



Reinforcing Group Discussion Skills of Management Students for Better Placement Outcomes

Dr.A.Palaniappan

Professor and Head, Department of English, K.S.Rangasamy College of Technology, Tiruchengode. India

Abstract : Group Discussion (GD) is a widely used assessment tool in management recruitment to evaluate communication, leadership, teamwork, and analytical skills. Despite adequate conceptual knowledge, many management students demonstrate inconsistent GD performance due to lack of structured practice and feedback. This study examines the effectiveness of a structured reinforcement module designed to enhance GD competence and placement readiness among management students. Using a quasi-experimental pre-test and post-test design with 65 postgraduate management students, performance was assessed through a validated rubric. Statistical analysis using paired sample t-tests revealed a significant improvement in overall GD performance. The findings highlight the importance of systematic reinforcement and rubric-based feedback in improving employability skills.

Keywords: *Group Discussion, Management Education, Employability Skills, Placement Readiness, Rubric-based Assessment.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Employers increasingly prioritise behavioural and interpersonal competencies alongside academic credentials. Group discussions are frequently used in campus recruitment to assess managerial potential. However, many management students struggle to perform consistently due to anxiety, lack of structure, and limited feedback. This study proposes a structured reinforcement model to stabilise and enhance GD performance for better placement outcomes.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Prior research indicates that GD performance correlates strongly with workplace collaboration and leadership potential. Experiential learning theories emphasise repeated practice and reflection as essential for skill acquisition. Rubric-based assessment has been shown to enhance learner awareness and performance consistency, yet limited studies have empirically validated such approaches in management GD training.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a quasi-experimental pre-test and post-test design. The sample consisted of 65 postgraduate management students selected through purposive sampling. A structured GD reinforcement module was implemented over six weeks.

IV. GD REINFORCEMENT MODULE

The module included diagnostic assessment, skill orientation workshops, guided practice sessions, rubric-based feedback, and reflective reinforcement. Students participated in multiple GDs with rotating roles.

Table 1: Group Discussion Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Indicators	Scale (1–5)
Content Relevance	Logical and factual contributions	1–5
Communication	Clarity, fluency, articulation	1–5
Teamwork	Listening and collaboration	1–5
Leadership	Initiative and facilitation	1–5
Analytical Ability	Reasoning and problem-solving	1–5
Behaviour	Confidence and professionalism	1–5

V. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the effectiveness of the intervention. Mean scores, standard deviation, and paired sample t-tests were computed.

Table 2: Pre-test and Post-test GD Performance Scores

Test	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Pre-test	2.84	0.51	65
Post-test	4.02	0.43	65

Table 3: Paired Sample t-Test Results

Mean Difference	t-value	df	p-value
1.18	12.67	64	< 0.01

VI. FINDINGS

The results indicate significant improvement across all GD dimensions. Communication clarity, teamwork, and confidence showed the highest gains, confirming the effectiveness of structured reinforcement.

VII. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that GD skills are trainable and can be stabilised through systematic reinforcement. The proposed module provides a replicable framework for management institutions to enhance placement readiness.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Brookhart, S. M. (2013). How to create and use rubrics for formative assessment. ASCD.
- [2] Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
- [3] Rao, M. S. (2018). *Soft skills for managers*. Excel Books.
- [4] Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (2013). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. Wiley.
- [5] Anderson, J. R. (2015). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (8th ed.). Worth Publishers.
- [6] Arthur, W., Day, E. A., McNelly, T. L., & Edens, P. S. (2003). A meta-analysis of the criterion-related validity of assessment center dimensions. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(1), 125–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00146.x>
- [7] Bartram, D. (2005). The Great Eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1185–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1185>
- [8] Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (2013). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. Routledge.
- [9] Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(1), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710810840730>
- [10] Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. National Academy Press.
- [11] Brown, G., & Knight, P. (2012). *Assessing learners in higher education*. Routledge.
- [12] Chan, C. C. A., & Sher, P. J. (2014). Group discussion as a pedagogical tool in management education. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.03.002>
- [13] Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3–7.
- [14] Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. Bantam Books.
- [15] Hackman, J. R. (2011). *Collaborative intelligence: Using teams to solve hard problems*. Berrett-Koehler.
- [16] Hargie, O. (2011). *Skilled interpersonal communication: Research, theory and practice* (5th ed.). Routledge.
- [17] Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3–4), 85–118.
- [18] Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices*. AAC&U.
- [19] Laker, D. R., & Powell, J. L. (2011). The differences between hard and soft skills and their relative impact on training transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(1), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20063>
- [20] McClelland, D. C. (1998). Identifying competencies with behavioral-event interviews. *Psychological Science*, 9(5), 331–339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00065>
- [21] Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741–749. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741>
- [22] Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>
- [23] Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a “Big Five” in teamwork? *Small Group Research*, 36(5), 555–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405277134>
- [24] Yorke, M., & Knight, P. T. (2006). *Embedding employability into the curriculum*. Higher Education Academy.