REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of available literature on the private higher education in India. In the final section a critical review of the related studies is presented.

Virk (1998) was of the view that higher education in India needs urgent reforms as it is not presently contributing effectively to economic growth of the country. The standard of higher education is not enviable because the universities in their present form are neither geared to create new knowledge nor do their graduate study programs measure up to international standard.

The rapid expansion of the system, limited financial input and student unrest have eroded the teaching/learning process, despite the modernization of curricula. The supply of funds to universities is limited, coupled with inefficient use of public funding. The universities are unresponsive to market trend and are essentially divorced from work of world. Higher education is more supply-oriented than demand-oriented. The research base in universities is rather weak. However, adds centers of Excellence, Center of Advanced studies, Area Study Centers and mono-disciplinary institutions in the universities have made substantial advances in a number of research fields. Yet inadequately equipped libraries and laboratories and a shortage of qualified teachers continue to hinder the progress of higher education toward achieve.

Clark (1995) states that governments have rarely launched private higher education sector by specifying what roles private higher education should or would play, neither have scholars or other higher education actors drawn up guidance blueprints or foreseen what and how roles would develop. On the contrary, roles have more often emerged from a generally uncoordinated multiplicity of choices and constraints.
Ashforth (2001) views that private configurations are changing rapidly. This is true even in systems with a continuous private higher education history, such as Japan and the uniquely longstanding U.S.A. case. Change is much more dramatic in systems like the Chinese and Turkish, where private higher education re-emerges after a period of non-existence, and the Russian and Indian where it first emerges.

Levy (2002) states that there is great diversity even within this growth, a diversity that goes beyond the original identification of the third wave (and thus demands fresh research globally). Some of these private institutions play a “role” of little more than taking in tuition while dishing out poor education and then award degrees to those who do not drop out; thus the “role” is perhaps one of making profit.

More positively, many have roles of providing access for those who could not otherwise get into higher education. This may be seen as an equity role. Others provide a choice related to access.

Castro and Levy (2000) describe that private institutions rarely assume or claim to assume academic elite roles complete with doctoral education, basic research, large laboratories and libraries, or mostly full-time academic staffs. This provides an opening for critics to belittle these institutions as not “true universities,” not fulfilling university roles.

Boorstin (1958) argues that, in fact, private roles often turn out to depend on what roles public sectors do not undertake. The public unawareness or purposeful avoidance allows some groups, including entrepreneurs, to perceive a need or opportunity for private action. The point is relevant to all types of private higher education. For “academically light” roles the public sector does not deign to undertake, there is sometimes a
true sense of intentionally leaving roles to private institutions; one major example concerns the Asian cases where public sectors did not take on major demand-absorbing access roles.

However, even refusal to assume such an access role has not always been with a keen eye on what the private sector might do. Instead, refusal is often based simply on what the public sector prefers to do or thinks it can do well or what government thinks it can do. It is less about refusal and rejection of potential roles than about the absence of serious consideration of additional roles. Where public universities in Eastern and Central Europe do not “lower” themselves to fields such as accounting or business management as new economies are created, they do not always consider or approve of private institutions assuming those roles.

Levy (1982) states that a dramatic emergence of private higher education is also common where major or “neoliberal” economic change occurs in non-communist settings. Until the 1980s and even 1990s, private higher education was rare in sub-Saharan Africa and absent in some Asian countries. Sudden change results in part from powerful global tendencies that limit the financial role of the state, privatize and internationalize in overall development policy. These are tendencies from beyond higher education policy. Naturally, no country pursued such political-economic policies in order to lead to private higher education consequences (or to public higher

Bernasconi (2004) concludes that compared to the other types of private universities, the affiliated ones possess distinctive mission statements and declarations of principles, consistent with the orientations of their sponsor institutions, tend to be smaller, and tend to have more full-time and better qualified faculty. Some receive financial support from their sponsor organizations or its members. Distinctiveness was not found in student selectivity, nor in tuition levels, program offerings, curriculum design, the weight of research and graduate
programs in their functions, student socioeconomic profile and faculty involvement in governance.

**Levy (1992)** states that the literature on private higher education internationally shows that private higher education brings diversity, especially when compared to the public tertiary education sector, along the dimensions of finance, control, mission, and scope of functions. **Prachayani (2006)** states that the Indian government has stressed the role of private sector in promoting higher education in order to help enhance low rates of Higher education enrollment and national literacy in a context of resource constraints.

Higher education in the India is distinctive in many aspects, and among all its features, the role of the private sector is the most interesting to know. The India university system has been modelled after that of the United States’ model, despite the country’s vastly different cultural, political and economic realities (**Smolicz, 2002**).

The private higher education sector of the Indian is proportionally larger than that of any major country. Nearly 88 percent of the institutions are privately owned and managed without subsidies from the government, and 67 percent of all students are enrolled in private higher education institutions. The enrolment in various programs clearly reflects that higher education in the Indian is determined largely by market forces and the dominant private higher education institutions are there in response to student demand for different programs (**Tan, 1995**).

The Hunter Commission separated higher education and higher education with the objective that universities will have to manage the affiliated colleges. Progressively, **Saddler Commission (1917)** recommended separation of intermediate education from the degree colleges and suggested special selection committee for selection of university teachers.
Hartog Committee’s (1929) concern was improving quality and standards of education at the university level. The private universities bill was followed by the foreign university bill popularly known as the Foreign Educational Institution (Regulation of Entry and Operation) Bill. The bill was cleared by the cabinet in 2007 and is still pending in the parliament. The object behind the Bill is that private and foreign universities will promote competition in the higher education which in turn will help enhance merit and quality.

Globalization is described as, flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values and ideas across borders as, it affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities (Knight and De Wit, 1999). Thus, globalization is a Multi-faceted process and can affect countries in vastly different ways - economically, culturally and politically, but it does not take an ideological stance or a position as to whether this impact has positive and/or negative consequences. There are a number of factors which are closely related to this worldwide flow, which are seen as key elements of globalization.

These include the knowledge society, information and communication technologies, the market economy, trade liberalization and changes in governance structures. These elements of globalization have significant impact on the education sector (Knight, 2004).

Technology have made it possible for parent companies to operate satellite enterprises and give directions and instruction from the home base with minimum requirement for physical presence. This, however, has called for new skills and specialized knowledge, the absorption of which requires the availability of a well-trained and highly educated cadre of workers in the host economies (Gibbs, 1989).
The government initiative for the planned development of higher education in the country and Establishment of University Grants Commission has transformed the elitist system of education favoring the rich and higher class to a more democratic and mass based system. Around 40 per cent of enrolments now comes from lower socio-economic strata, and women comprising of approximately 35 per cent of the total enrolments (Tilak 2004).

Government funding on higher education has been diminishing on a year on year basis for more than one decade. In the view of withdrawal of government support to finance higher education private institutions has been allowed to take over the responsibility of imparting education to all. Further, in government aided universities the model of self financing and self sustaining institutions has been introduced. (Agarwal, 2006).

Higher education for their vested political interest rather than taking the right steps to enhance the quality of higher education. As a result those who can afford the high cost of higher education look forward for the opportunities abroad while the others have to compromise with sub-standard education. If India has to emerge as preferred location for higher education in the globalizing world it will have to develop a national policy to address the challenges of sub-standard quality, ineffective systems of monitoring and control, red-tapism in growth and development and political interference. (Knight, J. 2004)

Research-oriented education and modern teaching methods are the prime foci of such a promotion. Notwithstanding a view that private institutions have been providing according to Qazi (2006) presently, there are 57 universities and degree awarding institution in the public sector and 54 universities and degree awarding institutions in private sector. In total the number is 111. According to the HEC data out of 23.27 million eligible students in the age group of 18-26 the total enrolment was estimated at 1.16%. In 2002-2003, the
eligible population rose to 24.19% and the percentage of enrolment to 1.3%. Similarly in 2002-2004 the percentage of enrolled students stood at 1.7 million from an eligible population of 24.90 million.

This is so in spite of the participation of private sector, which has contributed up to 65,000 enrolments at university level. It should be mandatory for private sector institutions to set up undergraduate and graduate study programs in such basic sciences as physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics, and statistics, among others. Similar initiatives should be taken by private sector to set up departments in liberal arts and social science. All this can happen only with help and assistance of the Higher Education Commission, if it wants to keep an eye on the equality of education in the private sector.