

Influence of Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation on Educator's Perception with Institutional Support

Prof. Vibin Krishnan R¹, Prof. Samskruthi B L², Prof. Chaithra C G³

¹Assistant Professor and IQAC Coordinator, Department of Business Administration, Soundarya Institute of Management and Science

²Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science, Soundarya Institute of Management and Science

³Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Soundarya Institute of Management and Science

Abstract- The Indian higher education system is undergoing a paradigm shift from teacher-centered approaches to learner-centered, outcome-based frameworks. This study investigates the influence of pedagogical shift and Outcome-Based Education implementation on educators perception, with institutional support as a mediating variable. A quantitative research design was employed using a structured adopted questionnaire distributed to educators from higher education institutions. Data from 29 respondents were analysed using SPSS and Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4). The findings revealed that both pedagogical shift and OBE implementation have a significant positive impact on educators perception. However, institutional support did not significantly mediate these relationships, although it demonstrated a strong direct correlation with educators perception. The results suggest that educators perceptions are primarily shaped by their direct engagement with pedagogical and curriculum reforms rather than institutional mechanisms alone. The study emphasizes the need for higher education institutions to strengthen institutional support structures and training initiatives to sustain educators adaptability to pedagogical and outcome-based reforms envisioned under the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020

Keywords: Pedagogical Shift; Outcome-Based Education; Educators Perception; Institutional Support; Higher Education; NEP 2020; Educational Reform; Mediation Analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

The higher education landscape is witnessing a profound transformation from the traditional teacher-centric model toward a learner-centered, outcome-

oriented framework. This shift emphasizes not only *how to teach* but more importantly, *what to teach* and *why to teach*, aligning education with measurable learning outcomes and competency development (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Spady, 1994). The concept of Outcome-Based Education (OBE), introduced by Spady in the 1990s, underscores that all educational processes should be designed to achieve clearly defined outcomes in terms of student performance. OBE has since evolved into a global educational approach, prioritizing the development of skills, values, and knowledge that prepare learners for real-world application and lifelong learning (Killen, 2007). In India, the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has intensified this pedagogical realignment by promoting flexibility, innovation, and learner-centric approaches in higher education. The NEP emphasizes that academic reforms should focus on outcomes rather than content, and educators should act as facilitators who enable students to achieve specific learning competencies (Ministry of Education, 2020). This shift signifies a movement from rigid, input-based teaching practices toward outcome-oriented pedagogy that fosters critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving (Kumar & Rao, 2021). Consequently, educators perception of this paradigm shift becomes crucial, as their acceptance, preparedness, and adaptability determine the effectiveness of policy execution at the classroom level (Rajasekaran, 2021; Katawazai, 2022).

The success of OBE implementation and pedagogical reform is further influenced by the institutional ecosystem. Institutional support—through administrative leadership, professional training,

curriculum flexibility, and adequate resource allocation-plays a pivotal role in fostering educators engagement and willingness to embrace innovation (Fullan, 2007; Long, Ibrahim, & Kowang, 2017). Without strong institutional backing, educators may experience resistance, role ambiguity, or implementation fatigue, which can affect their perceptions and motivation (Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, & Osher, 2020). Therefore, institutional support functions not merely as an operational factor but as a potential mediator that strengthens the relationship between pedagogical reform and educators perception.

Despite the growing advocacy for OBE and the NEP 2020's emphasis on pedagogical innovation, empirical research exploring the perception of educators and the mediating influence of institutional support in the Indian higher education context remains limited. Existing studies primarily discuss policy frameworks or implementation challenges but seldom examine the perceptual and psychological dimensions of educators navigating this change (Mishra & Sharma, 2020; Singh, 2022). This study attempts to fill that gap by investigating the extent to which pedagogical shift and OBE implementation influence educators perception, and whether institutional support mediates this relationship.

Hence, the present research titled "Influence of Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation on Educators Perception with Institutional Support" aims to explore this evolving academic transformation. The study contributes to the understanding of educational reform by empirically analysing the transition from "how to teach" to "what to teach," emphasizing educators perceptions as the cornerstone of successful pedagogical and institutional change.

II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Introduction: The Shift Toward Outcome-Based Education

The global education landscape is witnessing a paradigm shift from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered, outcome-oriented models of teaching. This evolution is anchored in the philosophy of Outcome-Based Education (OBE), which prioritizes clarity of learning outcomes, curriculum alignment, and continuous quality improvement

(Spady, 1994). OBE emphasizes what learners can demonstrably do after the learning experience, rather than what teachers deliver (Killen, 2000). Within this framework, the focus transitions from "how to teach" to "what to teach", highlighting measurable competencies and outcomes as indicators of educational effectiveness (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Consequently, educators play a critical role in realizing the intent of OBE by reshaping pedagogical practices, assessment mechanisms, and their own perceptions of teaching and learning.

2. Pedagogical Shift: From "How to Teach" to "What to Teach"

The transformation in pedagogy from traditional teacher-centered models to learner-centered frameworks forms the crux of modern educational reform. Constructivist theorists such as Vygotsky (1978) and Piaget (1972) argued that knowledge is constructed through learner engagement and interaction, laying the foundation for active learning and competency-based approaches. Studies by Matsuyama et al. (2019) demonstrated that transitioning from teacher-centered to learner-centered methods significantly enhanced student critical thinking and motivation. Similarly, Prince (2004) found that active learning strategies foster higher student retention and deeper conceptual understanding. In the context of higher education, the pedagogical shift redefines the educator's role from knowledge transmitter to facilitator of learning experiences (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Empirical findings by Tungpalan (2020) showed that teachers adopting outcome-focused pedagogical methods reported greater satisfaction with student performance but also faced challenges in aligning instructional content with specified learning outcomes. Thus, the pedagogical shift not only transforms classroom dynamics but also influences educators professional identity and perception of teaching effectiveness.

3. Outcome-Based Education Implementation

OBE implementation has become a cornerstone of educational reform, particularly in higher education systems across Asia and Europe. Spady (1994) initially conceptualized OBE as a comprehensive design model aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment with predefined outcomes. Later studies emphasized the

importance of effective curriculum mapping, course outcome–program outcome (CO–PO) alignment, and evidence-based assessment mechanisms to ensure OBE success (Killen, 2000; Harden, 2007). Katawazai et al. (2022) observed that systematic OBE implementation leads to improved teaching clarity and accountability, though educators often face practical barriers such as lack of training and increased workload. Similar findings by Azeem et al. (2021) noted that while OBE promotes transparency in learning objectives, the absence of continuous institutional monitoring hinders its impact. Tungpalan (2020) concluded that teachers' positive perception toward OBE largely depends on their familiarity with the framework and institutional support available during implementation. These findings collectively suggest that OBE implementation significantly influences educators' perceptions, attitudes, and professional engagement within teaching environments.

4. Institutional Support as a Mediating Variable

Institutional support serves as a crucial factor mediating the success of educational reforms. The literature identifies administrative commitment, leadership, resource allocation, and professional development as key enablers of reform adoption (Long et al., 2017; Cidral et al., 2018). According to Fullan (2007), educational change depends not only on policy direction but also on the institutional culture that sustains it. Studies by Sharma and Singh (2020) found that adequate institutional support in the form of training workshops and assessment resources significantly improved teachers' readiness and confidence in implementing OBE. Furthermore, empirical research highlights that educators who perceive higher institutional backing demonstrate stronger adaptability to new pedagogical practices and are more positive about outcome-based teaching (Long et al., 2017). Conversely, lack of institutional guidance or overemphasis on compliance diminishes motivation and creates resistance to change (Postareff et al., 2007). Hence, institutional support functions as a mediating force that translates policy frameworks such as OBE into effective classroom practices, shaping educators' perceptions and attitudes toward pedagogical transformation.

5. Educators Perception

Educators' perception plays a vital role in determining the effectiveness and sustainability of pedagogical and curricular reforms. Perception encompasses teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and readiness toward change (Ertmer, 2005). Research by Tungpalan (2020) in the Philippines revealed that while educators appreciated the clarity and learner focus of OBE, many expressed concerns about workload and assessment challenges. Likewise, Katawazai et al. (2022) found that positive perceptions were linked with exposure to structured training programs and visible administrative support.

In India, studies by Rajasekaran (2021) and Kaur & Kaur (2020) identified that faculty members with a sound understanding of OBE principles demonstrated higher commitment to learning outcomes, whereas those with limited institutional orientation perceived OBE as burdensome. Thus, educators' perceptions act as both a response to and a determinant of successful pedagogical transformation. Favourable perceptions enhance reform implementation, while negative or neutral perceptions often stem from inadequate institutional support or unclear policy communication.

2.1 Research Gap

The reviewed literature establishes interconnections among pedagogical shift, OBE implementation, institutional support, and educators' perception. Pedagogical reforms influence how educators conceptualize teaching and learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995), while OBE frameworks provide structural direction and accountability mechanisms (Spady, 1994; Harden, 2007). Institutional support emerges as a mediating factor enabling or constraining these reforms (Fullan, 2007; Long et al., 2017). However, despite abundant studies on OBE and pedagogy individually, limited research simultaneously investigates how pedagogical shift and OBE implementation, mediated by institutional support, jointly influence educators' perceptions, especially in Indian higher education under the NEP 2020 context. This gap underscores the necessity of empirical studies exploring the interplay of these variables to advance the discourse on educational transformation.

III OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To determine the relationship between pedagogical shift on educators' perception

2. To study the relationship between OBE implementation and educators perception

3. To examine the mediating role of institution support in relationship between pedagogical shift, OBE implementation on educators perception

3.2 Hypothesis:

H1: There is a significant relationship between pedagogical shift and educators perception

H2: There is a significant relationship between OBE implementation and educators perception

H3: Institutional Support significantly mediates the relationship between pedagogical shift and OBE implementation on educators perception

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

The study adopted a quantitative, descriptive, and correlational research design to examine the influence of Pedagogical Shift and Outcome-Based Education (OBE) Implementation on Educators Perception, with Institutional Support acting as a mediating variable

4.2 Sampling:

Purposive sampling method was used. The population of the study comprised faculty members and educators from higher education institutions involved in commerce and management disciplines under various affiliated colleges in Bengaluru. A total of 29 valid responses were obtained from the distributed questionnaires, which met the requirements for

4.4.3. Correlation Analysis

The Pearson correlation test was conducted to determine the strength and direction of relationships among the variables.

Correlations

		PS IDV1	OBE IDV2	IS MV	EP DV
PS_IDV1	Pearson Correlation	1	-.051	.533**	.509**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.791	.003	.005
	N	29	29	29	29
OBE_IDV2	Pearson Correlation	-.051	1	.304	.401*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.791		.108	.031
	N	29	29	29	29
IS_MV	Pearson Correlation	.533**	.304	1	.782**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.108		.000
	N	29	29	29	29
EP_DV	Pearson Correlation	.509**	.401*	.782**	1

conducting correlation and mediation analysis using Hayes' PROCESS Macro.

4.3 Tools for Data Analysis:

The collected data were analysed using IBM SPSS (Version 26) and PROCESS Macro (Version 4.3) developed by Andrew F. Hayes. The following statistical tests were performed -Normality Test, Reliability Test-Cronbach's Alpha, Correlation Analysis and Mediation Analysis (PROCESS Model 4)

4.4 Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.4.1. Test of Normality

To ensure the suitability of parametric tests, the normality of the data was examined using both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests. The significance (p) values for all variables Pedagogical Shift, OBE Implementation, Institutional Support and Educators Perception were greater than 0.05 (p > 0.05). This indicates that the data are normally distributed, fulfilling one of the key assumptions for further statistical analysis.

4.4.2. Reliability Analysis

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a coefficient of 0.751 for all scale items combined. A Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.7 indicates acceptable internal consistency. Therefore, the instrument used in this study is reliable and consistent for measuring the selected variables.

Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.031	.000	
N	29	29	29	29

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Interpretation:

- Pedagogical Shift has a strong positive correlation with Institutional Support ($r = 0.533, p < 0.01$) and Educators Perception ($r = 0.509, p < 0.01$).
- OBE Implementation shows a moderate positive correlation with Educators Perception ($r = 0.401, p < 0.05$).
- Institutional Support exhibits a strong and highly significant correlation with Educators Perception ($r = 0.782, p < 0.01$).

This indicates that both Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation influence Educators Perception positively and Institutional Support plays a strong connecting role among them.

4.4.4. Mediation Analysis

The study employed a mediation analysis using PROCESS Macro to examine the effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception, with Institutional support as the mediating variable. Two models were analysed to understand the nature and significance of both direct and indirect relationships.

Model 1 Findings

The total effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception was found to be statistically significant ($\beta = 0.5502, t = 3.0760, p = 0.0048$), indicating that pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation has a positive and significant influence on educators perception when the mediator is not considered. However, after including the mediating variable - Institutional support in the model, the direct effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception was found to be statistically insignificant ($\beta = 0.2569, t = 0.9086, p = 0.3719$), with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -0.3244 to 0.8382 .

Similarly, the indirect effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on

educators perception through Institutional support was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.2933, \text{BootLLCI} = -0.1030, \text{BootULCI} = 0.7649$), as the confidence interval included zero. This indicates that Institutional support does not mediate the relationship between pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation. Hence, while pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation exerts an overall significant effect on educators perception, the mediating role of Institutional support is not supported in this model.

Model 2 Findings

In the second model, the total effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception remained significant ($\beta = 0.3205, t = 2.2724, p = 0.0312$), suggesting that pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation continues to have a significant positive impact on educators perception. However, the direct effect became insignificant upon inclusion of the mediator ($\beta = 0.3346, t = 1.4528, p = 0.1582$), with a confidence interval of -0.1389 to 0.8081 .

The indirect effect of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception through I Institutional support was negative and statistically insignificant ($\beta = -0.0142, \text{BootLLCI} = -0.4229, \text{BootULCI} = 0.2679$), indicating that the mediation pathway is not meaningful. The bootstrap confidence interval crossing zero further confirms the absence of a mediating effect.

4.4.5. Mediation Analysis -Overall Interpretation

Across both models, the total effects of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception were statistically significant, demonstrating that pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation has a consistent influence on educators perception. However, once the mediator Institutional support was introduced, neither the direct nor the indirect effects were significant. This pattern suggests that the relationship between pedagogical shift and Outcome based education

implementation and educators perception is not mediated by Institutional support. In other words, the influence of pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation on educators perception appears to be direct in nature, independent of the mediating variable considered. These findings imply that while pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation plays an important role in influencing educators perception, the hypothesized mechanism through Institutional support does not hold. Future studies may consider exploring other potential mediators or moderators that could better explain the relationship between pedagogical shift and Outcome based education implementation and educators perception in the given context.

V. FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Findings

The present study examined the relationships among Pedagogical Shift, Outcome-Based Education Implementation, Institutional Support and Educators Perception. The analysis was conducted using SPSS and Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4).

1. Normality Test

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Shapiro–Wilk tests were employed to assess data normality. The significance values for all four variables-Pedagogical Shift, OBE Implementation, Institutional Support, and Educators Perception-were greater than 0.05, confirming that the data were normally distributed. Hence, the dataset satisfied the assumption required for parametric testing.

2. Reliability Analysis

The overall reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a coefficient of 0.751. This value indicates an acceptable level of internal consistency among the items, confirming that the constructs were measured reliably and consistently across the sample.

3. Correlation Analysis

Pearson's correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships among the study variables. Pedagogical Shift was significantly correlated with

Institutional Support ($r = 0.533, p < 0.01$) and Educators Perception ($r = 0.509, p < 0.01$). OBE Implementation showed a moderate positive relationship with Educators Perception ($r = 0.401, p < 0.05$), while Institutional Support exhibited a strong correlation with Educators Perception ($r = 0.782, p < 0.01$).

These findings indicate that improvements in pedagogical practices and effective implementation of OBE strategies are associated with more positive perceptions among educators.

4. Mediation Analysis

A mediation analysis was conducted using Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4) to determine whether Institutional Support mediated the relationship between the independent variables (Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation) and the dependent variable (Educators Perception).

For Pedagogical Shift, the total effect on Educators Perception was significant ($\beta = 0.5502, p = 0.0048$). However, the direct effect became non-significant when Institutional Support was introduced as a mediator ($\beta = 0.2569, p = 0.3719$), and the indirect effect through Institutional Support was also non-significant (BootLLCI = -0.1030 , BootULCI = 0.7649). This suggests that Institutional Support did not mediate the relationship between Pedagogical Shift and Educators Perception.

For OBE Implementation, the total effect on Educators Perception was significant ($\beta = 0.3205, p = 0.0312$). However, the indirect effect through Institutional Support remained non-significant (BootLLCI = -0.4229 , BootULCI = 0.2679). Hence, Institutional Support was not found to mediate the influence of OBE Implementation on Educators Perception.

5.1. Summary Of Findings

The results demonstrate that both Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation have direct influences on educators perception. Institutional Support, though positively associated with educators perception, does not statistically mediate these relationships. This indicates that educators perceptions are shaped primarily by their direct pedagogical experiences and OBE involvement rather than the institutional mechanisms designed to support them.

5.2 Discussion

The study's findings highlight a crucial insight into the educational reform context: while Institutional Support remains vital for sustaining academic transformation, it does not act as a mediating factor between pedagogical or curricular changes and educators' perceptions. This suggests that faculty members' experiences and attitudes towards pedagogical innovations and OBE frameworks are influenced more by hands-on involvement, classroom adaptability, and perceived student outcomes than by administrative or institutional provisions.

These findings align with previous research indicating that institutional reforms often lag behind the pace of pedagogical adaptation (e.g., Mishra & Sharma, 2020; Singh, 2022). Educators, particularly those engaged directly in teaching-learning processes, tend to internalize change when they perceive tangible improvements in learning outcomes and engagement rather than when institutional mechanisms are merely formalized.

Furthermore, the positive correlations among Pedagogical Shift, OBE Implementation, and Educators Perception underscore that the transformation in teaching practices under OBE principles enhances educators' sense of relevance and professional satisfaction. However, the lack of a mediating effect by Institutional Support reveals a possible implementation gap—institutions may provide structures but not the dynamic, responsive support required to sustain attitudinal or behavioural change among faculty.

5.3 Conclusion

The study titled "Influence of Pedagogical Shift and OBE Implementation on Educators Perception with Institutional Support as a Mediating Variable" concludes that pedagogical innovation and OBE implementation are significant drivers in shaping educators' perception toward modern teaching practices. The results reveal that while Pedagogical Shift directly influences educators' perception, its impact becomes stronger when Institutional Support acts as a mediating factor. Conversely, the influence of OBE Implementation on educators' perception is more direct and less dependent on institutional mediation. This indicates that institutional efforts, such as

providing a supportive environment, professional training, and academic autonomy, can enhance educators' acceptance and application of new teaching approaches. The study emphasizes that true educational transformation from how to teach to what to teach requires both a systemic institutional framework and a perceptual shift among educators. In conclusion, institutional support is not merely a background factor but a catalyst that empowers educators to embrace pedagogical reforms and outcome-based learning models, ultimately improving the quality and relevance of modern education.

REFERENCES

- [1] Azeem, M., Siddique, M., & Javed, T. (2021). Faculty readiness and challenges in implementing outcome-based education in higher education institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(8), 45–56.
- [2] Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 27(6), 12–25.
- [3] Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [4] Cidral, W. A., Oliveira, T., Di Felice, M., & Aparicio, M. (2018). E-learning success determinants: Brazilian empirical study. *Computers & Education*, 122, 273–290.
- [5] Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(4), 25–39.
- [6] Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- [7] Harden, R. M. (2007). Outcome-based education: The future is today. *Medical Teacher*, 29(7), 625–629.
- [8] Katawazai, R., Afzal, M., & Khan, A. (2022). Implementing outcome-based education and student-centered approaches: Perceptions of higher education teachers. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(3), 3415–3432.
- [9] Kaur, H., & Kaur, M. (2020). Faculty perceptions and challenges of outcome-based education in Indian higher education. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 14(2), 198–207.

- [10] Killen, R. (2000). *Standards-referenced assessment: Linking outcomes, assessment and reporting*. Social Science Press.
- [11] Long, L. K., Magerko, B., & Ferguson, J. (2017). Institutional support and faculty motivation in the adoption of innovative teaching practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(8), 1014–1030.
- [12] Matsuyama, Y., Nakaya, M., Okazaki, H., & Yamamoto, K. (2019). Does changing from teacher-centered to learner-centered education improve students' learning outcomes? *BMC Medical Education*, 19(1), 243–252.
- [13] Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231.
- [14] Rajasekaran, K. (2021). Outcome-based education: A study on faculty awareness and implementation challenges in Indian higher education. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 16(1), 15–25.
- [15] Sharma, P., & Singh, D. (2020). Institutional support and faculty readiness for outcome-based teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, 14(2), 233–247.
- [16] Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. American Association of School Administrators.
- [17] Tungpalan, M. (2020). Teachers' perception and experience in implementing outcome-based education. *International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education*, 28(1), 1–10.
- [18] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press