

**CHANGING ROLE OF THE STATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN
INDIA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LIBERALISATION**

*Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JAI SHANKAR PRASAD



**ZAKIR HUSSAIN CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI
2002**



**JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI - 110067**

**ZAKIR HUSAIN CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

July 2002

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled “**CHANGING ROLE OF STATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LIBERALISATION**” submitted by **JAI SHANKAR PRASAD** in partial fulfillment for the award of the degree of **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY** has not been previously submitted for any degree of this or any other University and this is his own work.

We recommend that this dissertation may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

K Chanana

Prof. Karuna Chanana
(Supervisor)

Deepak Kumar

Dr. Deepak Kumar
(Chairperson)

CHAIRPERSON
Zakir Husain Centre for
Educational Studies
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110067

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I humbly dedicate this work to my family, whose love and blessings have always been with me.

This study would have been impossible without the generous co-operation and help rendered by numerous people in many ways. My sincere regards are due to my supervisor Professor Karuna Chanana. To work under her supervision has been a great learning experience for me. I have immense admiration for her.

The library staff at JNU Central Library, Miss Seema at the Library of the Zakir Hussain Centre for Educational Studies, NIEPA, NCERT, UNESCO and the World Bank were exceedingly helpful.

I acknowledge my indebtedness to all the authors whose work I have used for my dissertation. They have all enriched me in various ways. My sincere thanks are due to my friends who have stood by me in trying times.

The discrepancies that might have crept in my work are solely my responsibility.

*Jai Shankar Prasad
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-67*

CONTENTS

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	
Introduction	1-9
Chapter one: State Education Relationship: Theoretical Perspectives	10-32
Chapter two: Globalization, Nation state and Education	33-50
Chapter three: State Policy Towards Higher Education in India	51-77
Chapter four: The Social Context of Higher Education in India	78-107
Chapter five: Conclusions	108-118
Appendices	119-121
Bibliography	122-128

INTRODUCTION

The education system has been one of the prime pillars of growth of the modern nation state, since the industrial revolution started in the European nations. Education, while preparing the requisite manpower for industrial and technological development, was also the most potent tool for creation and strengthening of national cultures and citizenship. This dimension has rendered education immense political and economic significance for the state.

During the growth of capitalist economies and the liberal state systems, the emergent bourgeoisie used the state to establish non-denominational and modern educational system free from the control and influence of the entrenched feudal classes and values (Archer 1984). The state used education for the creation and strengthening of the national communities and for helping the capitalist accumulation process (Green 1990). Thus was created the triad of state, capitalism and modern education.

The emergence and intensification of democratic struggles of the worker and marginal classes and sections brought the state to the center of the struggle among the competing interest and political groups during the 19th and early 20th century (Held 1989). These movements, along with the international circumstances of capitalist competition and conflict and anti-colonial struggles, generated a strong force within the liberal democratic states to expand and democratize the mass education system. The socialist and communist movements in various countries added a new dimension to the acceptance of the responsibility towards education.

By the time the 'welfare state' came into its own after the Second World War, the principle of education as a right for every citizen of a country had gained considerable currency. The state now was held responsible for providing education to the largest base of population as far as possible. The newly independent post-colonial Asian

and African nations largely following the social-democratic model of development, the East European socialist countries and the Communist states of USSR were the classical examples of state responsibility towards education.

Education, which was emphasized as a tool for national cohesion and economic development, was now brought in to the discourse of social justice and promotion of equality of opportunity. Not only in the post-colonial countries, which owed allegiance to this principle to their historical and political legitimacy, but also in the capitalist countries of Europe and the United States of America, education was considered to be the best possible avenue for social mobility and the equalizer of social and economic inequalities (Halsey 1997).

This brought university education, which was till now constricted in its base and more or less an *elite* institution in terms of access and treatment, within the reach of a larger section of the population. Higher education became the aspiration and tool for mobility of the masses with the state trying to ensure its expansion and democratization to the extent possible. The state in the capitalist countries was able to bring about a convergence in the interests of the capitalist accumulation process and the demands of social justice and equality of opportunity and social security (Halsey 1997). Subsidies for higher education and support for universities and students formed a significant share of the welfare spending made by the state on the social sector. Political parties, industries and the state, all had a tacit understanding over the issue. All agreed that the widest possible base for development of high quality human resources was needed for capitalist expansion and a growing market in the Keynesian model of economic development. The Keynesian model attributed an active role to the state in creation of employment and maintenance of the largest possible workforce in order to achieve greater development. This formed the consensus over 'economic nationalism' which, lasted up to the

economic crisis that started emerging during the mid-seventies all over the world (Halsey 1997).

The nature of this 'consensus' over welfare spending in education by the state needs to be understood clearly. The consensus had three components, 'security', 'prosperity' and 'opportunity' bound by the belief in the potential and the responsibility of the state bureaucratic system to deliver these. The state ensured its legitimacy among the masses by providing social security through what is called 'social wages' and attempted to combat poverty. It created an ideological hegemony, upholding the ideas of equality of opportunity and unfettered social mobility through emphasis on expansion and democratization of state supported education system, including university education.

The state convinced the capitalist interest groups of the utility of these measures by promising expansive markets for goods and services by improved living conditions of the people. Promoting the already existent conviction that greater expansion of opportunities and mobility based on merit were in the interest of advanced capitalism in the long run was also a part of this process. Education became the most prized tool for creation of the 'human capital'.

The education system, however, could not create much difference in the structures of hierarchy in the capitalist societies and it was being argued that despite the expansion of education, the sole purpose it served was of social reproduction and continuance of privileges for the socially dominant classes (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Boudon 1974). As Halsey et al. (1997) note, "the privileges of the already privileged remained. Universities were still dominated by those from professional and managerial backgrounds; and even when intelligence was taken to account the social background still remained a significant factor in the individual's life chances" (p: 5).

In the post-colonial societies, which followed the social democratic model of development and liberal democracies, this consensus was built into the histories of

emergence of the modern state and the political system. The state was ostensibly on the side of social justice and equality of opportunity and based itself on the promises of quick economic growth as well as redistribution of resources (Jules and Apple 2000). Education, especially higher education, became a major demand of large and politically alive sections of population, which had been hitherto deprived of the benefits of higher mobility offered by such education. State responsibility towards education became an understood thing in this scenario.

The period of 1945 to late 1970s may be considered as an era of expansion and importance of education all over the world and an ideological consensus over the idea itself. Education as a forceful symbol of social justice acquired the center stage in this period. This was functional in an overall paradigm of the role of the 'welfare state' and the supremacy of the state bureaucratic mechanisms to deliver the goods of economic prosperity, social security and equal opportunity. The economic crisis all over the world, 1973 onwards, however, changed the situation. The consensus over the welfare state's capacity in delivering the goods it promised began to disappear (Halsey 1997).

The new economic scenario showed growing influences and power of the transnational corporations and new technologies and modes of communication. The old-standardized mass production systems of the Fordist kind became redundant and non-competitive in the opening up global market. The emergence and growth of new information and knowledge based industries of a more flexible kind; dependent upon high value skills showed the only possibility of surviving in the world market. Movement of capital from closed boundaries of state directed and protected economies to various parts of the world accompanied this phenomenon, which developed in global finance, trade and markets (Held et al 1999)

Thus, a situation was created in which the state had to come to terms with the growing importance and influence of global capital enterprise. It had to participate in a global competition for capital flows, markets and jobs for its population. The Keynesian

model of state directed economic activity; full employment and social sector spending came under questioning and became difficult to sustain in the environment when its dependency on the capitalist enterprise was very high (Held 1989)

The New Right, which acquired political stewardship of the western capitalist nations during the 1980s, re-emphasized the importance of private capital enterprise and demanded minimal state intervention in the economy, reduced social sector spending and state regulations and restrictions. The economic and political ideology they professed is called 'neo-liberalism' in contemporary literature. They maintained that the bureaucratic system of delivering goods had failed due to its inefficiency in resource allocation, too much support for the social sector and lack of enterprise, which only the private profit motive can provide in a capitalist economy. They advocated a roll back of the bloated state and freeing of the market forces from the clutches of the state. The consequences of such ideological moorings were reduced taxes, greater freedom to the global and internal capital, reduced expenditure on social security and welfare spending and a surge towards privatization in most areas of social life in order to facilitate the expansion of the market (Apple 2000).

The neo-liberal ideology was and is being carried to the developing world by the processes of globalization and liberalization. The processes of globalization have created international flows of goods and commodities, labour and capital and diffusion of a western style consumerist culture leading to wider integration of markets and trade. It has become impossible for any nation now to remain aloof of the global society and processes. This has generated the milieu for greater diffusion of the neo-liberal doctrine of economic and political standards.

The international financial organizations, international trade and tariff regulations, the international organizations of governance and several other organizations which wield considerable control over the global economic processes, have encouraged and transferred the neo-liberal ideology to the developing countries through various

measures (Pannu 1994). The most significant measure is of the 'liberalization' or 'Structural Adjustment Programs' attached to the loans and bailout programs devised for a developing country facing a financial crisis, mostly of a 'balance of payment' kind, by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. This program attempts at making long term shifts in the political economy of the nation to make it more market centered and global in character.

The nation's fiscal crisis is 'managed' in this program by 'demand management', that is, curbing the demand of goods and services by reducing the state expenditure. Consequently, it is assumed that helping the market from the supply-side, which is enhancing the productive capacity and efficiency of the market, boosts the economy (Tilak 2000; Nayyar 1996). This is done in two ways: first, minimization of state controls, regulation and restriction over the economy, specially the export-import sector. The national market is thus, made more open and integrated to the world market. Second, encouraging greater privatization of the economy and other social sectors. This way, the market of the developing country is integrated to the global market and is supposed to find its way to prosperity through competitive market forces (Pannu 1994).

This situation leads to a significant transformation in the commonsensical understanding of role of the state in the area of higher education. The most prominent impact that occurs is that fiscal stringency reduces the budgetary allocations to the social sector, like health and education. However, it is not necessary that education be effected in such a manner only. Since it is the most visible part of bureaucratic machinery involved in the social sector, it becomes the most probable victim. The commonest form of response is reallocation of resources from higher education to the elementary education sector. What follows is a continued drying up of the public higher education sector leading to capacity destruction or deterioration. Also, since the state abrogates its responsibility towards higher education giving reasons that it is inefficient resource allocation in a non-merit good, which has more private than social returns, the large scale

demand of affordable and quality higher education from the majority remains unfulfilled. Under the other major shift, private enterprise, in whatever is possible, is encouraged (Tilak 2000). Thus, privatization of higher education at a large scale takes place. In consonance with this trend, education is seen as a marketable service and an industry on the global scale. The Educational Services under the WTO regime is a recent example of such changes. Through these services the WTO is trying to work out a mechanism for institutionalizing the international market development process in higher education. Also, as is expected, foreign capital and industries are encouraged to develop the higher educational market. Thus, emerges a global private education system working on the principles of the market and profit motive. 'Commodification' of education is the logical corollary of this situation where the capacity to buy would decide the kind of education one possesses (Burbules and Torres 2000).

What are the consequences of this transformation for the goals of social justice and equality that the higher education systems hold so dear to themselves in the developing countries? What kind of social differentiation and stratification would emerge and what would happen to the already disadvantaged, who had hoped to join the public higher education system to attain social mobility? Who would gain from the new developments? Can privatization work in any given condition and location regardless of the peculiarities of society, culture, history and politics? What can the state in a developing country, caught in the twin dilemma of international market and political forces and the needs of a broad based, socially just educational system do? Is there an escape from privatization? Answers to these questions can only be situated in the larger context of the society we are analyzing, the nature of its educational system, its inconsistencies and paradoxes and the nature of the state that is functional in the nation.

In the present study some of these questions have been attempted for answers in the context of the Indian higher education system. The focus of the study is on the role of the state in higher education in relation to equitability of the higher education system

in India in the context of the changes that have appeared since India adopted the Structural Adjustment Program of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in 1991 and has followed since then. In this context, the role and nature of private enterprise in higher education in India is examined and the consequences that a shift towards the market in this sphere can have for the weaker sections of the society have been discussed.

The first chapter of the study is an exploration into the theoretical perspectives in sociology of education towards understanding the relationship between state and the educational system. It attempts to understand the contributions of the liberal-pluralist, the functionalist and the Marxist and Neo-Marxist theoretical perspectives. Representative thinkers in each of the stream are dealt with in relation to the objectives of the study. In concluding the first chapter it is hoped that a comprehensive perspective of the state-society-education relation is built up which could help the inquiry into the Indian context.

The second chapter of the study tries to bring the state-education relationship in the context of globalization and liberalization. The chapter attempts to deal with the issues related to the impact of globalization processes on higher education systems in the post-colonial developing countries and the role of the state. What are the constraints the state in the developing countries faces in this scenario? What are the influences on their policy towards higher education in relation to liberalization process? What changes are appearing or might appear? What would these changes mean for the cause of social justice and equity in higher education? These are some of the questions that are attempted for an answer in the second chapter.

The third chapter tries to evaluate the state policy towards higher education in India since independence and gauge the changes that have appeared since the New Economic Policy was adopted by the Indian government in May 1991 under the Structural Adjustment Program in the tutelage of the World Bank and International

Monetary Fund. The emphasis of the study remains on the issues of social justice and equity.

The fourth chapter brings us to the core of the issue that is, to judge the social context of higher education in India and to situate the contemporary changes in the policy in the context. The inherent inequities of the higher education system in India in terms of access of the system by women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe students are analyzed. In this context the nature and role of private higher education in India is discussed. In order to provide an empirical basis to the issues related to equity in private higher education in India, the inferences drawn from a field study conducted by the researcher have been given.

In concluding the chapter it is hoped that an understanding of the possible consequences of growth of privatization and marketization in higher education and the role of the state in this regard is enhanced.

CHAPTER-1

STATE EDUCATION RELATIONSHIP: THEORETICAL PRSPECTIVES

The national education system as a universal and public institution emerged as an instrument of state formation in post-revolutionary Europe. It was an effective and valuable vehicle for integration of the new nation-states and one of their prime institutional supports. Nations have relied upon its ideological potential for creation of independent statehood (Green 1990). Formal education as a deliberate organised system of instruction acquired its present character and configuration with the growth of industrialisation and the modern nation states (Kamat 1986).

In the last two centuries, needs of rational economic organisation, scientific and technical revolution and massive expansion of production and consumption systems have made mass education indispensable. As a major factor in economic growth and development, social mobility and equality, and as the main indicator of democracy, education has immense economic and political value for the modern nation-states. It is noted that, "...in more centralised and nationalised public school systems...policies enforce conformity and identification with a nationalist tradition, a larger community, and a broader context of citizenship and responsibility...the political implications of education surpass the conditions of an individual to be educated and constitute a strategic set of decisions that affect society at large, hence the importance of education as a public policy, and the role of the state... a principal purpose of educational

system... is to create a loyal and competent citizen” (Burbules and Torres 2000:3-4). In our times, the states have become the sites around which pedagogical process is situated and controlled. Whether it is a developed European nation or the developing post-colonial nations, education is largely a state enterprise. “The states control, regulate, mandate, co-ordinate, finance and certify the processes of teaching and learning” (Burbules & Torres 2000:4).

The consequential nature of state-education relationship for society as a whole renders a sociological analysis indispensable. Three broad approaches can be distinguished in the analysis of the state-education relationship. First, the liberal-pluralist perspective, which is the descendant of classical ‘liberalism’ and ‘liberal-democratic’ theories of state associated with Hobbes, Locke, Bentham, James Mill and John Stuart Mill and the contributions of Weber’s political sociology. The chief social thinkers adopting pluralist approaches are Margaret Archer and Randal Collins. Second approach is the functionalist perspective, which concentrates on role of state and the educational system in the persistence and change of the society as a whole and analyses their mutual linkages within this framework. The chief contribution in this perspective is of Emile Durkheim. The functionalist theories focus on the role of education in the creation and maintenance of social cohesion and the role of the state in this context. The third perspective is of the Marxist and Neo-Marxist thought. Marxian analysis concentrates on class-conflict and political-coercive nature of the state. Education is largely considered as an instrument or apparatus for domination by the ruling

classes. A wide variety of emphases and focus of analysis have emerged among the neo-Marxist thinkers, which would be discussed in detail later in the chapter.

The liberal-pluralist perspective

The major strand in the liberal pluralist approach towards state and its relation to society and its institutions like education is rooted in the classical liberal tradition of the 17th to the 19th century political theories. The meaning and emphasis of the word 'liberalism' has continuously changed historically and is still controversial (Held 1989). It encompasses a wide range of heterogeneous body of work from Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), James Mill (1773-1836), John Stuart Mill and other Utilitarian.

The early liberals, namely Hobbes (1668) and Locke(1663), were more concerned about the separation of the 'private' sphere – or the civil society – from the 'public' sphere or the political system and the state. They visualised a society, where 'individuals' would pursue their self-interests and their 'natural rights' of liberty, while life, liberty and property would be protected by the state. The state should aspire to secure freedom for the individuals to fulfil their interest and capacities through the mechanisms of constitutional governance, private property, the competitive market economy and the patriarchal family. These new rights and freedoms were confined to the middle class male 'bourgeoisie' only. These rights spread gradually to other classes and women with considerable conflict and struggle.

Later Liberals such as, Jeremy Bentham(1843), James Mill(1937), and John Stuart Mill and other Utilitarians were more concerned about the political accountability of the government towards the people and stressed on democratic system of politics. John Stuart Mill(1982), stressed the need for 'equality' among individuals and the conditions of full development of human capacities as the best freedom. For him 'democracy' and 'liberty' were the most essential natural rights of individuals.

Thus, the picture that the classical 19th century 'liberalism' visualised of the state was of an umpire which monitored and provided the best possible conditions for the pursuit of the best 'utility' for citizens, according to the rules of economic exchange and competition, market economy and private appropriation of the resources (Held 1989). Apart from the contribution of classical liberal theories in the formation of the liberal-pluralist perspective towards the state-education relationship, the works of Max Weber are of great importance.

Max Weber (1864-1920) is one of the founders of the discipline of sociology, a champion of European liberalism and of the German nation-state. He dismissed the feasibility of 'direct democracy' and maintained that centralised bureaucratic administration by the state may be inescapable in the modern era. He placed emphasis upon three key elements of the state: territoriality, violence and legitimacy. He maintained that the chief characteristic of the modern state is of the capability to monopolise the legitimate use of violence within a given territory. He suggested that force is not the normal or only means of the state, but

force is a mean specific to the state. The state is a relation of men dominating men, a relation supported by means of legitimate violence (Girth and Mills 1972).

The monopoly of physical coercion is legitimised and sustained by a belief in the justifiability and / or the legality of this monopoly. The general obedience is due to the 'rational-legal' organisation and authority system in the modern state. Weber maintains that tradition or charisma no longer appeals to sustained belief and obedience in the authority structure. It is "by virtue of "legality", by virtue of the belief in the validity of legal statute and functional "competence" based on rationally created rules (Girth & Mills 1972).

Growth of capitalism was instrumental in the massive expansion of rational-legal administration. He maintains that in the modern society, private and public administration is becoming more and more bureaucratised. As economic life becomes more and more complicated, differentiated and advanced in specialisation, bureaucratic administration becomes more indispensable. According to Weber, the decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organisation has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organisation.

Weber extended the meaning of the concept of bureaucracy to all forms of large-scale organisations such as the civil services, political parties, industrial enterprises, and universities. Weber places the 'rationalisation' of education and training as a prominent cultural, economic and social impact of the general trend towards 'rationalisation' in the development of modern societies. Weber mentions

that the capitalist enterprise requires special system of examinations and the trained expertise and dominates the functioning of the universities with its needs. Thus, education is seen as a part of the state bureaucratic structure, engaged in creating conditions for the capitalist enterprise (Girth and Mills 1972).

Weber's idea about the multi-dimensionality of power is taken as the basis of the pluralist approach towards state and power distribution in the society (Held 1989). The classical pluralist theory maintains that there are many determinants of the distribution of power other than class and therefore several power centres in a society. The individual is not the chief bargainer for freedom and self-interest, but the various groups and social sectors which form the world of the individuals, compete for their self-interests. In the pluralist account, power is non-hierarchically and competitively arranged. It is an inextricable part of an 'endless process of bargaining' between numerous groups representing different interests, e.g. business organisations, trade unions, political parties, ethnic groups students etc. Despite inequalities and unequal access to sources, every 'interest group' has some advantage, which can be utilised in the democratic process to make an impact (Held 1989). Political outcomes are, thus, the results of the governments trying to mediate between competing demands.

Archer's 'Social Origins of Educational Systems' (1984) is the first major attempt to deal with questions like why and how the state became involved in education and the consequences of the involvement using a liberal-pluralist perspective (Dale 1986). Archer analyses the role of the state in educational change and development in four European countries; England, France, Russia and

Denmark. She maintains that before the period of state controlled education, education was owned and controlled by particular elite groups within the society, such as the church and the power to define the nature of instruction rested in their hands. She calls them the 'dominant' groups. This exclusive power over education came to be challenged by the so-called 'assertive groups'; these were the fast ascendant classes/ groups, who were at present denied much power, or status, and were competing for the same by redefining the political system into a liberal state system. Redefinition and rescue of education from the clutches of the entrenched classes formed a major part of their pursuit.

They used two different strategies to gain influence over education. First was, 'Restriction', which means using of state legislative machinery to devalue the monopoly of the dominant groups', and second 'Substitution', which is to devalue its monopoly of educational supplies through market competition (Archer 1984:155-7). She emphasises upon the fact that the interaction between the 'dominant' and the 'assertive' groups of the society gives rise to specific structural changes between the society and education relationship and the education system itself (Archer 1984:144). Thus, the state was an agency of support for the assertive groups working to gain influence over educational institutions through 'restrictive' or 'substitutive' role. Archer's analysis concentrates on 'how' the education-state relationship changes and which are the players. However, several key questions regarding the decision making of the state, the specific intervention and the functions of educational practices are not answered in her analysis. We do not get any clear picture of how and why the

priorities of the state change and what are its effects on the nature and direction of the educational changes.

The liberal-pluralist perspective can be criticised on several grounds. The government treats not all groups equally and effectively. There is no guarantee that the government machinery responds to anybody other than on powerful positions. The government does not necessarily do anything about the issues being discussed and debated. Very limited numbers of groups have the resources to compete in national political arena. Many groups do not have enough resources for significant political mobilisation. As Marxist critiques have pointed out, the capacity of the government to act in the ways of 'interest' groups also is constrained. Private accumulation, private investment and property are such exigencies for the capitalist states (Held 1989).

The functionalist perspective

The functionalist perspective begins with the questions: what needs does education satisfy for society and in what ways does it contribute to the stability of the social system? The same question would be put for the state as well, and a relation between the two would be examined. The main roles that the functionalists have attributed to the education system are of socialisation and selection. Emile Durkheim's sociology formed a foundation stone in the understanding of state and education relationship in the functionalist perspective. He has dealt with the question of defining the state and its role towards

maintenance of social solidarity, and the part that education can play in it (Blackledge and Hunt 1985).

Durkheim points out that the notion of a 'political society' is of modern origin and is characteristic of the developed societies. A 'political society' is a separation between government and the governed. For him a political society is characterised by the "union of a greater or lesser number of secondary social groups, subject to the same one authority which is not itself subject to another superior authority duly constituted" (Durkheim 1956: 45). The term 'state' should not be used as coterminous with the word 'political society'. State implies the organisation of officials, which is the instrument where by the governmental authority is used.

According to Durkheim, the state must fulfil a 'moral function' above all its functions, and here he prefers a different reading of the state from Hegelian idealism, Utilitarian and Socialist thought (Giddens 1971). He maintains that the characteristic problem facing the world in the modern age is the conciliation of the individual freedoms emerging out of the dissolution of the traditional societies with the moral control necessary for social cohesion in the society. Thus, the key solutions involved in the development of modern societies are not economic but moral (Giddens 1971). Durkheim suggests that with increasing differentiation in the society developing from the 'mechanical' to 'organic' type, the individual are progressively freed from the subordination of the 'conscience collective'. Moral ideals emerge which stress the rights and freedoms of the individuals. The state

increases in its activities and reach. This may seem paradoxical but the essential theme is that the modern state itself acts as a protector of these rights.

Education can play a very crucial role in inculcating the necessary secular attitudes and values in the individual along with generating the necessary social cohesiveness. The state thus performs the crucial moral function in creating the modern education system in the society. He defined education as the “influence exercised by the adult generation on those who are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to stimulate and develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole, and the particular milieu for which he is specifically destined” (Durkheim 1956:71). Durkheim considered it of utmost importance for the state to control the teaching and learning processes going on in its boundaries. The moral states of modern rationalism, scientific attitude, citizenship and nationality must be instituted universally among children. However, the most glaring problem with Durkheimian analysis of the political system and the state is the lack of conceptual space for class divisions and political coercion in modern societies. Conflicts and inequalities are reduced to mere adaptation problems of changing from a ‘mechanical’ to an ‘organic’ society (Giddens 1971).

The Marxist and the Neo-Marxist thinkers debunk the functionalist perspective for understanding the education system in society and the role performed by the state in the educational sphere. They accuse the functionalist perspective of being teleological in character and conservative and status quoist in its results. The functionalist perspective tends to see the education system as

naturally just and viable, essentially performing the functions of socialisation and selection for the perpetuation of society. The existence of conflict between groups, the legitimisation of the existing social hierarchy by the education system is ignored or downplayed by the functionalist approach (Blackledge and Hunt 1985).

Marx (1818-83) and Engels (1820-95) attacked the idea, upheld by the liberal-democratic tradition, that the starting point of the analyses of the state can be the individual and his/her relation to the state. The key to understanding the relations between the people according to Marx and Engels is the class structure (Held 1989). They reject the liberal-pluralist claim that the 'state' represents the community interest as a neutral arbiter. The state is considered as the apparatus for managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie and their interests. It is a class apparatus along with other institutions of domination like law, education etc.

The Marxist and Neo-Marxist perspectives

Marx did not work specifically on education and it would be included in the super-structure of the society as understood in the Marxian perspective. The Neo-Marxist thinkers who used Marxian perspective in analysing the relationship between education and the state or education and society have worked primarily in two frameworks. The first group of thinkers belongs to the 'structural' Marxist camp and the second to the 'voluntaristic' Marxists. The first approach agrees with the idea that 'super structural' realities of the society, such as education and the state influence the process of development of contradictions in the 'base' or

the economy of the capitalist society. But it stresses the position that, in the last analysis, the 'base' determines the 'super structure'. They stress, as against the liberal-pluralist perspective, that society can not be understood scientifically if individuals are seen as mere possessors of free-will and not in the context of certain objective structural inconsistencies in the capitalist society. The first group consists of thinkers such as Althusser, Bowles and Gintis and Nicholas Poulantzas (Blackledge and Hunt 1985).

Bowles and Gintis in their celebrated work titled, 'Schooling in Capitalist America', used the 'correspondence principle' promulgated by Marx in analysing the education system in America. The 'correspondence principle' means that all institutions and ideologies existing in a society is directly determined by the economic system or the mode of production of the society. Bowles and Gintis contend that the education system, just like the state or the government in the capitalist American society, can not bring about change in the given economic set up, as they themselves are inextricably linked with the perpetuation and reproduction of capitalism.

The capitalist system is necessarily exploitative for the worker classes and produces a relation of subordination and supremacy. To counter the possibility of conflict and to maintain the capitalist economic system, the dominant classes use both the state as a repressive agent and the education system as a legitimating agency and a differentiating mechanism. The education system, on the one hand, produces the necessary ideological acquiescence on the part of the labourers about the righteousness of the system, on the other it prepares the

DISS
378.54
P8864 Ch



TH10568



89501-TH

younger generation for a class-differentiated society and alienated work conditions and inculcates those qualities, attitudes and qualifications necessary for a capitalist economy according to the class position of the youth. Thus, Bowles and Gintis consider the expansion of education through the state policy as a partial victory for the workers class struggles, as the education system itself is a tool for perpetuation of the capitalist system of production. Here, the state is considered as an agency in the hands of the capitalist classes and education is understood as doing nothing but what suits the capitalist system.

French structural Marxists Althusser (1971) and Poulantzas (1978), have analysed the social-reproduction of class relations in advanced capitalist societies. They propose that because the capitalist enterprise itself is unable to accomplish the necessity of social reproduction, the state come to neutralise the socio-economic contradictions through various methods and mechanism so as to achieve this objective.

Althusser explained this in his essay 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses' (Althusser 1971:127-86). He maintains that the ruling classes accomplish the reproduction of social division of labour through the state, which operates through two main apparatus. First is called the RSA, or the repressive state apparatus, and the second ISA, ideological state apparatus, such as the education system, media, press, cultural and religious etc. while the former intervenes in the class struggle on the part of the state by means of force and repression, the second operates as a long drawn and subtle way of securing the consensus of the people over the ruling class ideology. He says, "this reproduction

of the skills of labour power is achieved more and more outside production... by the capitalist education system.” (Althusser 1971:152).

Althusser can be criticised for generalising all the ideological apparatuses as the state apparatuses. Also, it is not possible to see all the ideological apparatuses performing the same functions, in a coherent manner. There might be instances where these apparatuses have their own autonomy and agenda different from the state’s agenda. The same question of whether state is a mere agency in the hands of the capitalist/ruling class also remains (Blackledge and Hunt 1985).

In his work, ‘The State, Power and Socialism’ (1978), Poulantzas has dealt with the question of social reproduction. He considers the capitalist state as not a product of social relations of production but as a constitutive element in their generation and reproduction. The state acts to organise the dominant class block and to disorganise the subordinate classes. Thus, state policy is the outcome of conflict in general and is created by state apparatuses, which are in themselves the loci and residues of class-conflict. In his analysis, schools contribute to reproduction of class structures by the distribution of youth in various factions/strata of the labour force. It also inculcates the right values among the children for continuation of the capitalist system of production. Thus, the state and the productive structure are part of, and shaped by, the class struggle. The state and the educational system project the class struggle into the political arena. The class struggle carried on in the state is also carried on in the educational system. This struggle is over control over new knowledge and valued technologies as well as over control of over-socialised labour.

The second group, the 'voluntarists', gives primary importance to the 'super-structural' realities in the society and disagrees from the deterministic thought of the 'structural' Marxists. They disagree with the idea that individuals and groups are mere cogs in the predestined schema of 'dialectical' forces. They have tried to see how the dialectics of the contradictions in the 'base' of the society develop in terms of the 'super structural' realities. They give prime importance of individual's consciousness of the contradictions rather than the objective conditions. The primary thinker in this direction is Antonio Gramsci.

Gramsci's (1980) political theory is involved with his analysis of culture, education and superstructure in general. Gramsci's work on 'hegemony' and the state altered the direction and scope of Marxian political theory. According to Gramsci hegemony refers to the successful attempt of a dominant class to utilise its control over the resources of state and civil society, particularly through the use of mass media and the educational system, to establish its worldview as all inclusive and universal. Through the dual use of force and consensus the dominant classes use their political, moral and intellectual leadership to shape the 'taken for granted' views, needs and concerns of the sub-ordinate groups. It also attempts to put limitation on the possibility of critical and radical opposition discourses.

Gramsci maintains that insofar as hegemony is founded on consensus, it is an educative relationship between the dominant and the sub-ordinate classes. Hegemony is exerted by the ruling class and is organised by the 'intellectuals'. Education is a process of generation of social conformity. The state, as an 'ethical state', assumes the function of an educative state trying to build a new type or

level of civilisation. Thus, education constitutes a crucial agency of the state for creation and maintenance of hegemony of the dominant classes (Gramsci 1980).

The state, through its apparatus contributes a great deal towards the process of reproduction of the capitalist relations of production, acting as a system of enforcement and threat, but also struggling to control people's consciousness. In this regard, the generation of social conformism through intellectuals and the educational systems is a complex task that the capitalist state undertakes (Gramsci 1980).

The foremost among those who reject the structuralist-voluntarist divide are Claus Offe (1985) and Habermas (1976). They criticise the Marxist standpoint for regarding the capitalist state from a partial position. The state is analysed based on its capacities and its role in legitimising the interests of the capitalist class and in disorganising the worker's struggle. This leads to a particular de-emphasis on the capacity of the working class in advanced capitalist countries to influence the course and organisation of state administration. Poulantza's focus on the 'state' as a 'condensation of class forces' is criticised. Offe (1985) argues that this leads to ignorance of the internal differentiation and definition of the state as a rational bureaucratic organisation. For Offe, the state comprises of institutional apparatuses, bureaucratic organisations and formal and informal codes which regulate and constitute the public and private spheres of the society. His analysis emphasises the relative autonomy of the state to the point that bureaucracy becomes the independent mediator of the class struggle, which is inherent in the capitalist accumulation process. Offe suggests that this relative autonomy of the

bureaucracy leads to several educational policies which do not correspond exactly to economic or political legitimisation; for example, the state tends to counteract those systemic forces in a capitalist economy which render the work force unemployable.

Habermas (1976) examines how the state sustains the institutional order in which capital mechanisms occupy a prime place and how it mediates the class antagonisms. Attention is focused on how social conflicts and severe economic problems are 'displaced' on the states, initiating an erosion of mass loyalty towards the state, or a 'legitimisation crises' in conditions of acute crisis when the state is not able to manage the mediator's role between the labour and the capital interests (Held 1989).

The most significant criticism of all the approaches discussed above is their treatment of the state as a mere 'agency'. A neutral, homogenous, monolithic entity, which acts according to the imperatives, decided at the larger level of society. Autonomous nature of the state and its implication for the educational system in a capitalist society has been developed by Roger Dale. He tries to combine the macro and micro perspectives of sociology of education in analysing the state education relationship. According to Dale (1989), the state in a capitalist society has the following major problems/ functions, which decide the problems/ functions of the education system as such: supporting the capitalist accumulation process, guaranteeing the social context for its continued existence and legitimisation of the capital accumulation process. It is within these broad goals that the education system in a capitalist society is decided upon by the state.

However, several other factors influence the working of the state. Problems of the states vary with space and time and can not be laid down a priori. Proper means, capacity and inclination to solve the above mentioned problems can not be taken for given. They have to be analysed contextually. Policy makers do not necessarily have perfect knowledge, capacity or are expected to solve all problems. Implementation of solutions to these problems is always a multi-directional and complicated matter. Not everything that the state does is determined by these core problems. The most significant problem that the capitalist state faces is opposition by the subjugated classes. The state must find means to minimise or counter these opposition forces. The solutions generated by the state are not necessarily complementary; in fact they are often contradictory in nature. Dale also emphasises the distinction between the state and the government when analysing the state-education relation. The government takes up only problems, which are politically relevant, and not all issues can be so. Finally, implementation of policy matters is always a problem because of the internal autonomy and inertia of the state apparatus. Thus, the state is not a monolithic and unidirectional actor. What it can perform, what is asked of it to do and what is possible for it is dependent upon several internal as well as external factors and historical and organisational specificity's (Dale 1989).

The theoretical formulations discussed above are primarily about the developed capitalist countries. They provide useful clues about the functioning of states in developing post-colonial countries as well. However, these countries present unique situations of state-society relations due to a host of peculiar socio-

historical, political, cultural and economic problems. These societies have more in common among themselves than with the western capitalist nations.

Carnoy and Samoff (1990) in their study of five developing countries namely China, Cuba, Tanzania, Mozambique and Nicaragua have analysed the special role of education in social change in these societies and the importance it has as a political and ideological legitimisation asset for the state. These societies are termed as the 'transition societies'. These societies have recognised and debunked the class character of the state and the capitalist organisation of economy and have based themselves on the promise of large-scale social transformations with an explicit or implicit ideal of democratic-socialism. The factors, which crucially influence the role of state towards education in such societies, are the pre-transitional legacy and the politico-economic history of the 'transition' period. The socio-political origins of the educational goals and priorities in these countries, the groups and classes who are carriers of those policies, particular priorities for that particular time and the conflicts and conditions of choices made and the effect of these choices on the nature and outcome of education form the most crucial set of factors which decide the configuration of education in these societies.

Developing on the same lines, Apple and Jules (2000), recognise the centrality of the state in education and the struggle over educational policies by various groups and sections of society. The 'Transition State' formally recognises the class basis and inherent discriminatory character of the state and tries to legitimise itself on its negation. The structures and processes in and outside the

educational system are still in formation and are filled with conflicts and contradictions as they seek a coherent way to restructure the relation between education and the transformed economy. A radically different political structure and a socio-cultural agenda which, seeks to overthrow the entrenched elite in society is being followed. This puts immense importance on educational development.

The specific problems that a state in a post-colonial country faces are radically different from the developed capitalist countries. Pressure for quick industrial development to raise the living standards of people and distributive justice is acute. The state has to begin to legitimise the existing social structure and also itself and its constituents. Hegemony has to be created, maintained and enhanced. Unlike the developed Western societies, the state in these societies is not indigenous but imported from outside through colonial experience. The economy is generally dualistic and under developed with powerful presence of foreign capital. The state has to create and maintain sufficient autonomy to perform its re-distributive roles and also to confront the claims of existing elite. It also has to maintain its sovereignty and integrity from outer aggression. Under such critical circumstances, the educational system faces severe problems. Resources are scarce, the goals set for education are high, the political demand for education is soaring and the state in itself considers it a crucial symbol for its commitment towards equality, democracy and social justice.

Thus, in the developing countries the state faces not only the problem of maintaining the capitalist accumulation process and its enhancement but is caught

between several currents. At one hand it has to negotiate with the entrenched classes in order to enhance capitalist accumulation and economic growth for quick development, at the other it has to act on the urgent demands of social justice and equality from the masses. Education acquires a crucial role for the state in this situation. Apart from the economic and technological utility of education for the development process, it replaces actual socio-economic transformation as a symbol of social change. It gives the state a benevolent and ethical character and establishes its legitimacy. Democratic and equitable expansion of education thus becomes a political necessity for the state in the developing countries.

Conclusions

The state-education relationship has not been the focal point of any theoretical perspective in sociology of education. What has been analysed is the relation of education to the larger system and forces of society as such. State has merely appeared in the background. The role of education in the perpetuation of the social system in relation and the role played by the state in the same have been seen separately.

While the basic framework of the functionalists was to see education as fulfilling the functions of socialisation and selection in maintenance of the social system, the Marxist thinkers analysed it in terms of perpetuation of the class domination in a capitalist system. By the very nature of such framework, the emphasis was not on the role of state policy or state apparatus as such for education system and their implications for society. Instead, the stress was on how

forces outside the state or the education system used them for their pre-decided functions. There is no consideration of the relatively autonomous nature of the two systems in them. This has often been understood as the reason for improper explanation and analysis of state-education relationship in different locations and time and also in an incomplete understanding of the society-education relationship as such.

In this regard, the Weberian and the liberal-pluralist understanding of the situation of the state in a multi-centred power matrix in society were not one ruling class/capitalist class determines the state policies is significant. Education must be understood as a site of struggle, where several groups and sections in the society want to redefine it through the state policies. Also, it has to be understood that the state and the education system are no monolithic instruments, and are systems in themselves also with their own needs and priorities.

Roger Dale's understanding of the state having its own needs and priorities, and the limitations it faces in fulfilling them is of considerable importance here. It might also be contended that the problems of the state might not be the problems of the education system. This has crucial importance for understanding the context of state policy in the underdeveloped nations and the course taken by them in educational policies. The needs of the state in post-colonial countries have to be understood in relation to the economic, political, cultural, ideological and international pressures, which are different for the western developed nations.

The political nature of the educational policies, the value attributed to its expansion and democratisation, the dilemma of lack of resources and need for capitalist growth form the basis of any understanding of the state and education relationship in underdeveloped countries. In this context the forces of globalisation and liberalisation have created another dimension in the policy imperatives of the state towards education.

CHAPTER TWO

GLOBALIZATION, NATION STATE AND EDUCATION

This chapter tries to examine the consequences of globalisation for state policy towards higher education. The focus is on post-colonial developing countries. The impact of Structural Adjustment Program for higher education in India has been looked into. The chapter begins with a brief exploration into the definition of globalisation and then tries to understand the impact of the globalisation processes on the autonomy of nation states. The next section deals with the impact of globalisation on the state-education relationship.

Defining Globalisation

The term 'globalisation' has gained considerable currency in the popular and the social scientific understanding. It is, however, a contested and controversial concept in the social sciences and multiple explanations and different interpretations regarding what it actually represents abound. The nature, origin, impact and future of the globalisation process in different spheres of social life and parts of the world have been discussed from different viewpoints. One comprehensive definition of the processes and structures of globalisation is not yet possible, even though several thinkers have devoted attention to the phenomena.

The most common understanding of the concept of globalisation is of a new era of a closely integrated world society, where social, economic and political activity at local levels have global significance and impact and the vice-e-versa. According to Albrow (1996:9), globalisation refers to "all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated in a single society, the world society". Giddens (1990: 64) defines globalisation as "the intensification of world wide social relationships, which link distant places in such a way, that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-e-versa". The contours and constituents of the so called 'world society', their significance and future, are the issues around which the debate about globalisation is centred.

The emergence of a global society where territory, time and space do not decide the limitations, impact and configuration of national level political and socio-economic activity, along with the growing awareness among the social actors of such a condition is one major dimension of globalisation emphasised by social thinkers. For example, Malcolm Waters (1995:3) defined globalisation as—“ a social process in which, the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and people become aware that they are receding”. Giddens explains globalisation as a transformation of time and space leading to conditions of ‘social action at a distance’, termed as ‘distanciation’. It implies the interconnectedness of economic, political and cultural activities around the world, largely due to the increasing intensification of the means of instantaneous global communication and mass transportation. The decontextualization of social action around the world implies that no national economy or polity can stand alone and unaffected by the world processes and structures (Giddens 1990).

David Held et al. (1999:16) define globalisation as “a process (or a set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of the social relationships and transactions...generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and the exercise of power”. Here globalisation is seen as a process on a continuum between the national and the global.

Beck (1992; 1997) distinguishes between ‘globality’, ‘globalisation’ and ‘globalism’. Globality refers to the specific condition that we are increasingly living in a world society; in the sense that no happening in the world is only a limited local event now. Globalism indicates the subjective realm of our society where the ideas about a growing global society have made deep inroads. Robertson (1992) uses the concept of ‘global human condition’ to indicate the global oriented perspective; that is the growing awareness among the people of the world as one society. Globalisation is used as a blanket term to describe the processes and structures involved in the creation of the global society. Analysis of the

globalisation process involves delving into the economic, political, cultural and social changes that have characterised it and understanding their nature and future. Impact of the globalisation processes for the nation-state is one major focal point for such analysis.

Globalisation and the nation state

Globalisation is seen as growth of interstate connections and its impact on state policies, declining importance of the nation state and the emergence of global/international political, economic and cultural organisations, corporations and bureaucracies (Lash and Urry 1994). David Held et al (1999) distinguish between three broad approaches towards understanding the relation between globalisation and the nation state. These approaches are not monolithic or water tight compartments, but are different in their focus. The first is the 'hyperglobalist' approach, which considers globalisation as emergence of a radically new era. The 'hyperglobalists' assert that economic globalisation leads to 'denationalisation' of economies (for example, Lash and Urry 1994; Ohmae 1995) through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade and finance. In fact traditional nation states are seen as unnatural business units in the global economic field. It is suggested that economic globalisation is constructing new forms of social organisation that are sidelining traditional nation states as the primary economic and political unit of the world society. Governments are instead forced to manage the social consequences of globalisation and also manage in a context of global competition, which makes the earlier social democratic models of welfare and social protection untenable. They assert that economic globalisation is creating new winners and losers, in the world economy and earlier structures of international economic hierarchy are not relevant today. Growing acceptance of the neo-liberal ideological regimes by the elite and the 'knowledge workers' around the globe, imposition of a global culture of western lifestyle and consumerist ethics and growth of liberal democratic systems has created/is creating a 'global civilisation' defined by universal forms of social, economic and political organisations.

The 'global civilisation' is bringing in mechanisms of 'global governance', so that the state and the public are subject to new regional and global authorities. Also, as the state lies at the hub of global economic and cultural flows, and economic activity is no longer confined within the national territory, it is facing increasing pressures from the international actors. This has undermined state authority and legitimacy. Thus, global market, civilisation, governance and culture are considered as the four pillars of the new emergent world society.

According to the second approach, called as the 'sceptical approach', contemporary globalisation is by no means unprecedented. The 'sceptical' question the 'hyperglobalist' contention that there is any major economic globalisation existent. They think it is at best an 'internationalisation' of few predominant national economies (Hirst and Thompson 1996; Amin 1997). The 'sceptical' stress the enduring power of nation states to control their economies. The forces of internationalisation depend upon the power of the nation states to steer their national economic activity in the international scenario and get the best bargain for itself.

They question the idea that internationalisation of economy has created any major changes in the north-south and core-periphery relationships, other than replacing erstwhile dominant nations with dominant clusters of developed countries. Thus the sceptical theses is dismissive of the notion that internationalisation is bringing about any significant restructuring of the global economic relations and hierarchy. Global governance is considered nothing but a mechanism for the perpetuation of the relations of international dominance.

Third is the 'transformationalist' approach, centred on the idea that globalisation is the central driving force behind rapid social, economic and political changes in the world today (see Giddens 1990; Castells 1996). Contemporary globalisation is unprecedented to the extent that the nation states today need to adjust with conditions where there remain little differences between the international and national and internal-external matters. The

transformationalist consider globalisation as an open-ended process replete with contradictions and contingencies. Its direction and future trajectory are uncertain and is not compared with any ideal typical concept such as 'global civil society' or 'global market'. New forms of global stratification are visible across states, communities and nations. In this arrangement the old divisions of north-south or core-periphery do not hold completely true and neither are completely irrelevant. It is possible to find all the possible 'worlds' in the same country and community.

In the realm of economic globalisation, states have become even more active, but the modalities and forms of activism have changed. International economy, institutions and corporations are equally important today for the state as are the internal matters. These changes have brought in imperatives for policy and institutional changes in the state systems all around the world, which are geared towards the global market norms (Strange 1996). In the political realm also the interaction and importance of international decision making agencies have induced changes in the mechanisms of political decision making. Also, the distributive aspects of globalisation can have important domestic political changes, which require a global dimension in domestic policy making (Held et al 1999).

A reconstituting and reengineering of the power, functions and authorities of the national governments, has been taking place. The state retains the ultimate legal supremacy over what transpires within its boundaries, but this supremacy is juxtaposed to varying degrees, with the expanding jurisdiction of the institutions of international governance and the obligations and constraints of international law. The notion of the self-governing and autonomous state appears more as a normative claim than a descriptive statement. A new form of sovereignty is displacing the earlier forms of statehood, where it is more of a bargaining resource for a politics characterised by transnational network (Held et al 1999).

The world can no longer be conceived as state centric as authority has started becoming diffused in several private and public international and regional organisations. In

this scenario governments need to seek coherent strategies to deal with the global economic and political formations. Several models, depending upon time and location are being followed in this regard, such as the neo-liberal 'minimalist' states to 'developmental' and 'catalytic' states. Governments have increasingly become outward looking, co-operating and constructing international regulatory regimes to manage the numerous global issues that are part of their national and international agenda. Thus, the power of the governments are not necessarily diminished by globalisation processes, but on the contrary is being reconstituted and restructured in order to handle the growing complexity of international connectedness (Rosenau 1997).

It is possible to say that the power of nation states have been both diminished and not diminished due to globalisation. It is said to diminish because increasing global competition forces the nation states to focus on economic policies that make it globally competitive, at the expense of policies that make it domestically stable or generate social cohesion. The nation state is compelled to make the national economy attractive for the global capital, even if that means reduced public spending and policies that benefit financial interests more than workers or consumers (Castells 1996).

The state autonomy has not diminished because of the ultimate authority over the territory and the infrastructure space in which the global capitalistic activities are conducted. It is suggested that the congenial and conducive political and social environment provided by the nation states in the countries of investment are also a form of 'social capital' for the state, which increases its bargaining power (Coleman 1988). The national policies of the state can have an enormous impact on such social capital. The World Bank also, has stressed on the importance of the nation state for economic and social development (World Bank 1997).

The state, at the political level survives as a medial institution, far from powerless, but constrained by the imperatives to balance between the following four factors: a) responses to transnational capital, b) responses to global political structures and other

international organisations, c) responses to domestic pressures and demands to maintain its own political legitimacy and d) its own needs and self-interests (Torres and Morrow 2000). Most policy decisions, including that of education are made in the complex matrix of these four pressures.

Globalisation and the state-education relationship

The process of globalisation is still unfolding and each and every state/country is facing a different set of conditions related to it. Also, every country has a unique character and configuration of its education system and the state policy towards education. This makes it difficult to generalise about the impact of globalisation on the state education relationship.

The educational system has undergone three primary forms of change, apart from several others, in different degrees all over the world. The first is in financial terms. Most states are under exceeding pressures, emergent from the economic restructuring and global economic environment, to reduce the growth of public spending in higher education and to find alternative sources of funding for the much needed expansion. The second change that has emerged is in terms of labour markets. The returns for higher levels of education are rising all over the world as a result of shifts in the nature of economic production to knowledge intensive products and services. There is increasing pressure upon the governments to attract foreign capital, which necessitates a ready supply of highly skilled labour. This places enormous pressures on the states to expand their higher education systems, and to correspondingly to expand lower levels of education. The third change that has emerged has been in educational terms as such. The quality of national education system is being compared internationally. This has brought about increased similarity in course content, curricular emphasis and design and the general culture of educational preferences and attitudes (Carnoy 2000).

However, as is clear from the elaboration made above, there is a distinct reconfiguration of the state's autonomy and a reconstitution of its capacities to decide upon

its own domestic issues which have a global dimension. The state today is more likely to be influenced by the international organisations propagating and institutionalising the mechanisms related to economic globalisation and to follow their ideological prescriptions and paradigms. This has to be understood in the larger context of the supremacy of the state to decide upon what occurs in its boundaries and the kind of domestic pressures it faces. The questions that face us today are whether the autonomy of the states to decide upon their educational systems is left intact in the present era? What are the forces or institutions that are shaping education in countries experiencing globalisation? Are the changes that are appearing in the educational policies in the larger welfare of these nations or only of certain classes? (Burbules and Torres 2000).

Taylor (1997:61) mentions that “ a consideration of globalisation factors needs to be incorporated into any policy analysis of national developments”. It is suggested that the ways in which globalisation influences the national economic policy making can be many. For example, globalisation processes are taken into account in the policy priorities at the national levels, ideological discourses that frame education policy decisions have become largely globalized, and the political and financial structures beyond the nations are controlling the educational policy making and lastly the cultural environment in which the education system works is being globalized fast.

Taylor (1997) has analysed the cases of Papua New Guinea (PNG) and the Malaysian educational systems to show the kind of impact the World Bank and other international agencies propagating economic globalisation are having over the educational policies of the respective countries. In the case of PNG, it is noted that as a poor country its capacity to construct and define its own educational policies, are very limited. It is heavily dependent upon external aids and loans for such purposes, which is provided by the World Bank, IMF, Asian Development Bank etc. The agencies provide tightly conditioned loans and aid, which make it impossible for PNG to keep its own cultural and value framework in

education intact. The benefit of such influence goes to the minority of westernised bureaucratic and business elite of PNG, and not to the indigenous minority. Fraclas maintains that while recent changes in the way the global capitalism operates might open up new ways for the wealthy 'first world' nations but for the 'third world' nations it appears as another form of colonisation. He maintains that the international organisations are expropriating the rights of the indigenous people to define the policy parameters of their own choice and according to their own needs by pushing through the economic aid programs and their own set of universal criteria of development and education (as mentioned in Taylor 1999). Coupled with this are the conditions attached with the Structural Adjustment Loans that PNG accepted in 1989 from the World Bank and the IMF, leading to slashed state expenditure on health, educational programs and welfare. Also, the nature of the state is also transformed through encouraging legislation, which creates social conditions for overseas investment in the country more congenial.

The Malaysian higher educational system also shows the kind of pressures faced by the state when policy making renders global capital and trade more important than the domestic needs and priorities. To maintain the growth of its export sector, Malaysia needs global standard human resource, trained in technical/professional and service oriented streams. This education is received in the English language and is generally provided by the large self-financing private sector in higher education. This sector provides education to a narrow fraction of the population, which is of Chinese origin and constitute around 25 percent of the total population. The rest of the population is served by the public education system, which provides training in the local 'Bhasa Malay' language. This education is suitable for jobs in the government sector but is not valued in the international market and is of inferior quality. There has been increased pressure for expansion of global standard education in the recent times and the Malaysian State has encouraged even more privatization. Now, most of the private universities in the country have tied up with the

Australian universities for educational programs, which are run partially in Malaysia and partly in Australia, or even full programs being completed in the country itself. This has encouraged greater privatisation of higher education, and the system has become sharply biased towards those who have the capacity to pay and the already privileged groups in the society. Malaysia's commitment towards building its own national education system has been faltering due to its commitment towards global capital, which has been guiding its economic growth. It is probable that the public sector will be reduced even further in future, creating imbalances in the needs for nation building and the needs for the global capital.

Thus, as the discussion above shows, the globalisation processes tend to tilt the policy imperatives and priorities of the state towards the needs and requirements of global capital and market. Though every nation is the sole arbiter in the decision making and the responses differ from nation to nation, the unmistakable presence of the global dimension in education is important. This becomes even more crucial for the poor countries, which depend upon external loans and aid for their economic reform/survival. For nations undergoing the Structural Adjustment Program, the impact of international agencies and their ideology has been even greater (Hoogevelt 1997).

In fact, there has been critical erosion of the political and social capacities of the state to negotiate and to implement policies related to the key social spheres such as education in several African nations since they have started 'adjusting'. The dominance of the globalisation model of development as propagated by the institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank, is seeping into the ideological discourse of policy making and propagating international intervention as inevitable and beneficial in all spheres. This has critical consequences for the kind of educational problems that are defined for attention and the kind of solutions that are picked up (Hoppers 2000). The consequences for the majority populations in these countries are not at all encouraging. Greater freedom for markets and

influence of foreign capital on major policy decisions; greater privatisation and roll back of the state from social sector responsibility are the visible impacts of the program.

In relation to the educational policies this has been the most important dimension of globalisation for the developing countries. This is related to the political-economic transformation of the countries, which undertake the deregulation or liberalisation of their economies under the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The policy implications of the SAP have long term irreversible influences on the nature and configuration of the higher education sector. This significantly undercuts the capacity of the states to device policies, which bring about democratic expansion in higher education or to generate a significant degree of autonomy in research and development (Pannu 1994).

The Structural Adjustment Program and higher education

The SAP is a two pronged strategy adopted by the World Bank along with the International Monetary Fund to restructure the economies of the developing countries facing financial crisis, mostly of the balance of payment kind. The latter provides short-term loans for stabilisation and fiscal viability of the economy, by imposing short run constrains on the demand side of the economy by reducing governmental expenditure on 'unproductive' and expensive sectors. The former attempts at improving the overall health of the economy through supply side reforms. It aims at structural changes in the nature of the economy. It imposes conditions with sectoral loans regarding trade liberalisation and deregulation, dismantling of the state centric economic system, enhancing the export oriented global market integration and greater role for the private sector wherever possible and greater integration of the national economy to the world market, facilitating globalisation. While the stabilisation loans of the IMF impose stringent conditions on the state expenditure, usually on the social sector in the name of unproductive and inefficient resource allocation, the adjustment loans and the policies attached to it create long term shifts in the policy priorities.

All this would lead to budgetary cuts in the social sector spending (Nayyar 1995). Though this cut is not necessarily aimed at education or for higher education, it comes due to the influence of the World Bank in redistribution of resources within education from higher to the elementary education sector, for so-called 'efficient' allocation of resources. For example, among the several recommendations of the World Bank Educational Sector Paper, 'Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review' 1995, the main are: shift of public funding from higher to lower levels of education, the expansion of secondary and higher education through increased privatisation and the increase in the quality of education through relatively costless 'efficiency' reforms such as decentralisation.

Privatisation and globalisation are two major aspects of the SAP. Privatisation as a policy preference implies reduced role of the state and placing the market at the centre of the society. Privatisation is seen as a "powerful phenomena that puts markets and market concerns ahead of the state and the policies of the state" (Tilak 2000:53). With globalisation the world economy acquires equal or even greater significance in the policy imperatives of the state than the national economy. Accordingly domestic policies have to be subordinated to international policies. The role of the state is reduced to the promotion of private sector and globalisation in the domestic economy, while the adjustment processes change the political economic structure of the nation.

The chief impact of the adjustment policies on the higher education sector in India have been reduced budgetary resources, leading to accumulative drying up of the capacity of the system quality, quantity and equity wise. The cut is made largely in the 'planned' expenditure, which is responsible for capacity and facility enhancement, while the non-plan expenditure is left untouched or even increased as they form a large part of salaries and other such expenditure having political fallout if reduced. Also, the capital budgets are more likely to get slashed than the recurring expenditures. Investments in buildings, physical facilities and equipments etc. are traded off for recurring expenditure forming large parts of wage

bills. This situation continues along with expansion of the system taking a toll even further on the quality of the public education sector. As the policy priorities have shifted from non-tradable to tradable goods and commodities, within the education sector the priority shifts from less or non-revenue generating but otherwise valuable courses to more revenue generating courses. This is not only the case with social sciences and humanities but also for the physical and biological sciences. The priority has shifted to cheap marketable crash courses and certificates rather than proper disciplines of study. The budgetary allocation to research is an indicator of the shift. This has even more adverse effects for the majority section of students, especially the women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe, who are concentrated in the general education courses in the public education sector (Tilak 2000). The reduced preference for their quality enhancement would lead to their sidelining in the job market even further. This is in a way the derailing of the university system from its true goals and purposes of enhancement of learning and creation of new knowledge (Beteille 1995).

An important outcome of the adjustment policies has been the introduction of measures of increased cost recovery. Student loans and increased fees are two vehemently advocated measures in this regard. As cost recovery measures are introduced and direct and indirect subsidies are cut, access to higher education may be seriously effected. Inequities already existing in the system would further increase in terms of lower enrolment rates for women and other socio-economically weaker sections. The Government of India has time and again indicated reduced subsidisation of higher education, which would necessitate mobilisation of resources from fees primarily (GOI 1994; 1997). This has been in line with the World Bank policy of reduced subsidy for higher education and reallocation of resources to elementary education (World Bank 1986; 1994; 1995). The deliberative reports on this issue (UGC 1993; AICTE 1994), have recommended that the student fees already constitute around 15 percent of the total educational expenditure, which is comparable with several developed nations. The recommendations have been to increase the fees gradually to not

more than 20% of the total cost. However, it is witnessed that several universities and colleges providing professional education, such as management and engineering, have already increased the charges to phenomenal amounts. For example, today only the brochure, application and admission fees for a normal management course would exceed Rs. 2000 per candidate, apart from the high cost of education provided. This is sure to have adverse effect on the accessibility and demand of valued professional higher education among the weaker sections and the marginal sections of the society. Apart from this the dual pricing system and the capitation fee colleges continue to flourish. Coupled with this is the unavailability of protective measures and practicable and viable supportive programs of scholarships or loans for the weaker sections. In fact, the budgetary allocation for scholarships and support programs has declined sharply during the economic reform period (Tilak 2000). All this is happening in the time when the demand for higher education in the international job market is bound to increase. The decided shift would be in favour of the rich and already privileged sections.

The shift towards privatisation in the higher education policy appeared for the first time in the post-liberalisation era (to be discussed in chapter three). The Government of India states that “higher education needs to be extended in an equitable and cost effective manner mainly by large expansion of distance education and increased involvement of voluntary and private agencies” (GOI 1993: 204). This has been in line with the World Bank reform policies, which have been concentrating on privatisation in all spheres of social sector, especially higher education (World Bank 1994; 1986). It is noted that a movement towards privatisation has become the most important agenda of the World Bank (Richardson and Haralz 1995).

The shifts in the state policy towards higher education in India need to be seen in this context (to be discussed in chapter three). The effects of structural adjustment policies have been a restoration and encouragement of private enterprise in higher education. This happens directly as the adjustment policies advocate privatisation and marketization in every aspect of ‘services’ and indirectly because of reduced government expenditure. Private

funding in education would increase but that can not compensate for the loss of government spending and neither can it be expected to keep the goals of social justice and equality in view (Tilak 1991).

Educational development and the structural reforms seem to be antithetical (Tilak 2000). The basic paradox here is of the needs of the international market and the needs of the nation under adjustment. The international market, controlled by the transnational corporations based in developed countries, would like to create conditions so that exploitation of the cheap and low/semi-skilled labour available in these countries is made possible (Ilon 1994). For the standardised mass goods production, they would evidently lay more stress on elementary education rather than higher education in conditions of stringent budgets. While the adjustment plans make it more difficult for the state in these countries to maintain the levels of social sector spending as earlier, the ideological and political influence brought down upon them creates more favourable conditions for policy decisions, which move the given limited resources for education from the higher education sector to the elementary education sector. Thus, the state would be cutting down actual spending on education, on one hand, and transferring the resources available to the elementary education sector on the other. However, the states in the developed countries would, on the basis of their advantage with capital and resources, maintain their higher education systems in good shape as is explicit in their political agenda (see Powar 1998). This would maintain their already existent upper edge in the areas requiring high skills and information input such as electronics and communication, media, information systems, biotechnology and space technology, military and allied sciences etc. Thus, in the information age, when the key to economic competitiveness is greater investment in higher education and knowledge creation, the developed countries are securing their future and the adjusting countries are fighting to attain a balance between their own needs and the pressures of the global market (Singh 1994; Stewart 1995).

The adjustment policies stress that the “society can no longer afford social democracy, so expensive social and educational programs must be curtailed” (Laxer

1993:13). It has also been suggested that the dual processes of macro and micro economic changes affect the access to higher education in adjusting countries. While macro level budgetary shifts increase the cost of post-secondary education, the micro-level changes in household incomes and prices lessen the chances of access to higher education for the weaker sections due to increase in its opportunity costs. Apart from this, changes in the market policy of the state encourage privatisation and marketization of education, which effects the access to higher education by weaker sections (Noss 1991).

A clearer view of the differentiated and iniquitous impact of the adjustment policies on the adjusting countries can be had from the education of the *elite* and the poor in these countries. This shows how education is playing a legitimating role for the idea of the 'international division of labour' and the 'new world order'. While there has emerged a class of knowledge workers in both the developed and developing countries who are highly paid and are influential, the masses in the developing world are suffering from the disabilities caused by unequal access to quality education. These sections are served by ill maintained and less valued public education system and are forced into the low-income semi-skilled insecure job market provided by the trans-national corporations in these countries, while the 'knowledge workers' are the produce of the private sector in higher education (Tikly 2001).

Similarly, Ilon (1994) has shown that in future, a gulf between the 'global elite' and the rest of population in every country will increase. He maintains that "a national system of schooling is likely to give way to a local public/private system for the poor and a global system for the rich" (1994:99-102). Within this differentiated environment a top tier would receive a private education which would make them globally competitive; a middle tier would receive a good but not a world class education and the large majority would receive 'local', state education that would make them 'marginally competitive for low skill jobs' (1994:102).

Thus, in the direction of education two distinct processes are discernible in relation to the implementation of/ acceptance of neo-liberal policies in the adjusting countries. The 'dualization' of the higher education system will be the imminent outcome. There would be

emergence of two kinds of education systems. One for the majority, poorly funded and low in quality, and other for a very narrow segment, privately funded or public subsidised offering superior quality education. The other process would be increasing privatisation in various forms such as cost recovery, loans etc (Pannu 1994).

The net effect of these policies would be to annul whatever distributional potential education can have under conditions of equal access to students across class origins or family incomes (Colclough 1991; Samoff 1992). Privatisation and cost recovery in higher education commodifies educational goods, thereby making access dependent upon the ability to pay. Equity in education is thus, likely to decline sharply (Colclough 1991). Commodification, privatisation and unequal access already plague the higher education systems in the developing countries. The vehement promotion of these by the World Bank and other international organisations, through their financial and intellectual complex, can create even worse situations. In such scenario equal access to higher education would be closed off to large sections of population and also the middle classes caught in the income squeeze (Pannu 1994).

Conclusions

Globalisation appears to be an imminent and universal phenomenon, but the degree of and terms and conditions and modes of engagement of various nations vary considerably. While the 'first world' can boast of new avenues of social and economic change and transformation for better, the 'third world' basically faces it as a close fight between autonomy over its own policies and decision making powers and the demands of the global capital pushed by the international agencies such as the World Bank and the IMF.

Indeed, economic globalisation, constituted of the integrated world market, mobility of capital and finance, transnational/multinational corporations and the international agencies that govern the rules and regulations of global economic activity, is the most significant form of globalisation that has occurred. There is strengthening of the market and private interests all over the world. States today are trying to create conditions for capital

stability in their nations and are devising policy measures to enhance the market on their soils.

This involves accepting the principles of privatisation and marketization of their economies and creation of such conditions as would facilitate the twin processes. The roll back of the state from social sector spending, central and directive or regulative positions in the economies, and concentration on maintenance of the 'social capital' for globalisation are the major policy decisions. Educational policy is necessarily influenced in this scenario.

In the developing world the educational reforms have been largely 'financial reforms' driven (Carnoy 2000). The SAP is the main factor in the acceptance of the priorities of privatisation and marketization of education in the state policy. In India for example, the liberalisation period has seen greater emphasis on private enterprise, significant budget cuts and subsidy slashes and greater emphasis on market orientation of higher education. All these policies have resulted in advocacy and implementation of cost-recovery programs and self-financing private education. This scenario is likely to leave out large sections of the population from the globally competitive and standard education. Considerable reduction of the governmental expenditure and relinquishing of the responsibility for the same under the influence of ideological and political pressures from the World Bank have generated significant irreversible trends in the pattern of state funding for higher education and its responsibility. It can be suggested that the most crucial responsibility of the state is to safeguard the educational system, especially higher education, from the ill effects of liberalisation policies. This would be discussed in the next chapter with reference to the Indian situation.

CHAPTER – 3

STATE POLICY TOWARDS HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA

This chapter examines the state policy towards higher education in India since independence and the shifts visible in it after the liberalisation policies were adopted by the Indian government in May 1991, under the Structural Adjustment Program of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The aspect explored is the aims and purpose of higher education, the problems faced and the necessary reforms with respect to the Constitutional ideals of a socialistic and democratic Welfare state. The specific focus is on the aspects related to equity and social justice in higher education. The responsibility of the state for funding of higher education, the policy related to enhancement of quality, quantity and equity are dealt with.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, through the policies of liberalisation, the Indian economy was brought closer to the global market with deregulation and dismantling of the state centric economic system (Nayyar 1996). The mechanism for such opening up of the Indian economy entailed increased influence of the World Bank and other related international organisations over the policy imperatives of the Indian state towards the social sector, including that of education (Tilak 2000). Also, as the global market and culture made greater inroads into the Indian society, their influence and reach increased to a great extent generating other influential policy imperatives for the Indian State. There is a strong pursuit of the neo-liberal economic and political agenda by the World Bank and other international agencies guiding the economic liberalisation processes in several countries world over. This has generated a strong tilt towards privatisation and marketization as the policy imperatives of most of the developing countries, India being no exception.

The paradigm of the Welfare state seems to be weakened significantly. There is a greater freeing of the market from controls, regulation and direction by the state. In all possible areas of services, including the social sector such as health and education, private enterprise is being given greater encouragement and space, while the state expenditure in these areas is going down. This scenario has its unmistakable impact on the state policy towards higher education in India.

The analysis of state policy requires a careful understanding of its contexts of formation and implementation. The context of formation would include the various bodies involved in policy making, their goals and interests and capacities to influence the policies, objectives of the state and the various imperatives and forces acting on the policy making mechanism and bodies (Taylor 1997). As mentioned by Roger Dale (see chapter one), the state should not be considered as a monolithic entity. What it can do, or is capable of doing, and what it professes, declares and is called upon to do, may vary considerably with time and location and depends upon several complex social, economic, political and international factors. This situation becomes even more complex for the post-colonial developing countries like India (see chapter one). The state professes and attempts to bring about radical social, economic and political transformations in these countries, pushed by the rising tide of democratisation. It faces serious and myriad impediments from the entrenched elite in this process. The problem of rapid economic growth and lack of capital and the powerful demands of social justice and redistribution of resources put the state in a critical position. Education in this case becomes both, a vehicle for fulfilment of the goals of the state and a source of 'compensatory legitimacy'; a symbolic political justification representing social justice and egalitarianism (Jules and Apple 2000). Thus, the policy statements and their actual implementation can show a

massive gap in these countries. The actual potential of the state to fulfil what it formulates, as a policy would depend upon a host of factors.

The policy towards higher education since independence

In this section the policy towards higher education is analysed in terms of the responsibility assumed by the state for funding and support for expansion, democratisation and quality. The position taken in the policy over the questions of equalisation of opportunity for women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe are dealt with.

Education was expected to play a crucial and indispensable role in the social, economic, political and cultural reconstruction of the Indian nation at the eve of its independence in 1947. It was understood as a major constituent of the revolutionary changes taking place in the society. More so higher education, for its inevitable contributions towards industrial, scientific and technical progress of India envisaged in the socialistic pattern of development and state centric mixed economic system visualised by the Indian leadership. The role of higher education as an avenue of social mobility, modernisation of traditional Indian society and creation of a nationalistic ethos among the future generations were considered as pillars of Indian democracy and development. However, India was educationally very backward, and educational development during the colonial period was lopsided and defective. It needed a thorough overhaul, a rapid expansion and democratisation of its base and substantial qualitative improvement in tune with a modern independent and developing nation (Kamat 1989).

One of the prominent developments was the appointment of the University Education Commission in 1948 under the chairmanship of S. Sarvapallai Radhakrishnan. The immediacy of its appointment after independence was rooted in the urgent requirement for highly qualified manpower at the highest level in science and

technology as well as in the humanities and the social sciences for rapid economic, social, political and cultural development (Kamat 1989). The Report of the University Education Commission (1949) visualised higher education as the foremost organ of the modern civilisation and aimed to invest the universities with myriad and crucial responsibilities towards the material, intellectual and spiritual growth of the Indian nation.

Recognising the importance of higher education in building a new social and political order, upholding the ideals of liberty, equality and justice, it maintained that universities were to become the centre of intellectual and social adventure. The ideal of democracy, the report maintained means the freedom for each individual to attain holistic development in the context of the need for social changes. This freedom can not be had without social justice, which entails freeing of the individual from poverty, unemployment, malnutrition and ignorance. The guiding principle for changes and modifications in the institutions of democracy must be the enhancement of individual development and social welfare. And the educational systems we build also must pass this test. It considered social justice as the foundation of a democratic state and education as a great instrument of social emancipation by which a democracy establishes, maintains and protects the spirit of equality among its members (GOI 1962). The report establishes its position in favour of a society, which banishes class and status hierarchy. It maintains that:

In a democratic society, the opportunities of learning should be open to not only an *elite* but to all those who have to carry the privilege and responsibility of citizenship. Education is a universal right; not a class privilege... in distribution of educational opportunity there should be no caprice, prejudice, favouritism, special privilege or other arbitrary action. In general each person should have the educational opportunities of the kind and extent, which represent a fair share of the total educational resources. (GOI 1962:50-51)

It maintains that higher education is an obligation of the state and state aid and support should not lead to or confused with state control over academic policies and

practices. It advocates academic autonomy and the spirit of free inquiry of the utmost degree while being strongly in favour of state support and aid of higher education. Thus, the emphasis of the report is on higher education as a vehicle towards a just and humane society, and not only for material/intellectual development. The state is seen as the protector and upholder of the values of justice, equality and liberty enshrined in the Constitution. The obligation of the state towards establishing, expanding and improving a higher education system, geared towards the constitutional ideals is established without compromise.

The major recommendation of the report was the development of universities, particularly at the post-graduate stage, as the centres for research, and provision of adequate human and financial resources for the purpose of advancement of knowledge. Creation of a similar institutional base for the training of higher-level technological and professional personnel was also aimed at. Strengthening of the universities and such institutions by the Central government by ensuring the necessary funds and at the same time full autonomy in their functioning was strongly recommended, for which, the university Grants Commission was proposed. The report was in favour of an immediate turn towards the use of regional languages at the university level, along with English as a library language.

Most of these recommendations, except that of the establishment of the UGC, did not bring about any significant changes in the overall structure and configuration of the higher education system. In fact, the Secondary Education Commission (1952) suggested a different system of schooling to what was suggested by the university Education Commission (Kamat 1989). It took another fifteen years for the government to come up with any comprehensive and detailed rethinking over the educational

scenario in all its aspects when the Education Commission (1964-66) was appointed to look into the matter of developing a national system of education.

The Report of the Education Commission (1964-66), titled as 'Education and National Development', was a somewhat late but most essential appraisal of the urgent need to embark upon a comprehensive and radical transformation of the education system in India. It was to advise the government of India towards a construction of the national pattern of education and on the 'general principles and policies for the development of education at all stages and in all aspects' (GOI 1966). It mentions that "if... 'change on a grand scale' is to be achieved without violent revolution... there is one instrument and, one instrument only, that can be used: EDUCATION" (GOI 1966:4). According to the report a revolution in education would set in motion the social, economic and cultural revolutions.

While not losing the high hopes from higher education as indicated by the University Education Commission Report (1948-49), it was based on an appraisal of the crises in which the system was at that point of time. It addressed the questions of scarce resources and state funding, declining quality and standards, irrelevance for economic and cultural aspirations, and the inherent inequities in educational access and opportunities.

The commission recommended the establishment of 'major universities' in order to achieve the goal of improved standards and quality of higher education in India. The suggestion made was that a few universities should be selected for concentrated application of human and material resources and developed as the centres for excellence. They were expected to perform a catalytic function in revitalisation of the academic community through extension of their excellence to the overall university system. Centres

of excellence and development of 'autonomous colleges' were the other two recommendations in this regard (GOI 1966:279-282).

Reviewing the expansion of higher education during the first three five year plans, the commission expressed concern over the needs of expansion on one hand and the scarcity of resources on the other. It accepted that "the overall expansion of higher education in India is too meagre in comparison to that in the more industrialised countries...enrolments in the professional courses, particularly in science and agriculture, are extremely inadequate for the needs of our economic development"(GOI 1966:302). However, it lamented the sidelining of standards and quality of higher education due to indiscriminate expansion both in professional and general higher education. It advocated a strict selective system of enrolment in higher education in order to slow down the process of generation of educated unemployed youth. It was suggested that expansion of the facilities at this stage should be related to available resources and manpower requirements and not just on the basis of public and political demand. The recommendations were not against expansion but against expansion at the cost of standards and utility and indiscriminate proliferation of higher education institutions (Naik1997: 25).

One of the major aims that the Commission set before itself for the revitalisation of the national system of education was equalisation of educational opportunities and removal of inherent inequities in the system. It stated that "one of the important social objectives of education is to equalise opportunity, enabling the backward and under privileged classes and individuals to use education as a lever for the improvement of their condition" (GOI 1966:108). It noted the inequalities caused by imbalanced development of education in various areas of the country, poverty and social and educational backwardness of the population. The report made a series of recommendations regarding

expansion of educational opportunities for women and the weaker sections, namely the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, through scholarship programmes, hostel accommodation for rural students etc. It set a target of achieving at least 33 percent enrolment of women to total enrolment in ten years. The report also suggested coming up with and expansion of courses to meet the specific needs of women and the economic avenues open to them (GOI 1966:313). In order to make access to higher education more equitable it suggested that the program of freeship and scholarships should be extended as far as possible. It set a target of 25 percent and 50 percent of enrolment in under graduate and post-graduate program respectively by the year 1986.

Regarding the financing of higher education, the report asked the state governments to put adequate funds at the disposal of the universities and keep the universities immune from direct government intervention and also from direct public accountability. The commission maintained that the Centre must assume far greater responsibility for the development of post-graduate education and research and for the development of the universities. It noted that the extent of facilities provided at that stage was inadequate and its quality left much to be desired. The Government of India was to be exclusively responsible for post-graduate education and research (GOI 1966:312). It however, did recognise the importance of contribution from other sources of the community and the industry.

The idea of cost recovery from the students through fees or other such means was considered highly undesirable and against the ideals of the socialistic and the welfare state. The commission mentioned that to regard fees as a source of revenue for supporting education is the most regressive kind of taxation and falls more heavily on the poor classes of the society. It recommended that the country should work towards a situation when all education is free (GOI 1966:111). It noted that the share of fees in the total

recurring expenditure on higher education was already high and comparable to rich countries. However, the report did not suggest immediate abolition of fees in higher education, which it indicated as a first priority for primary and secondary education.

The report projected the role of private enterprise in higher education as very limited since the government of India rightly assumed the full responsibility of providing all the needed educational facilities. However, the report recognised the positive contribution of the quality private institutions in India and suggests that their assistance to the government would be valuable. For private institutions, which seek aid from the government, it suggested that they should be gradually merged with the government system and the source of their extra income, that is fees, should be abolished. The report stated that “the growing educational needs of a modernising society can only be met by the state and it would be a mistake to show any over-dependence on the private enterprise which is basically uncertain” (GOI, 1966: 446).

The National Policy on Education (1968) was the first comprehensive action plan formulated by the central government to guide the educational development in the states after the acceptance of the Kothari Commission Report. Some of the notable recommendations of the report, which were incorporated in the policy were the use of regional language of instruction at the university level, the common school system, the pattern of 10+2+3 for school and college education, non-formal education and the enhancement of teacher’s salaries.

The recommendations, which were opposed and rejected, include several key points on which the Commission had put great emphasis. The changing of the priority structure for higher education as a whole was the first to be rejected. The Commission maintained that till now the priority in higher education was first expansion, second quality improvement and lastly, reform of the character of education. It suggested that

this should be inverted and the first priority should be laid upon the reform in character of education, such as linking it more closely to economic needs, national aspirations and decentralisation etc. The second priority should be on maintaining optimum level of quality in the existent institutions and improving the overall level of higher education and research. The third priority should be of expansion of higher education without compromising the other two priorities. The political community and the government could not except this recommendation (see Naik, 1997 for a detailed analysis). Related to this recommendation was the scheme for development of 'major universities' and selective development of institutions, which were out rightly rejected on the same ground of priorities.

The policy made one thing clear that the state could not shy away from taking complete responsibility for expansion of higher education, even if the resources necessary for maintenance of quality and reform of the character of the education provided were not sufficient in the budgetary allocations. The state must find some way to compromise between the lack of resources, growing demand of higher education and the requirements of quality.

However, during the political debates on the formulation of a statement of the National Policy on Education of 1968, as recommended in the report, only some of the recommendations acquired wide-ranging political significance. Kamat (1989) opines that the social and political climate was not ready to adapt the major recommendations of the Commission and was in fact in favour of continuing the status quo with measures which actually supported the dynamics of political economy as it was developing after the Independence. Naik (1997), however, notes that the report also had some basic flaws, which made it difficult to be formulated in one comprehensive policy statement. The overall perspective of the recommendations as a *package* was lost in the process. Various

pressure groups and political camps, in a bid to capture the politically sensitive points, reduced the *comprehensive* approach of the Commission in a piecemeal effort. The politics of convenience reduced even the fundamental recommendations to non-committal platitudes and innocuous statements with no clear determination or will to implement the policies properly (Kamat 1989; Naik 1997).

The 1968 policy was reviewed and formulated into the 1986 National Policy on Education. The policy laments that the large system of higher education shows highly 'uneven' development, outdated and irrelevant courses and a discredited evaluation system. It states that the university system should be enabled to move centre stage. In fact, the stress in the policy is explicitly on creation of mechanisms to safeguard quality and efficient use of resources available (GOI 1986).

In relation to the enhancement of quality and standards the policy repeated the stress on the consolidation and expansion of facilities already existing in the institutions, in order to prevent their further deterioration. It mentions that provisions would be made for maintenance of minimum facilities and regulation of admissions according to the capacities. The autonomous college system and autonomous departments in the universities was given greater stress. In order to co-ordinate the expansion and quality maintenance of the higher education system in the states, a national apex body at the central government level and state councils of higher education at the state levels were proposed (GOI 1986).

The 1986 policy did not give a clear picture of funding and resources for higher education. In fact, the policy document does not devote any separate section for resources for higher education. It stresses on the idea that the state 'burden' towards education should be reduced as far as possible partly by efficient use of resources and partly by additional sources. It mentions that additional resources will be mobilised at the school

level through donations and securing help from the beneficiary communities in maintenance and facilities. It also plans for raising of fees at the higher education level. The 1986 policy was the first to mention that the private enterprise can help augment the state resources in the expansion of the system. This might have cleared the way for the further relaxation of policy towards increasing fees and private enterprise in higher education (GOI 1986).

In all, the policy presents a picture in which there is no bold assertion or commitment towards more resources for education. It does, however, mention the fact that the requisite resource allocation for education as recommended in the Education Commission Report 1966, has remained unfulfilled since then. The policy document promises that the eighth plan onwards the target of 6 percent of national income for education would be met (which of course did not happen!).

In terms of equity, the policy made a new beginning in the area of women education. It stressed the importance of education for the empowerment of women in society and promised deliberate positive intervention on the part of the state in curriculum design, teacher training and attitudes of administration and the institutions. The policy was emphatic on following non-discrimination and encouragement at all levels of education and especially in technical and professional education to counter sex stereotyping. For the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe students, equalisation with the general population at all levels and in all streams was taken as a target. However, the policy mentioned most of the intervening measures in the area of school education and higher education was only partially touched (GOI 1986).

The Rama Murthi Committee (1990) reviewed the 1986 policy. A report titled "Towards a Just and Humane Society" was prepared, which gave its recommendations after reviewing the various programs of the NPE 1986 POA. It states that higher education

should be given a dynamic role to play in social action related to critical issues faced by our people. As higher education is largely funded by the state, the universities should strike a balance between the regional expectations of the people and their global activities of research and education. In fact, the Committee asserted that this linking up of higher education with the people's initiatives and local planning would give it a life, which it lacks now even after the courses have been redesigned. Such capabilities should be integrally built into the courses and programs (GOI 1990: 218).

It mentioned that higher education reflects very serious weaknesses. The proliferation of universities and colleges has been rather unplanned. Infrastructure facilities are seriously inadequate. There is marked mismatch between education and employment. Wastage in the system in terms of failures and low pass percentage is very high. Examination reform has been slow. There are serious complaints about the lack of responsiveness in the system. The report noted that the foremost difficulty in stemming the unplanned growth of higher education is the inability of the UGC to stop the state Governments from doing so. It recommended serious evaluation of possible statutory mechanisms for this purpose (GOI 1990)

The report considered women's education to be an important constituent of the overall plan for attaining the ideal of equity and social justice in higher education. It addressed the issues of women's education, in the perspective of the special existential problems of women – such as the cultural norms of gender behaviour and the perceived domestic and reproductive roles which restrict their access to education. It strongly advocated intervention on behalf of the women by the state in all its manifestations (GOI 1990)

In accordance with its view about the relationship between education and social and economic development, the Report asserted that the work for upliftment of the

Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes should not be isolated activities in individual departments or institutions. It should be linked with a larger framework of social and economic change along with educational transformation, as they are mutual processes. In its words, these benefits should be part of an 'equity package'. The committee was of the view that fair participation of the weaker sections in the education system can be achieved only if their possession of means of production was assured through various mechanisms such as land reforms, fair wages, decentralisation of planning and development programs etc. Only this would enable an actual change in the access and continuance of the weaker sections in all the levels of education, including higher education (GOI 1990)

The report mentioned several recommendations for generating enough resources for higher education. It maintained that public expenditure in education should exceed 6 percent of the GNP. All technical and management education should be made self-financing with appropriate support to the students with the way of student loans. It also suggested increase in tuition fees and the fees charged for other specific purposes in the higher education institutions. It advocated the need for mobilisation of institutional finance, community contribution and augmentation of resources through utilisation of services and property of higher education institutions to strengthen their resource base.

The recommendations of the review committee were again reviewed and a new program of action was prepared by the central government in 1992 to provide guidelines for respective state policies (GOI 1992a). This policy remains the last comprehensive plan of action in the area of higher education in India. During this time in May 1991 the Indian government adopted the New Economic Policy (NEP) after an acceptance of the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to tide over a serious balance of payments crisis (Nayyar 1995). With this, the

phase of economic liberalisation in India started. This had serious implications for the state policy towards higher education and the overall scenario of higher education system as such. These changes are still unfolding and categorical evaluation of the future direction of higher education is not yet possible.

One more very significant issue in this context needs mentioning. The growth of private higher education in almost all parts of the country at an unprecedented scale occurred in mid 80's onwards with the capitation fee colleges in the states of Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu (Kaul 1993). The process has accelerated since then, especially after the liberalisation policies started having their impact. The state policy towards the private enterprise in higher education and its impact would be discussed in the next chapter, where the social context of higher education is discussed in detail. Here it should suffice for the purpose that the state never came out with a separate policy related to the private enterprise in higher education as such. In its general policies, since 1991, it has maintained a tacit understanding towards the issue which gives enough space for the private higher education system to go on its own way. In fact, in some ways this silence of the state is more consequential especially in the conditions generated after the economic liberalisation.

In several deliberative reports and discussion papers post liberalisation, the issue of state's role in education as such, has been discussed, which has serious implications for future stand of the state towards higher education. This discussion has been largely in the area of state funding and the reforms needed to rise above the present crisis of resources for higher education. The discussions and debates have been generated by the policy imperatives created by the economic liberalisation policies.

The Rama Murthi Committee Report, was reviewed by the Cabinet Advisory Board on Education (CABE) in 1992, to discuss the operational elements of the policy to

be modified in the existing 1986 NPE, and to be formulated in a POA. The CAGE report concluded that, the NPE 1986 policy framework was adequate for the time being in areas such as the education of Women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe. It sidelined the overall emphasis of the review report on a comprehensive approach by citing its lack of clarity in the actual course of action to be taken (GOI 1992b). The issue of a national statutory body for higher education to check unplanned growth of higher education was rejected on the basis of its coercive character. The establishment of state councils of higher education was kept open ended and no concrete statements were made regarding their establishment (GOI 1992b).

The CAGE Report added several new measures in the recommendations over the issue of resources for education. It mentions that in face of competing demands and resource constraints, resources for education can never be adequate. It suggested that higher budgetary allocation should be complemented with other measures. It suggested prioritisation within the education sector in the matter of allocation of governmental resources. It advocated progressive transformation of the higher education, especially technical and management education into self-financing by revising the fee structure. It proposed adequate support to the needy students by way of student loans. The report laid strong emphasis on generation of resources within the institutions of higher education through diverse methods. Its other primary recommendation was evaluation of academic programs on the basis of efficiency and effectiveness in terms of the outcomes (GOI 1992b: 75). One crucial issue in the 1992 POA is of the financing of higher education.

Financing higher education in India

The question of funding of higher education has always attracted deliberation and debates. After independence promotion of education became a responsibility of the state. Constitutional provision was made to support higher education. The governments

provided support for both maintenance and development of the universities and colleges set up by the state. State also provided support to private colleges established by trusts or societies in time. Thus, till now the state has been a main financing agency for the universities and the Colleges. The phenomenon of self-financing colleges, deemed university and self-financing programs of studies are of recent origin (Sharma 2000).

There has not been any concerted effort on the part of the state to formulate a policy for funding of higher education (Sharma 2000). There exists a general statement that the state shall aspire to allocate 6 percent of the National Income on education, but it remains an unfulfilled dream till now. The share of education to the National Income has hovered around the figure of 3 percent, since the Kothari Commission Report advocated for it. Also, there has been no proper assessment or fixation of a proportion for higher education in the overall resources for education (Sharma 2000).

While total expenditure in higher education has increased in terms of current prices, but the expenditure per pupil in real terms has indeed declined (Tilak 2000). The priority given to the higher education sector in terms of the percentage of GNP is coming down. The share of higher education in the GNP was around one percent in 1980-81, but it tended to decline to nearly half by the early 1990s. Since 1980s the balance of resource allocation within the educational sector is not in favour of higher education. Expenditure on higher education as a share of total recurring expenditure on education shows a constant decline in the same period (see Table 1).

This gradually diminishing investment in higher education is clear in the resource allocation made for education and higher education in the various Five-Year Plans. The share of higher education in total plan resource increased from 0.71 percent in the first plan to 1.24 percent in the fourth plan and ever since it has declined up to the 0.35 in the eighth plan (Tilak 2000). Also, as a share in total educational expenditure

allocated in the five year plans, higher education started from 9 percent in the first plan to 25 percent in the fourth plan and then steadily declined to 7 percent in the eighth plan outlay (Verghese 2000) (see Table 2).

Table 1: Expenditure on Education

Year	Education(% GNP)	Higher education (%GNP)	Recurring exp. (%GNP)
1950-51	1.2	0.19	20.0
1960-61	2.5	0.39	22.0
1970-71	3.1	0.77	27.0
1980-81	2.9	0.98	29.0
1990-91	3.7	0.56	18.0

Source: 1. Education in India (various years) 2. Annual Reports of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

Table 2: Share of Education in five-year plan outlay (%)

Plan	1	2	3
First plan	7.8	0.71	9
Second plan	5.8	1.02	18
Third plan	6.9	1.01	15
Plan Inter Regnum	4.8	1.16	24
Fourth plan	5.8	1.24	25
Fifth plan	3.3	0.52	22
Sixth plan	2.7	0.49	18
Seventh plan	3.1	0.53	14
Annual plans	4.3	0.48	11
Eighth plan	4.5	0.35	7

Source: Five year plan Documents, Planning Commission, and Government of India.

1= share of education in total plan outlay; 3= share of higher education in educational outlay

2=share of higher education in total plan outlay

Expenditure on higher education as a percentage of the GNP has come down from 0.98 in 1981 to 0.39 in 1994-95. Over the period 1990 to 1997, the share of higher education in the total expenditure on Education by both the Central government and the state Governments has decreased. In 1989-90 the Central government spent around 32.2 percent of its educational expenditure on higher education, it decreased to 28.9 in 1990-91 and 15.7 in 1996-97. In fact, in the face of declining educational expenditure in overall percentage of GNP, the total percentage spent on higher education (by the Centre and the state) has seen a decline from 14.7 in 1990 to 11.5 percent in 1996-97 (Sharma 2000). In the year 2000-01 the percentage share of higher education in the total outlay for education is around 9%(GOI 2001).

An analysis of the sources of funding for education clearly indicates that in the 1950's only 58 percent of the public expenditure on education came from government sources. The share of government in the expenditure on education has increased with time. Currently, nearly 85 percent of the educational expenditure comes from the government (Varghese 2000). Among the sources of education finances, the relative share of fees has declined sharply during the post-independence period, for example, it was 36.8 percent of total recurring expenditure in 1950-51 and around 15 percent in 1984-85. The Voluntary contributions in the form of donations and endowments have also declined in relative terms. Recent data available for 1991-92 for a few universities show that the contribution of fees in total expenditure on education varies from university to university. In general, the contribution of fees in the Central universities is much smaller (Tilak 2000). It is also found that academic support and research support does not count as the significant users of expenditure on higher education.

The need for more resources in higher education is clear. In order to maintain adequate level of expansion, equity and quality the prevalent resources need to be almost

trebled in real terms (Tilak 2000). Thus, the higher education sector in India is facing a resource crunch right from the late 1980's and the situation has worsened since the policies of liberalisation have been initiated. There is an accumulated drying up of the resources, and most of the expenditure occurs in the recurring kind, or the non-plan kind, the plan expenditure, which is used for infrastructure build up and improvement has been going down (Tilak 2000).

In this scenario, the state is trying to initiate mechanisms for generation of resources for higher education from alternative sources. Various schemes advocated by international agencies and organisations have been in the debate and many in India are keen over quite a few suggestions made by them (Tilak 2000). There are talks of cost recovery from the students, student loan scheme and credit market in higher education, scholarships, reducing the demand of higher education, greater privatisation and marketization etc. as the possible answer for the question of resources for higher education. However, these alternatives are highly controversial and have not proved to be feasible or beneficial in terms of quality, equity and quantity. This is specially so in the Indian context. It has been maintained by many, that the state can not relinquish the responsibility for providing quality higher education at this stage of development in India, and particularly when competitive global markets are more and more moving towards the knowledge industries. (Tilak 2000; Powar 1995,1997).

In the year 1992 the Justice Punnaya Committee was appointed to look into the financing of higher education in the Central universities and other institutions. The Punnaya Committee Report (1992-93) re-emphasised the importance of higher education. As considered by early policy makers and thinkers, its growth and development, is not merely an effort to establish the cultural identity of India on the international scene but also as a means to enhance the quality and productive capacity of

manpower. It is considered as a crucial input into the efforts to achieve self-reliance and autonomy in strategic areas.

The Punnaya Committee Report maintained that, it would be unfortunate and undesirable if the crucial role and relevance of higher education is underestimated and sidelined in the debate over the distribution of resources among different sectors of education. It states:

There is no denial, that while primary education is fundamental to the nation, higher education determines its economic and technological progress. While it is mandatory that the nation should achieve universal elementary education and total literacy, at the same time it cannot afford to neglect and relegate to a neglected position our quest to achieve global standards in higher education. The Committee deprecates the tendency, which view education in a truncated fashion and sets one sector against the other. The advancement of quality primary and secondary education itself depends upon the quality of higher education (UGC, 1993:17).

The Committee Report mentions that among the most important roles of higher education are a “critical input to ensure social justice and equity for providing upward mobility and higher levels of economic and social activities for the weaker sections” (UGC 1993:18). The report asserts that the demands of equity and social justice render it essential that the newly emerging beneficiaries of secondary education, largely from the most vulnerable sections, are able to afford and access quality higher education. The report considered higher education as the most significant part of the national educational endeavour and strongly justified and demanded support and intervention by the state (UGC 1993:18).

In May 1997 the Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, brought out a ‘discussion paper’, titled “Government Subsidies in India: A Discussion Paper”, which could have very far-reaching consequences on higher education. The discussion paper showed a clear influence of the World Bank on the policy making on education as such and higher education in particular in India.

The paper was an initiative on the part of the government of India to generate a debate on the issue of 'appropriate targeting of subsidies' by the state. The paper is based on three fundamental premises. First premise is clarified in the initial statement of the paper that is "subsidies are advocated when the social benefits of a particular service or commodity are greater than the sum of private benefits to the consumers". Basic education is kept under the above mentioned group, as it is understood to provide substantial social benefits. In its case "the normal market mechanisms are insufficient to ensure an appropriate level of such services, and subsidies are advocated to provide the necessary corrective" (GOI 1997: 2). This is then, a 'merit' good and thus attracts subsidy. On the other hand, higher education is considered as a 'non-merit' good with respect to subsidies, because economists believe that "there are normally no significant differences between the private and social valuations in these areas" (GOI 1997:2).

The second premise is that subsidy, which is directly delivered to the target population or products is more effective as subsidy on inputs are generally dissipated for the benefit of non-target populations. The paper notes that for example "A significant proportion of subsidies in higher education is probably appropriated by middle to high income groups" (GOI, 1997:2)

The third premise is, un-targeted subsidy produces wastage of resources and promote corruption and inefficiency (administration, law and order and defence have not been questioned in this regard!). Thus, the paper divides the services provided by the government in three groups. Public goods like, defence and administration, merit goods such as primary education and non-merit goods and services such as "education beyond elementary level"(GOI, 1997:6). Apart from this, the Report also assumes some very untenable and controversial arguments in the Indian context. It proposes a significant cut in subsidy on non-merit goods, around 90 to 50 percent in the period of three to four

years on the assumption that reduction in the number would not be harmful to the national interests. It assumes that a substantial increase in the user prices is possible. It also assumes that the middle classes, including the higher salaried classes would be able to afford the unsubsidised or nominally subsidised professional education. The validity of these assumptions is questionable in the Indian context (Powar 1997).

The arguments given in the paper are very much similar to what was advocated in the World Bank thinking over these issues. The World Bank document “ Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience (1994)”, states that “indeed it is arguable that higher education should not have highest priority claim on the incremental public resources available for education in many developing countries, especially those that have not yet achieved adequate access, equity and quality at the primary and secondary levels. This is because the social rates of return on investments in primary and secondary education usually exceeds the returns from higher education...”(World Bank 1994:3). The discussion paper generated much criticism and was shelved after its circulation. It however, gives an indication of the kind of impact the international organisations like the World Bank is having/can have on the educational policies of India.

Another major and controversial Report titled ‘A Policy Framework for Reforms in Education’, prepared by two leading industrialists in the country for reforms in education is a case in point. The very act of it being prepared by industrialists and not by Department of Education was highly indicative of the importance the state has come to attach to the market in the era of liberalisation. This report was prepared by the special subject group on policy framework for private investment in education, health and rural development submitted to the Prime Minister’s Council of Trade and Industry. In a way, the report can be considered the benchmark opinion of the section of people sharing complete identity with the World Bank programs towards restructuring of social

sectors like education and other services. They look forward to greater privatisation and market development in education and other social sectors as well.

The recommendations of the report for all the sectors of education are greatly consequential for higher education. The suggestion that the report makes with its overall argument is, in simple words, like this. Elementary education and high rates of adult literacy are necessary for greater economic growth and competition in the global markets. This should be the first priority of the state and only after the goal of universal primary education is fulfilled that higher education can be taken as a priority. Elementary education should be made free and compulsory and use of modern technologies and alternative schemes to deliver elementary education should be promoted. As this would require great resources on the part of the state, it should take care to invest most efficiently. "The most efficient use is where you get the highest returns... this is in the area of primary education" (GOI 2000:7).

Higher education is a 'good' with more 'private' and less of 'social' returns. Those who get higher education should pay for it, or resources for higher education should be arranged through industry sponsorships etc, in no case the government should bear responsibility for higher education, which can be marketed. Those, which can not be marketed, may be supported. Inevitably, higher education should become market oriented and change itself according to the demands of the global market. In fact, a market for higher education should develop, with private enterprise replacing the state in a big way and higher education becoming largely self- financing. A Private Universities Bill should be enacted and foreign capital encouraged in this area. Assessment and evaluation of the state run institutions should be based on a quantitative regime and the outcome efficiency and competitiveness in the global market. India should market higher

education in the global arena and thus courses and programs should be moved in this direction (GOI 2000).

Thus, the deliberative context of the state policy towards higher education in India seems to be transforming slowly but surely towards a tacit acceptance of the paradigm of privatisation, marketization and globalisation. Though the above mentioned 'discussion paper' and the 'Report for policy framework for reforms in education', have been shelved and the policy decisions have not shown any influence by their recommendations explicitly, they form a crucial ideological environment of policy formation today. They are an indicator of what may come in future, especially in the context of the silence of the state towards increasing privatisation of higher education in India (Sharma 2000). The pattern of state roll back from initiative and innovation, comprehensive responsibility and development of higher education as a whole and most important, funding of higher education, its modalities and priorities, show a trend towards the above mentioned policy shifts.

Conclusion

The policy towards higher education started with an emphasis on higher education as a resource for social, economic, cultural and national development. The state was assumed to support and expand higher education. Higher education policy laid considerable importance on its being an important measure of social justice. However, very less changes were made apart from the expansion, planned and unplanned, in the organisational structure and relation to the national needs until the National Educational Policy was formulated in 1968.

The state policy towards higher education since the Calcutta University Commission (1917) shows a recurrent theme of controlling unplanned growth, improvement of standards, increased funding and creating relevance for the economy.

While there has been significant demand for higher education, which is justified enough, this demand has been satisfied at the cost of quality. No plan or policy till now has been able to undertake macro-level reforms, even if some good examples do exist in various pockets. The basic structure of our higher education system remains that of established by the British.

Despite concerned about the falling standards and unplanned growth, the state has always treated education as the residual sector. Higher education has always been starved for more funds. The share of higher education in total educational expenditure has been falling since the late 1980s. The policy has been more favouring for other sectors of education, while expansion and deterioration in higher education has continued, mostly at the level of undergraduate general education. This dual process of less resources and expansion without standards in general education has taken its toll on professional education. This has brought in the private enterprises and has created a class-based system of desirable education damaging the cause of social justice significantly.

With liberalisation, the state under the policy prescriptions of the World Bank has gone even further in the direction of relinquishing the responsibility for expansion, funding and quality improvement. The issue of efficiency and stringency in resource use, 'doing more with less' to use Michael Apple's words, making higher education self-financing has got an upper hand in the policy prescriptions. Reallocation of resources within the given expenditure on education has been taking place. It has turned towards the private sector instead and has been trying to create conditions for their expansion in higher education sector. It is overseeing the fact that private education has never been the priority for the goals of social justice and democratic quality education in any of the policy prescriptions before 1992. It has failed to see, or has ignored the possible fallout

of this movement towards the market in higher education for the weaker sections, women and the minorities, and even the middle classes to a significant extent. Their chances of social mobility and social, economic and cultural development using higher education as an avenue, especially for the first generation learners, is highly jeopardised in this scenario.

CHAPTER-4

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA

This chapter examines the social context of higher education in India highlighting the issues of equity and social justice. It is divided into two parts. In part one, the access of women and the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the higher education system, compared to the general population is examined. An analysis of the role and character of private enterprise in higher education is undertaken and the questions of increasing privatization and market development in higher education in India are also dealt with. In part two, the debate over the issue of social implications of privatization in higher education and the question of the role of the state in this regard is supplemented with inferences drawn from a field study undertaken by the researcher.

Part One

Indian education is based upon the ideals of equality and social justice as is reflected in the Constitutional provisions regarding education and the various policy statements and reports of various commissions and committees related to education that have appeared since independence (see chapter three). The modern Indian state accepts the obligation of providing education to all citizens of the country and especially to those sections of the population who have hitherto been deprived and backward. This is also an important dimension of the larger pursuit of social justice and equity by the state for which, education has been recognized as an important tool. The concept of equal opportunities for all presumes equality of access to various channels of social and economic mobility. The equal opportunity to rise to a higher level in a stratified society is the landmark of equality in any society (Chitnis 1988).

The structures and processes of the society can not be insulated from the education system (Beteille 1983). It can be suggested that the education system is bound to reflect the social and economic characteristics of the society, and to a large degree its outcome and performance is determined by the social context in which it exists. In effect, the processes and structures of domination, subordination and exploitation in the society would tend to make education system a party in the perpetuation of the status quo.

However, education is also one field of human activity, which due to its very nature creates potential of change and dissension. Education is also an indispensable tool for supporting the process of social change. But the point, which is most relevant, is that education alone is not the agent of social change. It only acts in mutual relation to larger processes of social, economic and political transformation, in the absence of which, it is most likely to mirror the existing structures of domination and sub-ordination (Kamat 1986).

Higher education in India has witnessed rapid expansion in the last fifty years since independence. Though, it reaches only the 7 percent of the relevant age group of the population its expanse is impressive indeed. At present there are 189 universities, 42 deemed to be universities, and 5 other institutes of national importance. Total number of recognized colleges are 11,381 out which there are 1,520 women's colleges. In the year 2000-01, the total student enrolment was 77.34 lakhs. Around 80 percent of this enrolment are in the affiliated colleges (GOI 2001a) Though all sections of the population have gained due to the expansion, the social inequities of region, rural-urban, gender, class and caste have continued to plague the system in terms of equity.

The Indian education system exists in a society marred with serious social, economic, cultural and political inequalities and differentiation. In the Indian context,

social stratification based upon the caste system is a crucial determinant influencing the educational opportunities for a large section of the population (Naik 1997). Access to education depends upon the position of the individual in the caste hierarchy, which determines his/her socio-economic position in the society. The reverse of this situation also holds true, that is the socio-economic condition of the individual is determined by his/her educational attainment, which in turn is decided by the caste position. This is a bi-directional condition and forms a vicious circle of social and educational backwardness (Raza 1991:58).

Discrimination against women and structures for subordination of women are recognized as cross sectional barrier towards equal access of the higher education system. Across region, caste and class, women are left outside the mainstream society and –“ bear a cumulative burden of inequality” (Chanana 2001:293). The traditional role expectations, familial and cultural constraints and discrimination right from the beginning of the schooling days constantly reduce the chances of women to reach to the socially coveted and valued career options, which might pay greater returns in life. The education process is co-opted in the traditional structures of gender roles and subordination of women.

Women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe in higher education

The Indian leadership and the state have recognized the need for equal opportunities for women in all fields of life. The problems of women’s education were discussed in the first two plans and higher professional education and occupation oriented education for women were stressed upon (see Chanana 2001). The need for trained and highly qualified women to take up the responsibilities of a modern economy was emphasized in the University Education Commission Report in 1948. The Report of Committee on the Education of Women (1959) suggested several measures for a more

comprehensive approach towards women's education. However, the Report of Committee on the Status of Women in 1974 showed that the disparities in the education of men and women continued to be stark. The National Education Policy, 1986 stressed on the role of education in empowering women enabling them to free themselves from the social bondage of inequality. The National Perspective Plan 1988-2000, advocates the role of education in women's liberation and social and economic mobility (Chanana 2001).

Despite the assertions made in the policy and the efforts made by the state the higher education system still shows gross bias against women. In terms of total enrolment women have made considerable growth. From 10 percent of total enrolment in higher education in 1951 women have come up to 35.5 percent in the year 2000-01 (GOI 2001b). The enrolment of women increased from 10.8 percent in 1951 in the undergraduate level of education for all streams to 33 percent in undergraduate level, from 12.1 to 35.4 percent at the graduate level and from 14.1 to 36.5 percent in the research levels in the year 1996-97. A significant change has been a near equalization of women's enrolment in all levels of education, which is hovering around one third of total enrolment in this decade (Chanana 2001).

While the increase in the enrolment of women in general education is substantial, their participation in professional courses such as engineering is still low. Women are largely concentrated in the arts stream and a few faculties such as education and medicine. Though these disparities are also among the general population and the men students, they are starker in case of women. Men seem to be more evenly distributed across the courses. It is clear that the disparity between women and men's higher education, even after significant changes, is far from disappearing.

The social trend of changing values towards girl's education and career, traditional role expectations and the freedom afforded by modernization and urbanization for women, even if in their beginning, need to be supported by and within the higher education system. This is possible only when greater expansion of higher education facilities and supportive mechanisms for women students are put in place. Initiatives towards a qualitatively relevant and economically accessible higher education would go a long way in this direction.

The state and the central governments have also made several special efforts according to the guidelines given in the Constitution to take the benefits of modern education to the weaker sections of the society, especially the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe population. These efforts have been working against the entrenched social structure of domination, which have prevented large-scale social transformation since the Independence.

Various measures have been taken for greater participation of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes in higher education. They include, post-matriculation scholarships, reservation in government colleges for various professional and general courses and hostels, availability of scholarships in institutions of higher education, special assistance to institutions in backward areas having higher population of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe, remedial training programs and special cells in the universities to monitor the progress (Kamat 1989). With greater expansion of higher education facilities all over the nation and into remote areas as well, there has been increase in the number of first generation learners from among the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe students.

However, the situation is far from satisfactory. The Scheduled Castes form around 16.48 percent of our total population and receive positive discrimination and

other special provisions for educational development as mentioned in the previous section (GOI 2001b). Still, their enrolment in higher education in proportion to the total enrolment has been abysmally low since 1964-65. It was around 4.9 percent in 1964-65, 6.7 in 1974-75, 7.03 in 1978-79, 7.29 in 1988-89 and 9.5 in the year 1999-2000 (Raza 1991:61; Chanana 1993:135; GOI 2001b). The Scheduled Tribe population, which is around 8.8 percent of total population in India, faces a worse fate. In 1975-76 the percentage of Scheduled Tribe to total enrolment in higher education was 1.75, in 1978-79, 1.60 and in 1988-89 1.8 and in the year 1999-2000 this percentage was 3.07 (Chanana 1993:135; GOI 1980; GOI 2001b).

✓ Enrolment of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students, in different faculties over the years reveals another set of inequities. The National Commission on Teachers compared the enrolment of Scheduled Castes in the general and the professional courses. For the period 1964-65 to 1977-78, the Commission noted that the increase in the enrolment of the students has been in the general courses. The proportion of enrolment in the professional courses decreased from 32.63 percent to 17.08 percent in the years 1964 to 1978. It is also suggested that the proportion of scheduled Castes students in the professional courses at the post graduate level is significantly lower (by almost half) to their enrolment in the corresponding undergraduate professional education (as quoted in Raza 1991).

The decline in the participation of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students at the middle level of schooling becomes acute in the higher professional and research education. Though the number of students has gone up continuously, the participation of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students is very miniscule in certain fields and courses all along and we are still to see a proportional representation in the fields. Medicine, research, engineering, etc. show poor percentage to total enrolment

in these courses. For example, as the Table 1 shows, Scheduled Caste enrolment percentage to total was highest for Arts (9.87) followed by medicine (8.94) and engineering (5.88) in 1988-89. The corresponding values for the Scheduled Tribes students is a miniscule 2.79, 2.62 and 1.32 respectively. In the year 1999-2000, the percentage representation in engineering was 9.26 for Scheduled Caste and 2.15 for the Scheduled Tribe, in medicine it is lesser for the Scheduled Caste at 8.48 and for the Scheduled Tribe its greater at 3.17 than in 1988-89. The field of education has overtaken the faculty of Arts in 1999-2000; the Scheduled Caste is 12.37 percent and Scheduled Tribe 4.28 percent in education.

Table 1: The percentage of SC and ST enrolment relative to total across faculties.

1988-89	SCM	SCF	SCT	STM	STF	STT
ART	7.74	2.13	9.87	1.99	0.8	2.79
SCIENCE	4.1	1.61	5.71	0.61	0.19	0.8
COM	3.88	0.67	4.55	0.84	0.14	0.98
EDU	5.26	2.41	7.67	1.49	0.65	2.14
MBBS	5.79	3.15	8.94	1.96	0.66	2.62
ENG/TECH	5.49	0.39	5.88	0.52	0.8	1.32
RES	2.31	0.6	2.91	0.41	0.19	0.6
1999-2000						
	SCM	SCF	SCT	STM	STF	STT
ARTS	7.99	3.42	11.41	2.78	1.36	4.15
SCIENCE	5.34	2.80	8.15	1.18	0.56	1.75
COM	4.19	1.91	6.11	1.28	0.47	1.76
EDU	8.46	3.90	12.37	2.98	1.29	4.28
ENG/TECH	7.17	2.09	9.26	1.83	0.31	2.15
MBBS	5.48	2.86	8.34	2.07	1.09	3.17
RES	3.66	1.24	4.90	1.07	0.59	1.67

SCM=SC Male; SCF=SC Female; SCT= total for SC; STM=ST Male; STF= ST Female; STT= total for ST.

Source: 1) (Chanana, 1993:136) 2) Selected Educational Statistics 1999-2000, Dept. of Secondary and higher education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, government of India, 2001.

The combined structural subordination of caste and gender along with regional backwardness can prove seriously constraining for the girl student of a Scheduled Tribe or Caste in a rural area in one of the backward regions of the nation. For the year 1989 the percentage of scheduled caste women in the field of engineering was as low as 0.4 in

science it was 1.6, in research it was 0.6 percent. For the year 1999-2000 it was 2.09, 2.8 and 1.4 percent respectively. This shows the unrepresentative proportion of the Scheduled Caste women in almost all areas of higher education with possibilities of greater social and economic returns.

Thus, the social disparities are mirrored in the higher education system in India even after more than fifty years of so called expansion of facilities. The representation of the underprivileged sections is still around half or one third of their respective populations in the general courses and especially so in the more valued professional courses. This is a sad note on the ideal of making higher education as the avenue available for the downtrodden for social mobility.

In terms of human resource and scientific development and the growth of Indian economy also, this ideal is more than relevant. A large and skill full population is a must for growth in the global scenario today. But to achieve this, a massive expansion and quality improvement of the higher education system, in consonance with the other sectors of education is needed. This can not be achieved if the goals of social justice and equality that are the basis of Constitutional ideals for education are sacrificed. Looking at the massive inequities in the system, the goal of broad-based development will be lost in the beginning itself if we forget the democratic principles of our education system.

Indian higher education system is in a critical juncture now. It must not forget the ideals of social justice and overall democratic development in order to face the global economic scenario with strength. But, the forces of economic liberalization, along with the entrenched dominant interests in the Indian society, are taking the state towards a no come back situation on higher education (Tilak 2000). Greater privatization and marketization of higher education, decreased state funding and lack of political initiative to reform the public higher education are signs of a down ward movement. This

movement would create situations where higher education would move away from the responsibilities and duties of the state. The socially disadvantaged sections, which form the masses and depend upon the public education system, would be thrown to the vagaries of the market. Higher education as an avenue of social and economic mobility for the underprivileged sections would be lost irreversibly. Adding to the burdens of caste, region, and gender, this will add even wider class divisions in the society.

The pertinent issue of privatization is discussed here in relation to the issues mentioned above. Privatization of education forms the most prominent form of change that Indian higher education is witnessing today, and is pregnant with far reaching social and political consequences, especially for the cause of social justice and equality.

Private higher education in India

Private colleges in India form around three fourth of total institutions of higher education. They are primarily of two types. First are the privately managed but publicly funded or aided colleges. These form around 90 percent of private colleges. They receive aid from the government for almost whole of their recurrent expenditure and most of their capital expenditure at times. From the view of finances, these colleges would be considered similar to the government colleges, as they do not contribute to the educational capacity building (Tilak 1995). Tilak calls them as the 'pseudo' colleges.

The second are those colleges, which do not receive any aid or capital fund from the government and are privately managed and funded. They are the private 'unaided' colleges. These colleges recover every single rupee of expenditure on education from the students in form of fees and/or 'capitation amount', that is, a large sum of money paid by a student for securing admission. These institutes form the extreme kind of privatization, where the prime motive is profit and the governmental intervention is almost non-existent (Tilak 1991).

The number of these colleges was not significant till the late seventies. A rapid growth in their number occurred during the 1980s onwards, generally in the southern states of India. It is noted that during the second, third and fourth five year plans there were only 35 engineering colleges in this category (Chandrakant, 1986), which increased to around 161 engineering colleges established by private agencies charging high fee or 'capitation' amount in 1988 (Shatrugna, 1988). These colleges are generally providing professional and vocational education, as these are the areas where increasing demand of higher education exists and profit possibilities are highest. The private enterprise satisfies the excess demand among the upper and the upper-middle classes for professional education, especially among those who fail to get entry into government system on the basis of merit.

Beginning from Karnataka, (it was also here that the first private medical college in India, the 'Kasturba Medical College' in Manipal was established in 1950) and later joined by Maharashtra and other southern states of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, numerous un-aided professional and vocational education colleges came up during the 1980s and later on grew in numbers (Kaul 1993). These institutions bore the complete expenditure on education and the universities were unable to stop their growth. The colleges, especially those offering the coveted engineering and medical courses, charged phenomenal sums of money for granting admissions, called as 'capitation fee', and also devised numerous informal ways of collecting money from the students.

The state governments encouraged their growth and acted as catalysts in the process (Tilak 1995). The Maharashtra government tried to remove the 'obstructions' in establishment of new private colleges through amendments in the Universities Act 1983. It enabled the government to sanction establishment of private colleges surpassing the universities procedures. This led to a sidelining of stress on the requirements of

educational facilities and educational planning whatsoever (Deshpande 1994; Singh 1985). The government of Karnataka passed an Act in 1984 regarding the establishment of capitation fee colleges. In 1989, provisions related to the fees paid in these institutions were clarified and a differential fee structure for merit and non-merit seats was put in place. In actual practice however all the students, especially those who joined on non-merit seats and the out of state students, paid huge amounts of 'capitation fee'. The Andhra Pradesh government had brought an Act related to the capitation fee colleges in 1983. In this Act, it had considered the capitation fee colleges as an 'undesirable practice' and 'contributing to large scale commercialization of education', and legally prohibited the practice. By 1992, the Andhra government changed its stand completely. In an Act in 1992, the government allowed such institutions to fill up at least 50 percent of the seats available irrespective of the ranking in merit lists. This was a great boom period for the education businessmen; in the next year 12 new medical and 8 dental colleges were established. Despite the government fee for the payment seats being considerably higher than the government colleges, (around 10,000 when it was 2000 in government colleges), each student was required to pay large amounts of capitation fee (around 5 lakhs each).

The reason given was the great demand for such education and the paucity of funds on their part to fulfil the needs of establishment of new colleges of vocational and professional education. Also, the logic that those who could afford to pay should be made to pay was forwarded in defense of the private colleges. This was especially stated in support of private professional education, as it requires more resources and subsidies than general education, and the economic returns were also considered high.

However, there were varied opinions and concerns regarding the consequences of such proliferation of private colleges on quality and accessibility of education (see

Kaul 1993). Complaints of 'capitation fees' being in far excess of what permitted by the government, lack of quality and infrastructure for education despite high fee and all sorts of corrupt practices and profit motives became numerous. The government of India had been aware of this phenomenon all along. It mentions that "A large number of technical colleges have come up which charge sizeable capitation fee for admissions. There is a strong feeling that their activities should be curbed because they are providing access to education on the basis of economic status of the guardians and not on the basis of merit of the students." (GOI 1985:98). The government of Andhra Pradesh under the Telugu Dhesam Party banned the capitation fee colleges. The Janata Party government also banned it in Karnataka in 1984. But these rulings had little effect. In fact, the same state governments were later seen encouraging the expansion of these colleges and showed no real political will in stopping them.

This phenomenon continued unabated till early 1990's, when the Supreme Court of India intervened by a landmark judgement in 1992 (*Mohini Jain vs the state of Karnataka and others* July, 30 1992) banning the 'capitation fee' system. This judgement brought to fore the conflict between government policy of the states favoring private education and the Constitutional upholding of education as a fundamental right and not as class privilege and the issue of differential fees systems on the basis of residence. The Supreme Court held 'capitation fee' as illegal. And considered reservations on the basis of residence valid given all students are charged the same fees. It also mentioned that the state had a responsibility towards provision of higher education to every citizen qualified for it, and this duty may be discharged either through state owned colleges or through private colleges, given that both charge the same fees for similar courses. However, the Supreme Court in other judgement in Feb 1993 (*J.P. Unnikrishnan and others vs state of Andhra Pradesh and others*), virtually allowed charging of capitation fees in private

institutions to the extent of around 50 percent seats. In this judgement the Supreme Court made a distinction between the 'free seats' and the 'payment seats' and allowed the principle of differential fees (see Kaul 1993; Tilak 1995).

The reasons underlying the non-implementation of the policies of the state governments related to banning of 'capitation fee' and the tacit encouragement on the part of the state has been a question of analysis. It has been suggested that "There has come into existence a class of well to do people consisting of politicians, top bureaucrats, business executives, small and big industrialists, traders, business men, technocrats and professionals in independent private practices and large land holders which are capable of paying the capitation fee and high recurring fees. It is the pressure from these people which has resulted in the relaxation of government policies" (Kothari 1986: 594).

Kaul (1993) has suggested that the reason for the proliferation of the 'capitation fee' colleges is not only the paucity of funds on the state's part. She notes that a nexus of political power and caste vote bank politics among the rural and urban rich and the dominant castes is the moving force behind these institutions. Very influential profit seeking groups among the politicians, rural landlords and urban rich and individual businessmen have joined hands with the establishment of private colleges in Karnataka and Maharashtra. These institutions have become the source of political power and economic benefit, feeding on each other, for the dominant sections in the two states. They play an important part in the inter-caste competition and conflict while different interest groups race for the number of educational institutions they control.

Profit motive remains uppermost for the private college management. This was borne out in the study conducted by Kaul (1993), which revealed that the institutions served mainly the urban rich section of the population, the quality of infrastructure

available was dissatisfactory and the teaching staff was inadequately qualified and underpaid. One of the main consequences of these institutions has been the perpetuation of dominant structures of socio-economic status and reinforcement of anti-modern and anti-secular caste and community feelings. It also perpetuates a segregated and elite educational system, which is generating inequality of opportunity and inhibiting social mobility. One other serious consequence of the 'capitation fee' colleges is the lack of any possible manpower planning and waste of huge amount of resources and manpower due to excess availability of professional graduates. High unemployment and reluctance to work in rural or not-so-profitable areas were found to be the case among the engineering and medical graduates in Karnataka.

In a study of unaided colleges of education and physical education under the jurisdiction of the University of Poona in 1990-91, Deshpande (1994) mentions several critical problems with these institutions. As the colleges were established with prior sanction of the government of Maharashtra, it was difficult for the universities to stress planning of educational facilities. As the non-educational factors tend to get greater priority in their establishment, some regions get more colleges than required while others are short of educational facilities. The academic staff in these institutions is not much experienced and suitably qualified due to the lack of benefits and security. When the management aims at more profit, the view that education ought to be a service and not an industry gets sidelined, resulting in unequipped libraries, labs and other infrastructure facilities. The standard of teaching and learning declines, due to above factors working together. The serious effect of the private colleges allowing students on the basis of money power on the standards of teaching and learning is another deleterious effect.

This discussion suggests that these colleges were not only a response of the market towards the demand of higher education, but a crucial political and economic

instrument in the hands of dominant communities. Also, that privatization of education is not only a question of funds scarcity for the state but is deeply related to the dominant political groups. Privatization of education has serious consequences for the pursuit of the goals of the Indian Constitution towards a just and democratic society. Predominance of the capacity to pay over the chances/right of an individual to access quality higher education is the most damaging corollary of this process. The impact of this principle being followed largely in the education system and accepted by the state can be disastrous for large sections of subordinated and exploited people i.e. the SCs and the STs, and women. This lends an important dimension to the understanding the social context of higher education in India.

It needs to be understood that while fees in professional education has been progressively increasing, the system of student scholarships and/or loans which could be practicable and sufficiently supportive for the disadvantaged sections is still not in place (Tilak 1999). Also, it needs to be questioned that how much of the cost of education can be passed on to the students? As Tilak (1995) has suggested no where in the world is full cost recovery the rule. What must be kept in mind is that the private sector should not be allowed to use education as a quick profit business. Fees can only be a share of recurring cost of higher education and the institute must meet the other expenditure form other sources.

It is feared that if allowed, the capitation and the high differential fees charging private institutions would eventually overtake the government colleges. This would lead to reduction in the pressure of expansion of public higher education system and make it even easier for the government and the dominant groups to impose severe fund crunch on the public higher education system. This may lead to a vicious circle of declining

quality and relevance of the higher education reaching the majority of the population (Tilak 1995).

The present form of differentiation of fees on the basis of merit and among the private and government colleges also is inequitable as the basic flaw of being able to buy education remains intact. The following part presents empirical data into the socio-economic background of the students of the two engineering colleges in Delhi, private and government respectively.

Part two: Field Study

This section gives a brief description of the field study, undertaken by the researcher. The study involved a comparison of two engineering colleges in the Delhi region one each affiliated to the Delhi University and the recently established Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University respectively. The first college, named the “Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology”(NSIT) is an autonomous government college, the second college, the “Amity School of Engineering and Technology”(ASET) is a private unaided institution.

The objective of the study was to compare the socio-economic status of the students of the two institutes and also to compare the proportion of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and women students in the two institutes. The study was also directed towards a preliminary evaluation of the quality of infrastructure and education offered in the two institutes, the fee structure and the scholarships and /or other facilities available for the students to finance their education. The main aim was to present an empirical, though limited, basis for the debates over the consequences of privatization in higher education for the pursuit of social justice for the women and the weaker sections (here only SC and ST, though the category would include minorities as well). The above

comparison is expected to throw some light upon the chances of the women or SC and the ST candidates to access the highly prized and in demand professional education in the present scenario.

The study involved personal visits to the two colleges. Data regarding the socio-economic background of the students, their mode of procuring finances, the reasons for their joining that particular institution and their subjective perceptions about the quality of education offered in the institution, was gathered with the help of questionnaires and interviews with the students (see appendix 1).

In this study, the 'Stratified random sampling' technique was used to select the students. "The stratified sampling involves dividing the population into homogenous groups, each group containing subjects with similar characteristics." (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The sample was stratified along the proportion of SC and ST and women students to total students in the college concerned. A sample of 30 students was selected for each college. The data regarding student enrolment, scholarships and other facilities offered by the institution, the infrastructure and fees etc. were procured from the administration of the colleges considered. The tables related to enrolment of students in under graduate courses, stream wise and category wise, in the two colleges are given in appendix 2.

The limitation of the study is its scope in understanding the impact of privatization in higher education. The distribution of students from weaker sections and the women in other streams of professional or general education offered by the private institutions, such as education, management, fashion, architecture or law would need further studies like this. Other limitation of the study is that we are most likely to get students from the urban middle class backgrounds in the colleges as both of them have

reserved around 70 percent of the seats for students of the Delhi region. The study is in effect, a preliminary one, and is limited in its sample size.

The ASET and the NSIT

The “Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University” (GGSIPU) was established by the government of Delhi, [Delhi Legislative Act (9 of 1998), amended 1999], as an affiliating and teaching University. The University focuses solely on professional education such as engineering, technology, law, management, architecture, medicine etc. It commenced functioning from December 1998, with its temporary office established at the old campus of the Delhi Engineering College at the Kashmere Gate, Delhi.

The University undertakes academic activity at four levels. It has a University School of Study, two government Institutions affiliated to it, two Centers for Learning and Education and 45 private self-financing institutions affiliated to it. Thus, the university largely functions for the private institutions, which are mostly providing undergraduate professional education. Nearly 84.5 percent of the total students getting education under the University belong to these private institutions, around 6.5 percent to the Centers for Learning and Education, around 4 percent in the government institutions affiliated to it and around 5 percent in the University School of Study. The private institutions affiliated to the GGSIPU are administratively autonomous and have been given provisional affiliation for a certain period. The University has control over the admission procedures and processes, reservation of seats and the fee structures of the institution. The admission to all these institutions are made through a Common Entrance Test. Total number of seats available in all the institutions are divided in four categories. 50% of the seats are called the ‘ free seats’, reserved for students of Delhi region. 45% of the seats are called the ‘payment seats’, out of which 35% are reserved for the Delhi

region and 10% are for outstation candidates. 5% of the seats are earmarked for the NRI/NRI sponsored candidates who are directly admitted by the institutions. The difference between the 'free' and 'payment' seats is of fees only. The latter would pay around treble the amount as for the former. The NRI category, do not need to appear for the entrance exam. The fees to be charged for various courses, offered by the private institutions, are fixed by the University.

The Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribes candidates are given a concession of 5% in the minimum eligibility marks at the qualifying exam. 15% and 7.5% of the seats are reserved for the SC and the ST candidates respectively in the 'free seat' category. Vacant seats among this category are exchangeable. Unfulfilled seats in all reservation categories are considered as unreserved. There is no reservation in the 'payment seats' category.

The first college in consideration is the 'Amity School of Engineering and Technology' (ASET), owned and managed by the 'Ritnand Balved Educational Foundation'. It was established in 1999 and got affiliated to the GGSIPU in the same year. It has changed its premises thrice since its affiliation and at present is situated at a rented building at Bijwasan, Delhi. It offers B.Tech courses in four streams. The admissions to the courses are through the procedure established by the GGSIPU. Total permitted seats for each stream is 60, that is, around 240 students in one academic session. The college also provides admission to Diploma holders, called the lateral entry program, to the second year in each stream and total 24 seats are earmarked for this purpose (6 for each course).

The fees paid per annum by a student for the four courses, amounts to Rs. 17,250 for the 'free seats', Rs. 60,500 for the 'Payment seats' and US \$ 3,500 for the NRI/NRI sponsored seats. Apart from this students need to pay Rs.5000, as refundable

security money. The GGSIPU has no provisions for any scholarships apart from tuition fee concessions for students admitted in the University School of Study, given in order of merit in the CET to the first three students of each course. The entire prescribed fees is to be paid initially, and the tuition fee is refunded after the first semester exam. ASET being a private self-financing institute does not subscribe to any of these schemes, and thus has no scholarship programs whatsoever.

The ASET is at present in the fourth year of its existence and has not yet produced its first batch of Engineers. Its present premises are situated at a rented building of around 1 lakh square feet carpet area. The building has no open space around whatsoever and is a compact structure representing a large mansion instead. The same space houses three floors of classes, offices and 14 laboratories for different streams. No provisions for student's hostels is existent, arrangements have been made informally at the near by areas. The building provides no separate space/ or facilities for auditoriums, play ground, common rooms and even a proper canteen. The library has around 5,000 volumes. The management claims that a new better campus is being readied in a nearby locality. The college till now provides no job placement services at present and has no cell for that. The teacher student ratio in the college is around 1:14.

The 'Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology' (NSIT) was established by the Delhi government by the approval of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, government of India, in 1983. It is affiliated to the Delhi University but was accorded autonomous status in 1987. It was renamed from its previous name 'Delhi Institute of Technology' to the present name in the year 1997. It is situated at Dwarka, West Delhi. The NSIT offers admission to around 360 students at present in four under graduate Engineering courses. The number of seats has been increased from 255 in 1998-99 to 305 in 2000-01 to 360 in the session of 2001-02. Post Graduate courses were started in

the year 1999-2000. Admissions are based upon a Common Entrance Test. Around 85% of the total seats are reserved for students of Delhi region and the rest 15% for out side students. In both the categories the SC and ST students get 15% and 7.5% reservations respectively. The annual fee payable to all the undergraduate and post-graduate courses is similar, which is Rs. 17,500. Foreign students need to pay US \$ 1000 over and above the stipulated amount for development charges. The present fee structure came into being in the year 2000-01 session, before which it was Rs., 10,000 per annum till 1998-99 and Rs. 15,000 for the year 1999-2000.

NSIT provides full/half free-ships to around 10% of the students on roll, in each course on the basis of merit-cum-means. SC and ST students are liable to fee concessions subject to the fulfillment of certain criteria decided upon by the academic board. Merit scholarships, for not more than 10% of students enrolled in each course, of amount Rs.100 per month along with exemption of tuition fee are awarded. Also, there are three other scholarships worth Rs.100 per month each, payable by the Delhi University. Need less to say that, apart from the free ships (tuition fees concession) awarded on the basis of merit, and to the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students amounting to Rs. 2,400 per annum, rest of the scholarships have no practical value. Even the fees concessions awarded are not sufficient for the support of the student.

NSIT has a sprawling and impressive campus of around 140 acres and is a complete residential complex. Appropriate hostel facilities are available on the campus for those requiring it. It has around 45 laboratories for various streams and courses. The institute has basic infrastructure to computerize the various activities related to different divisions. It boasts of 'computer aided instruction programs' and 'campus wide networking' and a library, which has around 50,000 volumes and subscribes to almost every journal of importance for their field (also see the admission manual for the

college). The NSIT is engaged in the establishment of a 'science and technology park' and an 'energy park' in the campus itself. It also aims at providing industrial R&D consultation and facilitating technology transfer.

The training and placement division of NSIT provides training and placement services to the students. In the last few years, it has emerged as one of the most preferred institutions of various top companies. The institute is capable of securing around 90% of campus placement.

The Students at the two colleges

According to the data gathered, total number of students in all the streams at the ASET for three years was 746 as on Feb. 2002. The women students were around 9% (70) of the total students. The highest number of women students is in the stream of electronics and communication followed by information technology. The lowest number is in the stream of mechanical and automation engineering. The enrolment of SC students is around 11% (83) of the total students. The SC women are around 1.2% of the total students and 13% of the total women students. The ST students form around 0.6 % (05) of the total students, while there is not one ST women student in the institution. Among the SC, women form around 12.2% of the total SC enrolment. There are 33 students in the NRI/NRI sponsored category out of which only 2 are women (see appendix 2 Table 1).

The NSIT at present has around 1040 students in various under graduate engineering courses. The women students form around 12% of the total enrolment. The Scheduled Caste students are around 14.58% and the Scheduled Tribe students 7% of the total student population. The Scheduled Caste women students form around 1.6% and the Scheduled Tribes women form around 0.86% of the total number of students.

Amongst the women, SC and ST women form 13.07% and 7% respectively. Among the SC, the women form around 12.01% of the total SC enrolment. The corresponding figure for the ST is 12.32% (see appendix 2 Table 2).

The data gathered from the students of the two colleges through personal interviews and questionnaires, reveals that both the institutions cater to urban middle class populations. As the reservations for Delhi region is around 90% at the ASET and around 85% at the NSIT most of the students from out side Delhi have done their schooling from Delhi and belong to states near by such as Haryana, Chandigarh, Rajasthan etc.

At the ASET around 86.6% of the total students, 75% of the Scheduled Caste students, 88% of the general category and around 76% of women students have had private school education. At the NSIT around 40% of the Scheduled Caste students, around 33.34% from the Scheduled Tribe, around 95% from the general category and around 66.7% of women students have had private school education. In total, however, NSIT has around 80% of private school students on its roll. But, as is clear from the data, the representation of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students and women students from government schools is significantly higher than ASET at the NSIT.

Around 80% of the parents of students at the ASET are highly educated. 90% of the fathers have a post graduate/doctoral degree. Around 70% of the students have both the parents working. The occupations present a varied composition of the services class. No student in the sample belonged to a business or an industrial family or agricultural family. The majority around 85%, including the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe student's families belong to the well paid and high designated jobs in the government or private concerns and departments. The number of self-practicing professionals such as doctors or lawyers was around 10% of the sample.

At the NSIT case is not much different. Around 85% of the parents have at least one postgraduate/doctoral degree holder in the family. 87% of the fathers hold a post-graduate degree. The number of both parents working is however, lesser at 55%. The majority, 70% of the sample, belonged to the well-paid and designated government and private sector jobs. From among the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students however, the occupation of fathers showed greater variations including both high and middle level designations. This was also the case with the 20% of the general category students, who showed greater income disparities in their father's occupations. The NSIT, as the data suggested, was not very far from the ASET in general student's socio-economic background. The only difference being that the number of students from the weaker sections remained higher, and they represented more varied classes, ranging from low to high-income jobs. Also, it is true that around 60% of students among the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe did still hail from socio-economic backgrounds not very different from the better-placed general category students.

The NRI seats reserved in ASET were generally filled by local students, who procured NRI recommendations from some sources, and paid the requisite amount (around Rs.1 lakh 25 thousand per annum), to get admissions without the tests. The students (male only!) in this category are mostly those with poorer marks in their school exams compared to other students. NSIT presents a better picture in terms of marks obtained by students in their school exams in all the categories including women.

At the ASET none of the students had taken any loans for financing their education, which was, invariably provided by the family. At NSIT the case was much similar; only two students (6.67%) in the sample had taken loans from banks and both the students had one of their parents as a bank employee.

At ASET around 43.34% of the total students and 55% of the general category students found the faculty non-satisfactory and another 30% found it just average. About 23% considered it as good. At NSIT around 86% of total students, 82% of the general category and 80% of the Scheduled Caste students found the faculty good. 25% of total found it excellent.

At the ASET, around 70% of the total students, 75% of the women students and 80% of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students combined considered the cost of education as high and not worth of what they got in return. At the NSIT 80% of total students, 75% of women and 80% of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students thought that the cost of education was high but worth of what they got in return. Around 15% students said the cost was not very high.

About career prospects, the ASET students were generally worried and clueless. About 30% of the total students said that their career prospects after passing from the institute may not be satisfactory. More than 50% of the general category students had no idea about what their career prospects could be after the education. Among the Scheduled Caste 65% of the students were thinking the same. 60% of the total women students thought that career prospects were not satisfactory at all. In this area, the NSIT students, almost all of them, considered career prospects as being very good.

Regarding the quality of infrastructure and other educational support facilities provided by the institution, around 75% of the women students and 75% of the Scheduled Caste students at the ASET thought they were not satisfactory. In total, 55% students thought that the infrastructure facilities and the quality of education were far from satisfactory. About 87% of the total students, 80% of the Scheduled Caste and

Scheduled Tribe students and 85% of the women students at the NSIT maintained that the infrastructure and the quality of education at their college was good.

When asked to answer about their reasons to join their respective colleges, the ASET students mentioned mainly four factors. Firstly, they said that they did not get any other better option in professional education, and that wanted to join some professional education courses only. Second, mostly women mentioned along with the above argument, that they would have convenience remaining in Delhi. Third, they thought before the admissions that being a private college the ASET would offer better career prospects. Lastly, they mentioned that the image of the ASET was better among other private colleges. Almost all of them conceded to the idea that government engineering colleges offered better education than there college, but it was difficult for them to beat the competition.

The same questions put to the NSIT students got one major response from the students. Most of them had wanted to join the institute because of its reputation, career prospects and facilities. They also talked about the courses they had taken and why. They thought their institute was one amongst the best in India. When asked about the private colleges of engineering in Delhi, they proclaimed that they brought substandard teaching and unbalance in the job market. They mentioned that, the private colleges were liberal with grades in order to retain the students, which had a bad effect on the standards.

A comparison of the two colleges reveals several crucial points about the issue of privatization of higher education in India. It is very crucial here to see that the Delhi government created a university for the particular purpose of providing affiliation to the private colleges and established a semi-capitation fee system by allowing differentiation of fees among the students. With the payment seats priced at treble the amount of 'free'

seats, (the free seats are also far from the paying capacity of an average Indian middle class person), this is nothing but a continuation of the capitation fee system. It is an open acceptance by the state of the principle of profit maximization in the educational field by the private sector.

The private colleges, almost all of them concentrating on professional courses, tend to cut down on educational facilities and infrastructure and concentrate on maximum profits. This can have deleterious effects on the quality of education imparted and can also create a glut of students.

That the private sector is exploiting the excess demand in professional higher education is clear from the scenario. This is again a sad note on the inability of the state to take initiatives to revamp and diversify the education system so that to lessen the concentration of the middle classes on professional courses.

The expansion achieved through this mode of privatization lessens the pressure on the government for expansion of good quality and affordable educational institutions. This is a scenario where the state is shying away from the responsibility of providing education to every qualified citizen of India and to help the disadvantaged sections in attaining social mobility with the help of higher education.

As is clear from the study of the two colleges, both of them are catering largely to selected regional populations. The majority of students, hail from well placed families in both the institutions, including those who come from the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe families. The situation at the government college was somewhat better than the private college because the admissions were strictly based on merit and the fees were not prohibitive; the fees were increased to the present level in 1999-2000, before which, it was around 30% less. It is needless to say that we are far from the day when the Scheduled Caste women student of a backward region in the country, from a uneducated

and lower class family, could be as easily absorbed in the system as the urban middle class male student is.

The movement of students from other backward regions of India to avail the educational facilities is marred in the present arrangement of regional reservations. This is true for the government and the private college both. However, the situation at the private college is worse. Only Delhi Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students receive reservations and outside students have to come in the 'payment' seats (10% only).

In all, what becomes clear from the above study is the fact that already existing social and economic disabilities, which get mirrored in the higher education system are being reinforced and consolidated through the private sector now. The good and reasonably priced (!) government colleges are very few and very tough to get in, especially for students from not so enabling family and social backgrounds. The private colleges are flooded with the rich and the well placed. Again the quality will vary with the kind of shop you get to go in, as there would be little control that the state would exercise on the private enterprise, if the past experience is any guide. The chances that a lower middle class or even a middle class student gets a decent engineering education now are very slim.

Conclusions

The social context of higher education in India, in relation to equity and social justice shows a dismal record, even if the gains are visible. The socially disadvantaged sections, such as the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe, who are also in the lower rungs of class hierarchy in India and women, who face multiple disadvantages across all

cross sections are still to be absorbed in the mainstream of the social mobility avenues available in higher education. The system is still upper middle class, urban and upper caste male centric. The educational expansion that has occurred has led these disadvantaged groups into less valued and low standard general education.

While the need of the hour was to democratize the system even more and to expand and improve quality of higher education with suitable initiative and political will on the part of the state, we are seemingly going backwards. With privatization of higher education at a large scale underway, the core of 'valued' education is moving away even more from the reach of the underprivileged sections. A large part of the middle classes would also now find it out of their reach, pushed into under paid, insecure and exploitative occupation.

It is a critical juncture for the state policy towards higher education as well. At one hand commitment to equality and social justice is made, and at the other it is unable and unwilling to check the growth of private colleges. Given the resource constraints and burgeoning demand for professional education the government does not find itself in a position to take over the private colleges. Funding of professional education is expensive and can not be done solely by the state, in conditions of reducing budgets.

A proper cost sharing is not undesirable but the modes being developed for the purpose now, are outright privatization and fee increases, both of which, in absence of a profound scholarship program at all the levels of education, would go against the chances of the lower class and castes to access expensive education.

Looking at the record of the private sector in India in higher education it is doubtful that a time for marketization of education has come. The private educational sector is in for a 'quick profit' and political mileage than for providing cost-effective services to people. Infact, by the very nature of private enterprise, where profit motive is

dominant, it can not take over the higher education system which still is marred by serious inherent biases against the disadvantaged sections and does not reach more than 6% of the relevant age group.

Also since the private colleges go in those sectors of higher education where the benefits are higher, such as engineering, it seems impossible that they will reach out to the vast masses in India. This is because that the per capita income is very low for the high fees even in the government colleges of professional education. What we can hope for is a fulfillment of the demand of higher education for the middle and the upper classes only. But with the shifts that are visible in the state policy towards higher education, the demand for quality education among the masses seems to remain largely unfulfilled.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the study was to dwell upon the transformations in the role played by the Indian State regarding higher education after the liberalization policies were accepted in 1991. An attempt has been made to elaborate the kind of pressures higher education is facing today in terms of access of weaker sections and the women due to the changes in the state policies and standpoints towards it. The questions of privatization and marketization and decreasing state support for higher education as such and also from the standpoint of the weaker sections and women are dealt with. In other words it tries to situate the recent developments in higher education policy in India in the context of equality and social justice.

The study began with an exploration into the theoretical perspectives, which explain the nature of state-education relationship in modern societies. It has been seen that state is central to the education system in almost all societies. Education is largely a state enterprise, whether it is a developed nation or a developing country. For the post-colonial developing countries like India, education is more so. State remains the center for struggle by variety of power structures, and they try to compete with each other in establishing their versions of education through the state policy. The state in a developing country faces several problems right from their inception, which have a strong impact of the kind of educational choices it can make and implement. Pressure for quick industrial development so as to improve the living standards of people and attain distributive justice is great. The state has to legitimize the existent social structure and also itself and its constituents. Hegemony has not

only to be created, maintained and enhanced but also to be protected from the entrenched elite who has an interest in continuation of the status quo. Unlike the developed Western societies, the state in these societies is not indigenous but imported from outside through colonial experience. The economy is generally dualistic and under developed with powerful presence of foreign capital. The state has to create and maintain sufficient autonomy to perform its re-distributive roles and also to confront the claims of existing elite. It also has to maintain its sovereignty and integrity from outer aggression. Under such critical circumstances, the educational system faces severe problems. Resource scarcity is one of the most glaring problems. The goals set for education are high, the political demand for education is soaring and the state in itself considers it a crucial symbol for its commitment towards equality, democracy and social justice. So, expansion is very crucial for not only the political legitimacy of the state but also for the needs of economic growth and development.

The democratization of education in such a situation depends upon the intentions of the state towards fulfillment of its goals of large-scale social transformation towards a just and equitable society. Most of the post-colonial developing nations in the world face the paradoxes of this situation. Their societies are replete with socio-economic and political inequities. The goals of social justice and reduction in the wide gap between the rich and the poor remain unfulfilled (Apple and Jules 2000).

The Indian educational situation is quite close to the description made above. From the beginning Indian State faced an enormous pressure for

expansion. Higher education was the demand of millions of deprived people who had been hitherto denied its access. It became a typical symbol of social status and social mobility for the masses. It was pertinent and politically necessary for the state to support expansion of higher education. However, the system was plagued by the current problems of uncontrolled and unplanned growth right from the beginning (the Calcutta University Report 1917 mentioned it as a problem). Expansion at the cost of quality has been the crucial most fault of the system, while expansion itself is more than desirable. The social and cultural disparities existing in the society plague the system at all levels. The system does not favour the participation of large sections of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe populations in the country. Women also face disparities at all levels despite the visible progress made by them. These disparities are expressed in the terms of stream wise enrollment and stage wise proportion to total enrollment. Within higher education women and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe have a much larger concentration of their total enrollments in the general streams. This is just an indicator of the kind of hierarchy that exists in the higher education system in terms of valued and high return education such as engineering and medical or other professional courses like management. There are be multiple disparities for the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe women candidates from rural backward regions of the country in access to such education.

Since the 1990s, the changes towards economic globalization, brought to the developing world mainly in the form of Structural Adjustment Policies, have created even more difficult conditions for the Indian State to transform the education system into democratic and socially just one. The conditions and

ideological leanings dictated by the World Bank and the IMF have been accepted by the states in these nations. This is leading to increased roll back of the state from positions of social responsibilities and have tended to recreate it as an agency for maintenance of law and order and a conducive atmosphere for foreign capital and world trade market. Compulsions of global capital and the agencies advocating its growth have become extremely powerful in influencing the social policies. The global policy imperatives for the nation state now may even go against the needs of domestic importance. The capacity of the state now can be seen only in the complex matrix of domestic and global factors, in which the global factors would be the more decisive since the nation is more dependent on the external agencies. The role of the state as an active agent for promotion and maintenance of social justice and equality have been jeopardized with the adjustment policies. Instead of this, the market has been brought in the center stage as a solution for all the ills. However, the potential of the market to act in a socially just and equitable manner is not recognized even by its most ardent supporters (Tilak 1995).

In the sphere of higher education in India, which is already plagued with the multiple levels of inequities against the weaker sections, the adjustment policies have induced policy shifts towards greater privatization and reduced budget allocations to higher education leading to increased fee and other cost recovery mechanism. Higher education is being taken towards a largely self-financing stage. This is inspite of the fact that several deliberative commissions over the issue of fees and finances for higher education have maintained that the share of fees and other individual cost recovery should not be more than 20 percent of the total recurring expenditure of higher education

and that this should be reached gradually. The present share of fees is already around 15 percent of the total recurring expenditure, which can be favorably compared with several developed countries like USA. Already several good institutes and universities have increased the fees to increasingly higher levels. This is specially so for technical and professional education such as engineering and management courses. For example, the fees for IITs, the premiere government subsidized institutes have made their education fairly expensive. The importance of state investment in the capital expenditure in education can not be overestimated, as cost recovery can be only for recurring costs. The student loan schemes and credit market for higher education, advocated by the World Bank and in the deliberative report on the 'Policy Framework for Reforms in Education (2000)', have not taken any concrete shape as yet in India. They are also not likely to be of much use in the largely low per capita income of our population and several other social disabilities, which can impair their functioning as viable sources for individual educational finance. A very narrow section is availing of the facilities of a bank loan for education as yet. Scholarship and student support schemes, especially for weaker sections and women, have not been sufficient for decades now, and neither are they expected to be in the near future.

While expansion of higher education at the general level goes on, though with even lesser resources available, taking a toll on the quality of the public higher education system, private education is being given a free reign in establishing its control in the more valued and higher return areas of professional and services oriented education. The state is actively encouraging the private sector and has been trying to create conditions for their expansion

in higher education sector. It is neglecting the reality that private education has never been the priority for the goals of social justice and democratic quality education in any of the policy prescriptions before 1992, even if the contributions of the private institutions working with philanthropic motives and establishing models of standards have been lauded time and again. Otherwise, the private sector in higher education in India has always been profit oriented and has indulged in blatant 'black marketing' of education through the 'capitation fee' etc. Establishment of the 'differential fee' system is a case in point, which legitimizes the principle that lower merit candidates can buy education of coveted quality if they have the capacity.

The private education sector that has developed in India reflects even more of the disparities present in the higher education sector. As was found in the field study conducted by the researcher, both the government and the private engineering colleges served largely the upper middle class urban populations. Majority of the students in both the colleges belongs to families with high educational and occupational status. Mostly, they come from families of well-paid professional or government official class. However, the government college still represented a wider spectrum of the society in terms of socio-economic background of the students. The presence of women is abysmally low in both the institutions, ranging from 9 percent in the private college to around 11 percent in the government college. Similar is the case with the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe students. Private colleges show a lesser percentage here also. For example, the private college did not have a single Scheduled Tribe woman student on its roll as on February 2002. Even among the reserved categories, the students come from generally high

socio-economic status families in both the institutions. The study found gross difference in the quality of educational facilities offered by the institutions. The private college clearly cut down on the expenditure on infrastructure, space and the quality of faculty in order to improve the profit margins. The government college, on the other hand had far better facilities and infrastructure. It was found in the study that the majority of students at the private college were dissatisfied with the quality of infrastructure and the faculty there. They also were concerned about the career prospects after the course. Regarding the cost of education a majority of the students thought that the education being offered was not worth the amount charged and they felt cheated. For most of the students in the government college, these responses were towards the positive side. They were proud of their institution and its quality of education and infrastructure and the kind of career prospects it offered. The private college, established under the affiliation of a newly established University had a 'differential fee structure'. Which meant that around 50 percent of the students had to pay around treble the amount for fees as the rest of the students. Among two students who stood on the same merit level in the common entrance test, the one who could pay the high fees required would get admission. This is an outright acceptance of the preference for paying capacity in higher education. The so-called free seats in the private college were similarly charged as the seats in the government college.

Both of the institutions had no proper scholarship schemes for their students who came from weaker sections. Though a few freehips were available for the students of Scheduled Caste of Scheduled Tribe category at the government college, they were not sufficient to cover even 20 percent of the

annual fees required, leave aside the overall expenditure of the student. The private college offered no such scholarship/freeship whatsoever. Majority of the students, in both the colleges did not avail of any bank loans as such for financing their education. It may be because most of them belonged to families which could afford expensive education. Thus, the study shows that in general engineering education is monopolized by the male students from well off family backgrounds, more so in the private college than in the government college. On the other hand, the government college still offers better facilities and quality of education than the private college. The latter thrives on great demand among the rich for professional education, especially those who could not make it through the tough competition of good government institutes. The private college is mainly in 'business' and not for any philanthropic motive to provide capital investment to expand educational services. Also, it can be said that the possibility of human resource planning in this scenario becomes even remoter. The chances are that a glut of substandard professional higher education could be created, lowering the overall quality of the professional education.

Looking at this dismal record of the private sector it would be too much to suggest that it can be relied upon for expansion of higher education in India without sacrificing the quality and equity causes. Even if that happens it is too much to expect that the private sector can move into mass education because it is largely profit and demand motivated. It is difficult to imagine self-financing higher education servicing the low income, rural and backward population in the regional languages! It is clear that the possible fallout of this movement towards the market in higher education for the weaker sections and

even the middle classes to a significant extent would be a reduction in their chances to access higher education. Social mobility and cultural development using higher education as an avenue would become a day-dream for majority of the population in India. This is especially so for the first generation learners who belong to the weaker sections and the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribe mostly.

The overall impact of the shifts in the policy is reflected in the POA 1992. The movement towards the private enterprise coupled with the lessening budgetary resources on the part of the government would lead towards a stagnation of the public higher educational system, which serves the majority population in this nation. The poor, the lower castes and the women cutting across classes and castes, would be deprived of their chances to move up in the social ladder.

Moreover, the adjustment policies are antithetical to development of higher education system in the developing countries. This is in a time when there is a growing realization that higher education is the key to national competitiveness in the global market. What needs to be stressed here is that the impact of globalization on the state policies towards higher education need not be always negative. It is the role of the state to safeguard their education systems and especially the higher education sector. In this scenario atleast the globalization processes have put great burdens over the shoulders of the state in the developing world.

The state has not come out with any comprehensive policy towards large-scale reform in the higher education sector despite being aware of the immense importance of

the system for the national development goals and for the masses whose only hope for social mobility lies in the higher education. It is true that any major policy shift has not occurred explicitly. The state still commits itself to expansion of education and social justice, but the situation on the ground shows that deliberate inactivity and silence is in itself a policy! The state is maintaining silence for reasons of political opposition, and in the meantime giving the private sector enough time and space to capture the higher education system. This is especially so in the technical and professional or service oriented education, which are in demand in the global job market and are the mainstay of the upper-middle class and the elite in India. The state is apparently pacifying these sections by letting them have an alternative to the low quality and low valued public education, or from the strong competition by merit in the prominent public institutions, based on their capacity to pay. Thus, the state is failing on both the fronts; of creation of an indigenous higher education system geared for national development and democratizing access to the higher education system.

Policy decisions regarding higher education at the state and the regional levels have largely been petty politics motivated and short-term, without any larger plan or thinking invested in it. Political motivation towards reforms in higher education has always been weak in India. Educational policies do not raise much interest in the political class. The dominant sections at the national level have always followed a parallel education system. The dual system of education at the school level encouraged after the independence promoted segregation of students from different social strata in the educational system. Now the segregation is complete with private colleges and foreign Universities making 'twinning' arrangements with them. These sections to legitimate all forms of marketization and privatization have utilized the liberalization process. As long as there is low level-low cost-low quality expansion going on, the

political class can manage to keep the common and deprived masses in the illusion of social justice. In the meantime the rich can capture the benefits of coveted education on the basis of their capacity to pay, and the private enterprise can reap the benefits of easy money with low investment. Until and unless there is a clear political will towards creation of a vibrant educational sector based on the very foundations of social justice and equality, the problems we are facing today would worsen. As of today, that political will is clearly absent.

APPENDIX: 1

STUDENT INFORMATION SCHEDULE FOR THE FIELD STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE RESEARCHER

COLLEGE:

COURSE:

YEAR OF JOINING:

SEX:

1. YOU DID YOUR SCHOOLING FROM A Private School/ Government School.

2. MARKS OBTAINED IN STANDARD 10TH EXAM: -----

3. MARKS OBTAINED IN STANDARD 12TH EXAM: -----.

4. WHETHER BELONG TO THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES:

A) Scheduled Caste B) Scheduled Tribe C) General

5. WHETHER NRI/NRI SPONSORED CANDIDATE: Yes/ No. (Tick your response)

6. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF FATHER:

A) Intermediate/12th standard B) Graduate C) Post-Graduate
D) PhD

7. YOUR FATHER'S STREAM OF GRADUATION (if applicable) :

A) Science B) Professional/Technical C) Arts D) Commerce E) Others -----

8. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF MOTHER:

A) Intermediate/12th standard B) Graduate C) Post-Graduate
D) PhD

9. YOUR MOTHER'S STREAM OF GRADUATION (if applicable) :

A) Science B) Professional/Technical C) Arts D) Commerce E) Others -----

10. OCCUPATION OF YOUR FATHER:

A) Own practice/ business/industry B) Government employee C) Private firm/ concern
employee

11. Department _____.

12. Designation. _____

13. OCCUPATION OF YOUR MOTHER (if applicable):

A) Own practice/ business/industry B) Government employee C) Private firm/ concern employee

14. Department _____.

15. Designation. _____

16. ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON THE PRESENT EDUCATION (fees) _____

OTHER EXPENDITURE _____

17. HOW DID YOU FINANCE THE PRESENT EDUCATION:

A) Parents B) Bank loan

18. DO YOU GET ANY SCHOLARSHIPS: Yes/ No.

19. IF YES, PLEASE GIVE DETAILS:

a) source: _____

b) amount: _____

c) duration: _____

d) criteria: _____

20. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF YOUR COLLEGE IN TERMS OF:

a) Faculty: A) Good B) Average C) Not satisfactory D) No idea.

b) Cost of education: A) High but worth B) High but not worth C) Not Very High D) No idea.

c) Career prospects: A) Good B) Excellent C) Not satisfactory D) No idea

d) Quality of education and infrastructure: A) Good B) Average C) Not satisfactory D) No idea.

21. WHY DID YOU JOIN THIS INSTITUTE: (please answer in detail)

APPENDIX: 2

TABLE: 1 TOTAL ENROLMENT AT ASET ON FEB, 2002.

COURSE	SC			ST			NRI			GEN			TOTAL		
	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	T
CSE	20	1	21	2	0	2	6	0	6	138	16	154	166	17	183
ECE	20	3	23	0	0	0	10	0	10	142	17	159	172	20	192
IT	12	4	16	3	0	3	8	2	10	144	12	156	167	18	185
MAE	22	1	23	0	0	0	7	0	7	142	14	156	171	15	186
TOTAL	74	9	83	5	0	5	31	2	33	566	59	625	676	70	746

M=MEN, W=WOMEN, GEN=GENERAL, T=TOTAL, SC=SCHEDULED CASTE, ST=SCHEDULED TRIBE.

CSE= COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

ECE=ELECTRONICS AND COMMUNICATION ENGINEERING

IT =INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

MAE= MECHANICAL AND AUTOMATION ENGINEERING

TABLE: 2 THE TOTAL ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS AT NSIT ON FEB, 2002 (UNDER GRADUATE PROGRAMS ONLY)

COURSE	SC			ST			GEN			TOTAL		
	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	T
EC	41	4	45	21	1	22	210	33	243	272	38	310
COE	40	4	44	21	2	23	213	21	234	274	27	301
ICE	32	5	37	11	5	16	171	34	205	214	44	258
MPA	22	4	26	11	1	12	119	16	135	152	21	173
TOTAL	135	17	152	64	9	73	713	104	817	912	130	1042

M=MEN, W=WOMEN, GEN=GENERAL, T=TOTAL, SC=SCHEDULED CASTE, ST=SCHEDULED TRIBE.

EC=ELECTRONICS AND COMMUNICATION

COE=COMPUTER ENGINEERING

ICE= INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROL

MPA=MANUFACTURING PROCESSES AND AUTOMATION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AICTE, 1994, Report of the High Power Committee for Mobilisation of Additional Resources for Technical Education, All India Council for Technical Education, New Delhi.
- Albrow, M. 1996, *The Global Age*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Althusser, Louis 1971, *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*, in Althusser, Louis 1971, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, New Left Books, London.
- Amin, S. 1997, *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*, Zed Publications, London.
- Apple, Michael. W. 2000, *Official Knowledge-Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*, Routledge, New York.
- Archer, Margaret 1984, *Social Origins of Educational Systems*, Sage Publications, London.
- Beck, U. 1992, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, Sage Publications, London.
- Beck, U. 1997, *The Reinvention of Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bentham, J. 1843, 'Principles of the Civil Code' in *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, Vol. 9, (ed.) Jeremy Bowring, W.Tait, Edinburgh.
- Beteille, Andre 1983, 'The Pursuit of Equality and the Indian University' in *The Idea of Natural Inequality and Other Essays*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Betteille, Andre 1995, 'Universities as Centres of Learning', *Journal of Higher education*, 18(3), Monsoon.
- Blackledge, David and Hunt, Barry 1985, *Sociological Interpretations of Education*, Croom Helm, London.
- Boudon, R. 1974, *Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality*, John Willey and Sons, New York.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. 1976, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Routledge, London.
- Burbules, Nicholas. C and Torres, Carlos Alberto 2000, (eds.) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York.

- Carnoy, Martin 2000, '*Globalization and Educational Reform*' in Nelly.P.Stromquist and Karen Monkman (eds.) *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestations Across Cultures*, Rowman and Littlefield Publications Inc., New York.
- Carnoy, Martin and Samoff, Joel 1990, *Education and Social Transition in the Third World*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Castells, Manuel 1996, *The Rise of the Network Society*. Blackwell Publishers , Oxford.
- Chanana, Karuna 2001, *Interrogating Women's Education: Bounded Visions, Expanded Horizons*, Rawat Publications, Jaipur.
- Chandrakant, L.S. 1986, *Private Enterprise in Engineering Education*, Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore.
- Chitnis, Suma 1988, '*Educating the Weaker Sections of Society*' in Sharma, G.D. and Singh, Amrik 1988, *Higher Education in India: The Social Context*, Konark Publications Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Chitnis, Suma and Altbach, Philip.J. 1993, (eds.) *Higher Education Reform in India: Experience and Perspectives*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Cohen, Louis and Manion, Lawrence 1994, *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London.
- Colclough, C. 1991, '*Who Should Learn to Pay? An Assessment of Neo-Liberal Approaches to Education Policy*', in C. Colclough and J.Manor (eds.) *State or Markets? Neo-Liberalism and the Development Policy Debate*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Coleman, James 1988, '*Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, supplement, pp. S95-S120.
- Dale, Roger 1989, *The State and Education Policy*, Open University Press, UK.
- Deshpande, V.S. 1994 '*Privatisation of Higher Education: Inevitability, Problems and Remedies*', *Journal of Education and Social Change*, Vol.3(2).
- Durkheim, Emile 1956, *Education and Sociology*, the Collier-Macmillan Limited, London. .
- Giddens, Anthony 1971, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Giddens, Anthony 1990, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Girth, H.H and Mills, C.W. 1972, (eds.) *From Max Weber*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- GOI 1962, The Report of the University Education Commission (1948-49), Vol.1, Ministry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1966, '*Education and National Development*', Report of the Education Commission 1964-66, Ministry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1980, '*Progress of Education of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes*', Ministry of Education and Culture, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1985, *Challenges of Education: A Policy Perspective*, Ministry of Education, New Delhi.
- GOI 1986, National Policy on Education, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1990, '*Towards a Just and Humane Society*', National Policy on Education Review Committee Report, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1992(a), Programme of Action for the National Policy on Education 1986 (Revised), Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1992(b), Report of the Cabinet Advisory Board on Education Committee on Policy, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1993; 1994, Economic Survey, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 1997, '*Government Subsidies in India: Discussion Paper*', Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 2000, *A Report on the Policy Framework for Reforms in Education*; Special Subject Group on Policy Framework for Private Investment in Education, Health and Rural

- Development, Prime Minister's Council on Trade and Industry, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 2001(a), Annual Report, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- GOI 2001(b), Selected Educational Statistics (1999-2000), Department of Secondary and Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- Gramsci, A. 1980, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, International Publishers, New York.
- Green, Andy 1990, *Education and State Formation: Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA.*, Macmillan, London.
- Green, Andy 1997, *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Habermas, J. 1976, *Legitimation Crisis* translated by T. Mc. Carthy. Heinemann,
- Halsey, A.H. et al. 1997, (eds.) *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Held, David 1989, *Political Theory and the Modern State: Essays in State, Power and Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Held, David et al. 1999, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, Culture*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hirst, P and Thomson, G. 1996, *Globalization in Question: the international economy and the possibility of Governance*, Cambridge Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hobbes, Thomas 1968, *Leviathan*, (ed.) by C.B. Macpherson, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Hoogevelt, A. 1997, *Globalization and the Post-Colonial World: The New Political Economy of Development*, Macmillan, London.
- Hoppers, Catherine.A.Odora 2000, '*Globalization and the Social Construction of Reality: Affirming or Unmasking the "Inevitable"?*' in Nelly.P.Stromquist and Karen Monkman (eds.) *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestations Across Cultures*, Rowman and Littlefield Publications Inc., New York.

- Ilon, L. 1994, '*Structural Adjustment and Education: adapting to a growing global market*', International Journal of Educational Development, 14, pp. 95-108.
- Jules, Didacus and Apple, Michael.W. 2000, '*State and Educational Reform*' in William.T.Pink and George.W.Noblit (eds.) *Continuity and Contradiction: The Futures of the Sociology of Education*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Kamat, A.R. 1985, *Education and Social Change in India*, Somaiya Publications Pvt Ltd., New Delhi.
- Kamat, A.R. 1989, *Studies in Educational Reform In India Vol:1*, Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.
- Kaul, Rekha 1993, *Caste, Class and Education: Politics of the Capitation Fee Phenomena in karnataka*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Kothari, V.N. 1986, Private unaided engineering and medical colleges: Consequences of misguided policy, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 21(14), 593-96.
- Lash, S. and Urry, J. 1994, *Economies of Signs and Spaces*, Sage Publications, London.
- Locke, John 1963, *Two Treatise of Government*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mill, James 1937, *An Essay on Government*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mill, John Stuart 1982, *On Liberty*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Naik, J.P. 1997, *Education Commission and After*, A.P.H Publication Corporation, New Delhi.
- Nayyar, Depak 1996, *Economic Liberalisation in India: Analysis, Errors and Experiences*. Orient Longman, Calcutta.
- Noss, Andrew 1991, *Education and Adjustment: A Review of Literature*, Working Paper No. WPS 701, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Offe, C. 1985, *Disorganized Capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Ohmae, K. 1995, *The End of the Nation State*, Free Press, New York.
- Pannu, R.S. 1996, 'Neo-liberal project of Globalization: Prospects for democratization of education', *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(2), pp. 87-101.
- Poulantzas, Nichos 1978, *State, Power and Socialism*, Verso, London.

- Powar, K.B. 1998, (ed) *State Funding for Higher Education in India*, Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi.
- Raza, Moonis 1991, (ed) *Higher Education in India*, Association of Indian Universities Press, New Delhi.
- Richardson, R.W. and Haralz, J.H. 1995, *Moving to the Market: The World Bank in Transition*, Overseas Development Council, Washington D.C.
- Robertson, R. 1992, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Sage Publications, London.
- Rosenau, J. 1997, *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sharma, G.D. 2000, 'Financing of Higher Education in India: In Retrospect and Prospect' in Policy Recommendations on Financing for Higher Education, A Report of the Consultative Committee Meeting, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.
- Sharma, G.D. and Singh, Amrik 1988, *Higher Education in India: The Social Context*, Konark Publications Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Shatrugna, M. 1988, Privatizing Higher Education, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27(22), 2624-26.
- Singh, Ajit 1994, 'Global Economic Changes, Skills and International Competitiveness', *International Labour Review*, 133(2).
- Singh, Amrik 1985, *Redeeming Higher Education: Essays in Policy*, Ajanta Books International, New Delhi.
- Stewart, F 1996, 'Globalization and Education', *International Journal of Educational Development*, 16, pp. 327-333.
- Strange, S. 1996, *The Retreat of the State: the diffusion of the power in the world economy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Supreme Court of India 1992, Miss Mohini Jain versus the State of Karnataka and others, New Delhi.
- Supreme Court of India 1993, J.P. Unnikrishnan and others versus the State of Andhra Pradesh and others, New Delhi.

- Taylor, Sandra et al. 1997, *Educational Policy and Politics of Change*, Routledge, New York.
- Tikly, Leon 2001, 'Globalisation and Education in the Post Colonial World: towards a conceptual framework', *Comparative Education*, 37(2), pp. 151-171.
- Tilak, J.B.G. 1991, 'Privatisation of Higher Education', *Prospects*, Vol. 21(2).
- Tilak, J.B.G. 1995, '*Privatisation of Higher Education in India: The Capitation Fee Colleges*' in K.B.Powar and S.K.Panda 1995, (eds.) *Higher Education in India: In Search of Quality*, Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi.
- Tilak, J.B.G. 2000, '*Higher Education under Structural Adjustment*' in *Policy Recommendations on Financing for Higher Education, A Report of the Consultative Committee Meeting*, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.
- Torres, Carlos Alberto and Morrow, Raymond.A 2000, '*State, Globalization and Education Policy*' in Burbules, Nicholas. C and Torres, Carlos Alberto 2000, (eds.) *Globalization and Education –Critical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York.
- UGC 1993, '*UGC Funding of Higher Education*', Report of the Dr. Justice K. Punnaya Committee 1992-93, University Grants Commission, New Delhi.
- Vaerghese, N.V. 2000, 'Reforming Education Financing', *Seminar* 494, October, pp.20-25.
- Waters, Malcolm 1995, *Globalization*, Routledge, London and New York.
- World Bank 1986, *Financing Education in Developing Countries*, World Bank, Wahington, D.C.
- World Bank 1994, *Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- World Bank 1995, *Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review*, World Bank, Wahington, D.C.
- World Bank 1997, *World Development Report: The State in a Changing World*, Oxford University Press, New York.