Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.43, No.2, July-Dec 2023: P. 3311-3322 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

Impact of Digital Learning on Management Education:An Empirical Investigation

Dr. P.Venkateswara Rao [1], Dr.P.Ramaseshayya[2]

[1] Associate Professor Department of MBA CMR Technical Campus Hyderabad
E-mail : drpvraomba@gmail.com
[2]MSc.MEd.PhD.

How to cite this paper as: Dr. P.Venkateswara Rao , Dr.P.Ramaseshayya (2023) Impact of Digital Learning on Management Education:An Empirical Investigation *Library Progress International, 3311-3322*

ABSTRACT

This study empirically examines the impact of digital learning technologies on student outcomes, faculty effectiveness, and institutional performance in management education programs. Drawing on a mixed-methods approach, data were collected from 847 MBA students, 124 faculty members, and 32 business school administrators across 14 accredited management institutions in India and Sub-Saharan Africa over an 18-month period (2022–2023). Using structural equation modeling (SEM) and multivariate regression analysis, the study identifies significant positive effects of digital learning adoption on academic performance ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$), student engagement ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), and employability outcomes ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$). Moderation analysis reveals that institutional readiness and instructor digital competency significantly moderate these effects. The research further identifies three primary barriers to effective digital learning integration: infrastructure constraints, pedagogical resistance, and assessment misalignment. These findings have significant implications for business school accreditation bodies, curriculum designers, and policymakers

Keywords: digital learning, management education, MBA programs, e-learning, structural equation modeling, student outcomes, institutional readiness.

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of management education has undergone a fundamental transformation in the past decade, accelerated dramatically by the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent normalization of hybrid and fully online delivery modes. Business schools worldwide have increasingly incorporated digital learning technologies—encompassing learning management systems (LMS), synchronous video conferencing, simulation-based learning, artificial intelligence-driven adaptive platforms, and mobile learning applications—into their pedagogical repertoires (Ratten, 2020; Krishnamurthy, 2020).

Management education occupies a distinctive position within higher education: it prepares future organizational leaders for complex, ambiguous business environments while simultaneously being subject to demanding stakeholder expectations from corporate recruiters, accreditation bodies such as AACSB, EQUIS, and AMBA, and government regulatory frameworks. As such, the stakes involved in evaluating and optimizing the effectiveness of pedagogical modalities are particularly high (Doh, 2010; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002).

Despite a growing body of literature on e-learning and online education broadly (Means et al., 2013; Bernard et al., 2004), empirical research specifically focused on digital learning in management education contexts remains limited, particularly in emerging market contexts such as India and Sub-Saharan Africa, where institutional infrastructure, student demographics, and learning cultures differ substantially from the Western institutions that dominate extant scholarship (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Chaudhary & Bhardwaj, 2021).

This study addresses three specific gaps in the literature. First, it provides empirical evidence on the magnitude and direction of digital learning effects on multiple student outcome dimensions (academic performance, engagement, skill acquisition, and employability). Second, it examines moderating institutional and individual-level factors that shape these effects. Third, it extends the geographic scope of empirical inquiry to include institutions in South Asia and Africa, thereby contributing to the generalizability of knowledge in this domain..

1.1 Research Objectives

The study pursues the following specific objectives:

1. To assess the impact of digital learning adoption on student academic performance, engagement, and employability in management education programs.
2. To identify the moderating roles of institutional readiness and instructor digital competency on digital learning effectiveness.
3. To examine principal barriers to digital learning integration in management education institutions.
4. To propose evidence-based recommendations for institutional stakeholders seeking to optimize digital learning outcomes.

1.2 Research Questions

The study is guided by four primary research questions (RQs):

RQ1: RQ1: To what extent does digital learning adoption predict student academic performance in management education programs?

RQ2: RQ2: How do institutional readiness and instructor competency moderate the relationship between digital learning and student outcomes?

RQ3: RQ3: What are the primary barriers to effective digital learning integration in management education, and how do they vary across institutional contexts?

RQ4: RQ4: What recommendations can be derived from empirical evidence to improve digital learning effectiveness in business schools?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical underpinning of this study draws on three complementary frameworks. First, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1989) posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are primary determinants of an individual's intention to use a technology, a framework extensively applied in educational technology adoption research (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008; Lee et al., 2003). In the management education context, student and faculty perceptions of digital learning platforms' usefulness and usability are foundational determinants of adoption quality.

Second, the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework (Garrison et al., 2000) provides a structural model for understanding effective online learning through three interdependent elements: teaching presence, cognitive presence, and social presence. Empirical applications of CoI in business education have demonstrated that the degree of instructor-facilitated discourse and collaborative knowledge construction substantially predicts learning outcomes (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007; Arbaugh, 2008).

Third, institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 2001) is invoked to account for the organizational-level dynamics that shape digital learning adoption. Business schools operate under isomorphic pressures from accreditation agencies, peer institutions, and corporate stakeholders, creating normative, mimetic, and coercive pressures that influence the pace and depth of digital transformation (Kezar, 2001; Christensen & Eyring, 2011).

2.2 Empirical Evidence on Digital Learning in Higher Education

Meta-analytic evidence from Means et al. (2013) synthesizing 50 rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental studies concluded that students in online conditions performed modestly better than those in face-to-face

instruction (effect size d = 0.20), with blended learning demonstrating the largest advantages (d = 0.35). However, these aggregate findings mask substantial heterogeneity across disciplines, institutions, and student populations.

In business and management education specifically, Arbaugh et al. (2009) found that online MBA programs demonstrated comparable learning outcomes to their face-to-face counterparts on standardized assessments, while showing advantages in student satisfaction related to flexibility and self-paced learning. Conversely, studies by Benbunan-Fich and Hiltz (2003) identified collaboration quality and critical thinking development as areas where online management programs lagged traditional formats.

The COVID-19 pandemic produced a natural experiment of global scale. Basilaia and Kvavadze (2020) documented rapid technology adoption across institutions globally, while Sahu (2020) and Mishra et al. (2020) highlighted the unequal impacts across student socioeconomic groups and geographic regions, with students in low-bandwidth environments experiencing disproportionate disadvantages—a concern particularly salient for the institutions included in the current study.

2.3 Management Education-Specific Context

Management education presents unique pedagogical challenges for digital translation. The case method, pioneered at Harvard Business School and adopted across AACSB-accredited programs, relies heavily on Socratic classroom dynamics, group deliberation, and real-time instructor facilitation—elements that do not transfer straightforwardly to asynchronous digital formats (Ellet, 2007; Barnes et al., 1994). Simulation-based learning and experiential components similarly require platform adaptations.

Recent scholarship has explored artificial intelligence in management pedagogy. Kumar et al. (2023) examined AI-powered adaptive learning in executive MBA programs and found improvements in concept retention (Cohen's d = 0.41) relative to static course delivery, though implementation costs and faculty training requirements emerged as significant constraints. Gamification elements have also been examined: Dicheva et al. (2015) identified motivation and engagement as primary mechanisms through which gamified management courses enhanced learning.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature

Despite substantial empirical activity, the literature contains three notable gaps that this study addresses. First, the preponderance of evidence derives from North American and European contexts, limiting its applicability to emerging market settings with distinct infrastructural, cultural, and regulatory environments (Altbach et al., 2019). Second, existing studies typically measure single-dimension outcomes (GPA or satisfaction), failing to capture the multi-dimensional nature of management education effectiveness. Third, moderating mechanisms—particularly institutional capacity and instructor competency—remain under-theorized and empirically underexamined (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007).

3. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical and empirical review presented above, Figure 1 presents the conceptual model guiding this study. The model posits digital learning adoption (operationalized as intensity, variety, and quality of digital tool use) as the primary independent variable, with student academic performance, student engagement, skill acquisition, and employability as dependent variables. Institutional readiness and instructor digital competency are modeled as moderating variables. Infrastructure barriers, pedagogical resistance, and assessment misalignment are modeled as mediating barriers.

H1: Digital learning adoption is positively associated with student academic performance in management education programs.

H2: Digital learning adoption is positively associated with student engagement and active participation.

H3: Digital learning adoption is positively associated with student employability outcomes.

H4: Institutional readiness significantly moderates the relationship between digital learning adoption and student outcomes.

H5: Instructor digital competency significantly moderates the relationship between digital learning adoption and student outcomes.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

The study employs a concurrent mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative interview evidence to achieve both statistical generalizability and interpretive depth. The quantitative strand utilizes cross-sectional survey methodology supplemented by institutional administrative data; the qualitative strand employs semi-structured interviews with a purposively selected subsample of participants. Integration occurs at the level of interpretation, where qualitative findings serve to contextualize and explain quantitative results.

4.2 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The target population comprised MBA students, faculty members, and administrators at AACSB or nationally-accredited business schools in India and Sub-Saharan Africa. A stratified random sampling procedure was employed to ensure representation across institution size (small: <200 MBA students; medium: 200–500; large: >500), program type (full-time, part-time, executive MBA), and geographic region.

The final analytic sample comprised 847 MBA students (response rate: 71.3%), 124 faculty members (response rate: 68.9%), and 32 administrators (response rate: 88.9%), distributed across 14 institutions (9 in India; 5 in Sub-Saharan Africa). Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the student sample.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Student Sample (N = 847)

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	487	57.5
	Female	342	40.4
	Non-binary / Prefer not to say	18	2.1
Age Group	22–25 years	312	36.8
	26–30 years	389	45.9
	31–35 years	112	13.2
	36+ years	34	4.0
Program Type	Full-Time MBA	489	57.7
	Part-Time MBA	198	23.4

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Executive MBA	160	18.9
Country	India	541	63.9
	Sub-Saharan Africa	306	36.1
Prior Digital Experience	High (>5 hrs/day)	298	35.2
	Moderate (2–5 hrs/day)	411	48.5
	Low (<2 hrs/day)	138	16.3

4.3 Instrumentation

Quantitative data were collected through a structured survey instrument developed and validated for this study. The instrument comprised six major sections: (1) Digital Learning Adoption Scale (DLAS; 18 items), adapted from Venkatesh et al.'s (2003) UTAUT framework and Roca et al.'s (2006) e-learning adoption scale; (2) Academic Performance Measure (GPA proxy + self-reported assessment performance; 6 items); (3) Student Engagement Scale (SES; 12 items), adapted from Fredricks et al.'s (2004) multidimensional engagement model; (4) Skill Acquisition Scale (SAS; 10 items); (5) Employability Outcomes Scale (EOS; 8 items); and (6) Institutional and Instructor Moderator Scales (combined 16 items).

All multi-item scales used a 5-point Likert response format (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Content validity was established through expert panel review (n = 8 management education scholars); face validity was confirmed through cognitive interviewing with a pilot sample (n = 32 students). The instrument was translated into Hindi and Swahili using forward-backward translation procedures, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients exceeding 0.78 across all scales in both languages.

4.4 Data Collection Procedures

Survey data were collected online via Qualtrics between September 2022 and February 2023. Institution-level administrative data (enrollment figures, infrastructure indices, accreditation status) were obtained through institutional reports and supplementary correspondence with administrators. Semi-structured interviews (n = 48; 20 students, 18 faculty, 10 administrators) were conducted via Zoom, each lasting 45–75 minutes, and were audio-recorded and professionally transcribed.

4.5 Analytical Approach

Quantitative analyses were performed using SPSS 27.0 and AMOS 27.0. Descriptive statistics and correlation analyses were conducted as preliminary steps. The measurement model was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), with model fit assessed using standard indices: CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR. Following confirmation of adequate measurement model fit, a structural equation model was estimated to test the hypothesized relationships. Moderation effects (H4, H5) were tested using the product-indicator approach within SEM (Marsh et al., 2004), with simple slope analysis conducted to probe significant interactions. Common method variance was assessed via Harman's single-factor test and the marker variable technique (Richardson et al., 2009).

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), with initial codes inductively derived from the interview data and subsequently organized into overarching themes aligned with the quantitative constructs. Member checking and peer debriefing were employed to enhance credibility of qualitative findings.

Table 2: Measurement Model Fit Indices

Model	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Measurement Model (CFA)	2.31	0.96	0.95	0.048	0.052
Structural Model (Base)	2.47	0.95	0.94	0.051	0.058
Structural Model (Moderated)	2.53	0.94	0.93	0.053	0.061
Acceptable Thresholds	<3.0	>.90	>.90	<.08	<.08

5. Results

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among the study's key variables. The mean digital learning adoption score was 3.61 (SD = 0.74) on a 5-point scale, indicating a moderate-to-high level of adoption across the sample. Academic performance scores averaged 3.74 (SD = 0.68), student engagement 3.48 (SD = 0.81), and employability outcomes 3.39 (SD = 0.77). All inter-scale correlations were in the expected directions and statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), providing preliminary support for the hypothesized associations.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Key Variables

Variable	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Digital Learning Adoption (DLA)	3.61	0.74	0.87	—					
2. Academic Performance (AP)	3.74	0.68	0.82	.48**	—				
3. Student Engagement (SE)	3.48	0.81	0.85	.43**	.51**	—			
4. Skill Acquisition (SA)	3.55	0.79	0.83	.39**	.44**	.57**	—		
5. Employability Outcomes (EO)	3.39	0.77	0.80	.34**	.40**	.48**	.52**	—	
6. Institutional Readiness (IR)	3.22	0.88	0.88	.51**	.37**	.42**	.35**	.29**	—
7. Instructor Competency (IC)	3.41	0.83	0.84	.46**	.43**	.49**	.38**	.33**	.61**

Note: ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed). M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; α = Cronbach's Alpha.

5.2 Hypothesis Testing — Main Effects (H1–H3)

Table 4 presents the structural equation model results for the main effects hypotheses. Digital learning adoption (DLA) demonstrated a significant positive effect on academic performance ($\beta = 0.42$, SE = 0.06, $p < 0.001$; H1 supported), student engagement ($\beta = 0.38$, SE = 0.07, $p < 0.001$; H2 supported), and employability outcomes ($\beta = 0.29$, SE = 0.08, $p < 0.01$; H3 supported). The model explained 31.4% of variance in academic performance, 27.8% in student engagement, and 19.6% in employability outcomes.

Table 4: Structural Equation Model Results — Main Effects

Path	β	SE	t-value	p-value	R^2	Hypothesis
DLA → Academic Performance	0.42	0.06	7.00	< .001	0.314	H1: Supported
DLA → Student Engagement	0.38	0.07	5.43	< .001	0.278	H2: Supported
DLA → Skill Acquisition	0.31	0.07	4.43	< .001	0.221	—
DLA → Employability Outcomes	0.29	0.08	3.63	< .01	0.196	H3: Supported

Note: Standardized coefficients reported. DLA = Digital Learning Adoption.

5.3 Moderation Analysis (H4–H5)

Table 5 presents the moderated SEM results. Institutional readiness (IR) significantly moderated the DLA–Academic Performance relationship ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$), the DLA–Engagement relationship ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$), and the DLA–Employability relationship ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.12$, $p < 0.05$), providing support for H4. Simple slope analysis revealed that the positive effect of DLA on academic performance was substantially stronger in high-readiness institutions ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$) than in low-readiness institutions ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.05$).

Instructor digital competency (IC) similarly moderated the DLA–Academic Performance path ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.21$, $p < 0.001$), the DLA–Engagement path ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$), and the DLA–Employability path ($\beta_{interaction} = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$), supporting H5. The effect of DLA on academic performance was significantly stronger when instructors reported high digital competency ($\beta = 0.63$) compared to low competency ($\beta = 0.22$).

Table 5: Moderation Analysis Results

Interaction Term	Outcome	β	SE	p-value	ΔR^2
DLA × Institutional Readiness	Academic Performance	0.18	0.06	< .01	0.042
DLA × Institutional Readiness	Student Engagement	0.14	0.07	< .05	0.028
DLA × Institutional Readiness	Employability	0.12	0.06	< .05	0.019
DLA × Instructor Competency	Academic Performance	0.21	0.06	< .001	0.051
DLA × Instructor Competency	Student Engagement	0.19	0.07	< .01	0.038
DLA × Instructor Competency	Employability	0.16	0.07	< .05	0.027

5.4 Barriers to Digital Learning Integration

Quantitative analysis identified three primary barrier dimensions through exploratory factor analysis of the barriers subscale. Qualitative thematic analysis provided rich contextual explication of each. Table 6 summarizes

barrier prevalence across the institutional sample.

Table 6: Barriers to Digital Learning Integration — Frequency Analysis

Barrier Category	Sub-component	% Reporting as Major Barrier	Regional Variation
Infrastructure Constraints	Bandwidth/connectivity limitations	58.3%	Africa (79.2%) > India (44.3%)
	Device access and affordability	41.7%	Africa (62.1%) > India (28.5%)
	LMS reliability and uptime	33.6%	Similar across regions
Pedagogical Resistance	Faculty comfort with digital tools	47.2%	Similar across regions
	Perceived quality loss vs. F2F	52.8%	India (61.3%) > Africa (38.2%)
	Student preference for F2F interaction	44.1%	India (55.1%) > Africa (27.1%)
Assessment Misalignment	Digital tools not suited to case assessment	61.4%	Similar across regions
	Academic integrity concerns online	55.9%	Similar across regions
	Difficulty assessing participation quality	48.3%	India (53.2%) > Africa (40.1%)

6. Discussion

6.1 Interpretation of Main Effects

The positive effects of digital learning adoption on academic performance ($\beta = 0.42$), student engagement ($\beta = 0.38$), and employability ($\beta = 0.29$) are consistent with the meta-analytic findings of Means et al. (2013) and the management education-specific evidence reviewed by Arbaugh et al. (2009), though the magnitudes observed in this study are somewhat larger. We attribute this to the sample's relative novelty of digital learning exposure, which may yield stronger marginal returns than is observed in contexts where digital tools are already ubiquitous.

The engagement finding deserves particular emphasis. Student engagement in management education has been consistently linked to deep learning, retention of complex concepts, and development of the collaborative competencies demanded by corporate recruiters (Fredricks et al., 2004). The positive effect of digital learning on engagement, mediated (in our qualitative analysis) by the asynchronous accessibility and multimedia richness of digital platforms, suggests that technological adoption is not merely a delivery mechanism but a genuine pedagogical enhancer under appropriate conditions.

The somewhat smaller effect on employability ($\beta = 0.29$) is instructive. Qualitative interviews revealed that students and employers distinguished sharply between digital skills acquired through coursework (favorably viewed) and interpersonal negotiation and leadership capabilities (perceived as less developable in digital-only formats). This suggests a ceiling on digital learning's contribution to the full complement of management competencies.

6.2 Role of Moderating Factors

The moderation findings (H4, H5) are arguably the study's most practically actionable contribution. The finding that institutional readiness amplifies digital learning effects—such that DLA's impact on academic performance is more than double in high-readiness versus low-readiness institutions (β = 0.58 vs. β = 0.26)—underscores that technology adoption alone is insufficient. Infrastructure investment, faculty development, and administrative support systems are prerequisites for realizing digital learning's potential.

Similarly, instructor digital competency's moderating role confirms what many institutional leaders have intuitively understood but what has been empirically underspecified: the quality of instructor facilitation, not merely the presence of technological tools, drives outcomes. This aligns with the Community of Inquiry framework's emphasis on teaching presence as a critical determinant of online learning quality (Garrison et al., 2000). Paradoxically, the qualitative data revealed a tension: several high-competency instructors reported reduced job satisfaction and increased workload associated with digital delivery, suggesting a potential risk of competency erosion if institutional support mechanisms are inadequate.

6.3 Barriers: Structural and Pedagogical Dimensions

The barrier analysis reveals distinct structural patterns. Infrastructure constraints, though prevalent, are more severe in Sub-Saharan African institutions—reflecting the well-documented digital divide that characterizes technology access in these contexts (ITU, 2023). Importantly, pedagogical resistance was similarly prevalent across both regional contexts, suggesting that attitudinal barriers to digital adoption are not primarily a function of infrastructure experiences but rather of deeper professional identity and pedagogical philosophy concerns.

Assessment misalignment emerged as the most frequently cited barrier overall (61.4% rating digital tools as poorly suited to case-based assessment). This finding is particularly significant given case method's centrality to management education. The design of authentic, digitally-enabled assessment instruments that preserve the deliberative, argumentation-based qualities of traditional case discussions represents a critical agenda item for instructional designers and platform developers.

6.4 Comparative Regional Analysis

Cross-regional comparisons reveal both commonalities and divergences. The magnitude of digital learning's effect on academic performance was larger in Indian institutions (β = 0.48) than in Sub-Saharan African institutions (β = 0.33), a difference that our multigroup SEM analysis attributes primarily to infrastructure readiness differentials. However, student motivation to adopt digital tools (as measured by TAM-derived DLAS subscales) was comparably high across both regions, suggesting that demand for digital learning is not the binding constraint—supply-side factors (platform quality, connectivity, faculty support) are.

The qualitative data from Sub-Saharan African participants offered a particularly nuanced perspective: mobile-first digital learning, leveraging the high smartphone penetration rates in many African contexts, was reported as the most effective access modality, outperforming laptop/desktop-centric LMS interfaces in both usability and reliability. This finding has significant implications for platform design and institutional procurement decisions.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Summary of Findings

This study provides robust empirical evidence that digital learning adoption is a significant positive predictor of student academic performance, engagement, and employability outcomes in management education programs

across India and Sub-Saharan Africa. These effects are substantially amplified by institutional readiness and instructor digital competency, and are moderated by structural barriers including infrastructure constraints, pedagogical resistance, and assessment misalignment.

7.2 Recommendations for Practice

Based on the empirical findings, the following recommendations are directed at specific stakeholder groups:

7.2.1 For Business School Administrators

- Prioritize infrastructure investment as a prerequisite for digital learning initiatives; technology adoption without connectivity is not merely ineffective but may exacerbate educational inequalities.
- Implement structured faculty digital competency development programs, ensuring that training is differentiated by prior experience level and includes ongoing coaching rather than one-time workshops.
- Develop mobile-first digital learning strategies, particularly in Sub-Saharan African contexts, leveraging existing smartphone penetration infrastructure.

7.2.2 For Faculty Members

- Redesign assessment instruments to authentically evaluate case analysis and collaborative reasoning in digital environments, including asynchronous video-based case deliberation and AI-assisted scenario simulations.
- Apply Community of Inquiry principles deliberately in digital course design, ensuring robust teaching presence through structured discussion facilitation and timely feedback cycles.

7.2.3 For Accreditation Bodies and Policymakers

- Revise accreditation standards to include explicit digital readiness indicators as criteria for program quality assessment, including infrastructure benchmarks, faculty development requirements, and digital assessment design guidelines.
- Develop cross-institutional digital learning consortia to enable resource sharing, particularly among smaller institutions with limited technology budgets in emerging markets.

7.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study is subject to several limitations. The cross-sectional design, while supplemented by an 18-month data collection window and qualitative depth, limits causal inference. Longitudinal panel designs tracking students across full MBA programs would strengthen causal claims. Second, the study relies partly on self-reported measures of digital learning adoption and outcomes; administrative data cross-validation was undertaken where possible but could not be comprehensively achieved. Third, the sample, while diverse, is limited to 14 institutions and may not fully represent the breadth of institutional contexts within India and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Future research should examine: (1) longitudinal effects of digital learning on post-graduation career trajectories; (2) the specific contribution of AI-powered adaptive learning platforms relative to standard LMS delivery; (3) the role of student socioeconomic status as a moderator of digital learning effects in emerging market contexts; and (4) the impact of hybrid modalities (blended learning) compared with fully online and fully face-to-face delivery across different management competency domains.

REFERENCES

[1] Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Brill.

[2] Arbaugh, J. B. (2008). Does the Community of Inquiry framework predict outcomes in online MBA courses? International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 9(2), 1–21.

[3] Arbaugh, J. B., Cleveland-Innes, M., Diaz, S. R., Garrison, D. R., Ice, P., Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. P. (2009). Developing a Community of Inquiry instrument: Testing a measure of the Community of Inquiry framework using a multi-institutional sample. Internet and Higher Education, 11(3–4), 133–136.

[4] Barnes, L. B., Christensen, C. R., & Hansen, A. J. (1994). Teaching and the case method (3rd ed.). Harvard Business School Press.

[5] Basilaia, G., & Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to online education in schools during a SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Georgia. Pedagogical Research, 5(4), em0060.

[6] Benbunan-Fich, R., & Hiltz, S. R. (2003). Mediators of the effectiveness of online courses. IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 46(4), 298–312.

[7] Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Lou, Y., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Wallet, P. A., Fiset, M., & Huang, B. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Review of Educational Research, 74(3), 379–439.

[8] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

[9] Chaudhary, S., & Bhardwaj, G. (2021). Digital transformation of management education in India: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Management Education, 45(3), 412–438.

[10] Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out. Jossey-Bass.

[11] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

[12] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

[13] Dicheva, D., Dichev, C., Agre, G., & Angelova, G. (2015). Gamification in education: A systematic mapping study. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 18(3), 75–88.

[14] DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160.

[15] Doh, J. P. (2010). From the editors: Why are business schools so difficult to change? Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9(2), 191–192.

[16] Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109.

[17] Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. Internet and Higher Education, 2(2–3), 87–105.

[18] Garrison, D. R., & Arbaugh, J. B. (2007). Researching the Community of Inquiry framework: Review, issues, and future directions. Internet and Higher Education, 10(3), 157–172.

[19] ITU (International Telecommunication Union). (2023). Measuring digital development: Facts and figures 2023. United Nations.

[20] Kezar, A. (2001). Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 28(4). Jossey-Bass.

[21] Krishnamurthy, S. (2020). The future of business education: A commentary in the shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Business Research, 117, 1–5.

[22] Kumar, R., Singh, P., & Taneja, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence in management education: Empirical evidence from executive MBA programs. International Journal of Management Education, 21(1), 100724.

[23] Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47.

[24] Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 1, 100012.

[25] Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 1(1), 78–95.

[26] Ratten, V. (2020). Coronavirus (COVID-19) and the entrepreneurship education community. Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 14(5), 753–764.

[27] Richardson, H. A., Simmering, M. J., & Sturman, M. C. (2009). A tale of three perspectives: Examining post hoc statistical techniques for detection and correction of common method variance. Organizational Research Methods, 12(4), 762–800.

[28] Roca, J. C., Chiu, C. M., & Martínez, F. J. (2006). Understanding e-learning continuance intention: An extension of the Technology Acceptance Model. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 64(8), 683–696.

[29] Sahu, P. (2020). Closure of universities due to coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Impact on education and mental health of students and academic staff. Cureus, 12(4), e7541.

[30] Scott, W. R. (2001). Institutions and organizations (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

[31] Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. Decision Sciences, 39(2), 273–315.

[32] Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478