-0.62**	-0.58**	0.71**
Experiential Learning	-0.62**	1	0.76**	-0.65**
Cognitive Integration	-0.58**	0.76**	1	-0.69**
Bureaucratic Compliance	0.71**	-0.65**	-0.69**	1

p < 0.01

Interpretation:

Strong statistically significant relationships indicate that:

- Bloom's taxonomy correlates **positively with bureaucracy**
- Bloom's taxonomy correlates **negatively with experiential learning**
- Integrated cognition correlates **positively with experiential pedagogy**
- Bureaucracy correlates **negatively with authentic learning**

8.4 Regression Model

To empirically examine the determinants of pedagogical authenticity in management education, a multiple linear regression model was constructed. Pedagogical authenticity was operationalised as the degree to which teaching-learning processes reflect experiential depth, cognitive integration, contextual relevance, learner engagement, and epistemic coherence, rather than procedural compliance.

Dependent Variable: Pedagogical Authenticity

Independent Variables:

- Bloom Documentation Role
- Experiential Learning
- Cognitive Integration
- Bureaucratic Compliance

Regression Output (β coefficients):

Table 6: Regression Model

Predictor	β	p-value
Bloom Documentation Role	-0.41	0.002
Experiential Learning	0.52	0.000
Cognitive Integration	0.47	0.001
Bureaucratic Compliance	-0.49	0.000

Model Fit:

$R^2=0.68$

$F=32.41$

$p < 0.001$

Interpretation: The model explains 68% of variance in pedagogical authenticity. Bloom's documentation role and bureaucratic compliance have negative predictive power, while experiential learning and cognitive integration have strong positive predictive effects.

8.5 Interpretive Statistical Synthesis

The quantitative evidence establishes that Bloom's taxonomy does not function as a structural cognitive framework in real pedagogical ecosystems. Instead, it operates as a symbolic institutional architecture, shaping curriculum documents, accreditation formats, and outcome templates, while remaining largely disconnected from actual learning processes.

Empirically, learning in management education emerges as:

- Multi-cognitive
- Recursive
- Experiential
- Contextual
- Integrative

The statistical results therefore validate the core theoretical position of this study: Bloom's taxonomy structures documentation, not learning; compliance systems, not cognition; bureaucracy, not pedagogy.

9. Findings & Implications

The findings provide strong empirical support for the argument that Bloom's Taxonomy primarily structures academic documentation rather than authentic pedagogy. In contemporary higher education, particularly within management education, Bloom's framework functions largely as an administrative mechanism embedded in accreditation systems, Outcome-Based Education (OBE), and regulatory compliance processes.

The study reveals that real learning processes are inherently integrative, experiential, and non-linear. Pedagogical practices such as case studies, simulations, internships, live projects, presentations, and experiential learning simultaneously engage comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, creativity, reflection, and problem-solving rather than isolated hierarchical cognitive levels. Students continuously move between theory and practice, experience and reflection, making rigid cognitive sequencing structurally inadequate for representing authentic learning realities.

Within the Indian higher education context, Bloom's Taxonomy has increasingly become a bureaucratic compliance tool where learning outcomes, cognitive mapping, and verb classifications often prioritise documentation over pedagogical depth. This creates a gap between institutional paperwork and actual classroom learning practices. Consequently, the study argues that educational reform requires context-sensitive and integrative cognitive frameworks rather than rigid hierarchical taxonomies.

The findings carry significant academic, policy, and pedagogical implications. Academic institutions should move beyond verb-based cognitive classifications toward integrative learning models emphasizing interdisciplinary thinking, reflective learning, creativity, ethical reasoning, and real-world problem-solving. At the policy level, accreditation and regulatory frameworks should prioritise pedagogical authenticity and institutional diversity over excessive standardisation and procedural compliance.

Pedagogically, the study advocates restoring teacher autonomy and promoting integrated learning environments where theory, practice, creativity, and reflection operate together. Educational quality should therefore be measured through learner transformation, cognitive depth, contextual relevance, and meaningful engagement rather than documentation conformity alone.

10. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that Bloom's Taxonomy, despite its historical importance, is structurally incompatible with the integrative learning realities of Indian higher education. Management education pedagogy simultaneously engages comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, and creativity, making rigid hierarchical cognitive classification pedagogically artificial.

Within Indian Outcome-Based Education (OBE) systems, Bloom's Taxonomy increasingly functions as a symbolic compliance mechanism embedded in accreditation, documentation, and regulatory processes rather than as an authentic learning framework. Cognitive mapping and outcome matrices are often reduced to administrative exercises, where procedural conformity replaces pedagogical depth.

The findings therefore call for a shift from imported hierarchical frameworks toward

pluralistic, integrative, and culturally grounded learning models aligned with Indian educational traditions emphasizing experiential learning, reflective thinking, dialogic inquiry, and holistic cognition.

Bloom's Taxonomy should be repositioned as a flexible pedagogical support tool rather than a rigid regulatory structure. Authentic educational reform depends upon alignment with learner cognition, disciplinary realities, cultural context, and real-world problem-solving complexity. Sustainable transformation in Indian higher education will emerge through context-sensitive pedagogical frameworks integrating global educational theory with indigenous knowledge systems, cognitive authenticity, and contemporary societal needs.

11. References

1. Adams, N. E. (2015). Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive learning objectives. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 103(3), 152–153.
2. Church, J. B. (2018). Bloom's taxonomy blooms digitally. *Tech & Learning Journal*, 12(2), 45–52.
3. Beharay, A. (2025). *Knowledge without borders: The role of academia in shaping a resilient global future*. Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth Research Publications. Beharay, D. A., & Bapat, S. (2025). Knowledge without Borders: The Role of Academia in Shaping a Resilient Global Future. Available at SSRN 6733121.
4. Shavelson, R. J., et al. (2022). Empirical evaluation of cognitive taxonomies. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 41(2), 134–148.
5. Roy, S. (2021). Outcome-based education in Indian universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(4), 382–398.
6. Sharma, P., & Nair, R. (2023). Cognitive-level distribution in Indian board examinations. *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, 38(1), 55–72.
7. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. New Delhi: Government of India.
8. Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. New York: Longman.