CHAPTER – TWO

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY AND RESEARCH METHOD
2.1 HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN INDIA

Education in India has always been valued more than mere considering it as a means towards earning a good living. Right from pre-historic days, education, especially higher education has been given a predominant position in the Indian society. Ancient India considered knowledge as the third eye that gives insight into all affairs. Education was available in Gurukulas, Agrahars, Viharas and Madarasas, throughout the country. The great universities flourished in India when most of the western world was groping in the dark. Those were the halcyon days when India led the world in scientific knowledge and philosophical speculations. Though the glimpses of the original Indian education is still felt yet the impact of colonial rule on India has made the education system less innovative, non-creative and least original.\(^1\)

Though the Indian Higher Education Structure can be traced back to Nalanda and Takshashila Institutions, still the foundation for modern education was laid by the Britshers. They set up network of schools to impart western education in English medium and first such college to impart western education was founded in 1818 at Serampore near Calcutta.\(^2\) Over the next forty years, many such colleges were established in different parts of the country at Agra, Bombay, Madras, Nagpur, Patna, Calcutta, and Nagapattinam. Its historical landmarks are McCauley’s Policy of 1835 to promote European learning through English; Sir Charls Woods’ Dispatch of 1854\(^3\) which for the first time recognized the need for mass education with private and missionary help and gave up the policy of selective education known as the ‘filtration theory’ and finally the first Indian Education Commission of 1882 which recommended the initiative of private agencies in the expansion of education.\(^4\)

Higher Education sector has witnessed a tremendous increase in its institutional capacity in the years since Independence. The number of Universities/University-level institutions has increased 25 times from 27 in 1950 to 693 in 2014. The sector boasts of 45 Central universities, 325 State Universities, 195 State Private Universities, 128 Deemed University, 50 Institutes of National Importance (established under Acts of Parliament), five Institutions established under State legislation, 219 colleges with potential for excellence, 12 colleges of excellence, 374 autonomous colleges and 66 academic staff colleges. The number of colleges has also registered manifold increase with just 578 in 1950 growing to be more than
35,000 in 2014. The larger universities have many colleges affiliated to them. The language of instruction at the better rated colleges is English. Among the universities, some universities are considered as high standard good level universities.

The total enrolment increased from a meagre 0.1 million in 1947 to 20.56 million in 2012. Yet, it can cater to only 7% of the age group population viz 18 to 25 years which is lower than even that of developing countries as Indonesia (11%), Brazil (12%), and Thailand (19%). This small proportion of the targeted population enrolled in formal education at the tertiary level is indicative of the huge gap between access and demand for higher education in India. The bulk of the higher education system lies in its 131 affiliating universities. It contributes around 89 per cent of the total enrolment. In general, less than 3% of India's population has academic education, which is very low compared to world standard. But numerically India has almost 24 million university graduates. India has the largest target population for higher education in the world. Currently the Indian population in the relevant age group to enroll into a higher education course is more than that of Europe, USA and Australia combined. This signifies the abundant untapped potential. The Indian higher education system has established itself as the largest in the world, in terms of number of institutions, and one of the largest (3rd after China & USA) in terms of student enrollment.

Higher Education in India has been receiving continuous financial support from both the Central and the State Governments. At the start of the planning process in 1950, the total allocation for higher education was only Rs.170 million which has now gone beyond Rs.90,000 million. This impressive increase is offset to some extent by the rise in prices (inflation) and rise in number of students entering higher education. It is interesting to note that the plan allocation for higher education which went up to 28 per cent in the fifth plan period (1974-79) has been slowly decreasing on a year on year basis and came down to 6per cent of total plan expenditure during the tenth plan period (2002-2007). The allocation for higher education sector alone was Rs. 46,449 crore (UGC 12th FYP 2012-17).

In India, the spending per student has been going down over the years. The share of education in our five-year plan outlay has been falling. The first five-year plan gave education 7.86 per cent. By the fifth plan, the share of education was only
3.27 per cent of the outlay. Current spending on education in India is not more than 3.5 per cent of GDP. The Center itself concedes that the minimum should be 6 per cent. Again, out of the amount spent, very less is being envisaged to be spent on higher education. Its not even 3-4% of GDP. This compares unfavourably with the international reference level, especially with countries such as South Africa, which invests 8 per cent of GNP on education. A near doubling of investments in education is the soundest policy for increasing the country’s GDP per capita by many fold. Therefore, there is a need to evolve policy through which Private/non-governmental resources is mobilized. Now there is a question as to how to build self-sustaining models of institutions critical for autonomy and long –term viability and student-support.10

Although Higher Education has expanded several times since independence, issues of access, equity, and quality still continue to be the areas of concern. The Gross Enrolment Rate (GER), measures, the access level by taking the ratio of persons in all age groups enrolled in various programs to total population in age group of 16 to 23. For Higher Education GER has risen from 0.7 per cent in 1950-51 to 1.4 per cent in 1960-61, and 8 per cent in early 2000. The current GER which is about 20.4 per cent in comparison to the world average of 23.2 per cent, and an average of 54.6 per cent for developed countries, and 36.3 per cent for countries in transition. The targeted GER in higher education was fixed at 15% by the end of the 11th FYP and is envisioned to be 30% by 2020 (UGC 12th FYP 2012-17). The 11th FYP witnessed a major thrust on expansion of higher education. The 12th FYP has set a target to increase the GER by 10% so as to achieve a GER of 23.5% or 29% by end of 12th FYP (2017).11

The 12th Five Year Plan had the following objectives towards improvement of Higher Education:12

- Expansion, inclusion and rapid movement in quality by enhancing public spending, encouraging private initiatives and initiating the long overdue major institutional and policy reforms, will form the core of the XII Plan effort.
- Improve quality: work on a detailed reforms agenda including: a) admission, curriculum and assessment; b) accreditation & ratings; c) teachers competence and
motivation; and d) restructure affiliated colleges and research for policy formulation.

- An apex Independent regulatory mechanism accompanied by greater autonomy and internal accountability; establish a High level committee to suggest specific Reforms.
- Quantitative Expansion through establishment of new government and private funded institutions and increased intake in existing institutions.
- Reduce disparities based on gender, caste, region etc. through differential support.
- Establish 30 new Central Universities, 16 in States where they do not exist and 14 as World Class Universities (all India admissions, course credits, regular syllabi revision, Incentives for faculty, strong linkage with industry and research institutions, no affiliated colleges, outsource non-teaching functions).
- Establish 8 new IITs, 7 new IIMs, 10 new NITs, 3 IISERs, 20 IIITs and 2 new SPAs.
- Provide flexibility to universities to raise fees accompanied by scholarships, fellowships and student loans.
- Establish a National Science & Engineering Research Board for rejuvenation of research in Universities.
- Launch a national Mission in education through ICT coverage in all the Universities and colleges; broadband connectivity through National Knowledge Network and requisite nodes within institutions; to be implemented through an Empowered Committee.
- Revitalize and reform polytechnics through industry linkage and teacher development, establish 210 community colleges and 700 polytechnics.
- Strengthen Open Universities and reform statutory bodies, scale up SAKSHAT as the education portal for 50 crore people.

The 11th FYP witnessed a major thrust for expansion of higher education and promotion of greater regional and social equity, with continued focus on achieving quality, promoting excellence and supporting academic and institutional reforms. This led to a quantum nine-fold jump in the funding for higher education that enabled framing of many bold schemes for expansion with attention to equity and quality. This was a factor in an impressive overall growth in intake measured by the Gross
Enrolment Ratio (GER) during this period. Targets other than GER proved tougher to achieve, partly because less than half of plan allocations translated into actual sanctions and expenditure and partly because the system was not yet prepared to receive, process and meaningfully utilize the new level of support. Yet the 11th FYP laid the foundations for a new framework and vision for higher education based on the challenges and opportunities enumerated above. The 12th FYP, therefore needs to build on this foundation and learn from the lessons of the 11th FYP. Specifically, it would mean consolidating and qualitative and quantitative strengthening of the many new initiatives of the previous Plan, fine-tuning many of the existing schemes in the light of the experience, formulating some new and bold initiatives and revamping the modalities for framing new schemes and funding them.

During the last decade, the education sector has dominated economic planning. Despite many new national missions/programs and reforms agenda, by both the central and state governments with private sector intervention, the higher education sector is in a state of complete flux. While India has tremendously enhanced capacity, it lag in quality, given inadequate autonomy to our Universities. Centralized control and a standardized approach remains at the heart of regulations. In the 21st century, countries like China, Korea and Singapore, transform from developing to advanced economies in a decade due to strategic planning and a larger vision that correlated economic development to transformation in the education sector, in particular higher education and research, to become globally competitive.

Today, the median age of India’s 1.5 billion strong population is a mere 32; a good ten years lower than most other nations in the world. India is the largest contributor to the global workforce, its working age population surpassing 950 million. It is no surprise then that, India has emerged to be the world’s third largest economy achievement underpinned, no doubt, by its unique demographic advantage, but also a prospect that would not have translated into reality if not for the country’s pioneering reforms in university education over the past 20 years.

Over the last two decades, India has remarkably transformed its higher education landscape. It has created widespread access to low-cost high-quality university education for students of all levels. With a student-centric learning-driven model of education, India has not only bettered its enrolment numbers but has
dramatically enhanced its learning outcomes. India has also undertaken large scale reforms by making teaching an attractive career path, expanding capacity for doctoral students at research universities and delinking educational qualifications from teaching eligibility. As a result, today, India’s 70 million student population is a force to reckon with. Among them are potential thought leaders – researchers and academics – positioned at the helm of knowledge creation. Among them are entrepreneurs and executives of the future, industry-ready and highly sought after. From among them emerges India’s massive workforce, the engine of its US$13 trillion economy. Every ten years the literate population of India goes up by about 10%.

India seems to have indeed entered a golden age for higher education. Many progressive steps taken in 11th and 12th Five Year Plans have come to fruition. The country has emerged to be a global magnet for aspiring learners, and a role model for high-quality affordable educational systems. Today, India is the single largest provider of global talent, with one in four graduates in the world being a product of the Indian system. India’s greatest strength is its 550 million youths who have to be empowered with knowledge and employment. It is estimated that by 2020 three out of every ten additions to the global workforce will be Indians. It is among top 5 countries globally in cited research output, its research capabilities boosted by annual R&D spends totalling over US$140 billion. India is in the fourth cycle of its research excellence framework competing with the global best. 23 Indian universities are among the global top 200. India is a regional hub for higher education, attracting global learners from all over the world. The country has augmented its GER to 50% while also reducing disparity in GER across states to 5 percentage points. The number of people in higher education per thousand of population in India is one of the lowest in the world. The overall GAR (GAR is measured as percentage of students who report attending a higher educational institution to the total population in age-group 18-22) of the country in 2009-2010 was 27.7%. In other words, of the 1000 youth in the age group of 18-22, only 277 reported attending any higher educational institution. The participation of women (23.2%) and OBCs (26.2%) as a whole was marginally below the national average. The figure was substantially lower for SC (17.3%) and villagers (18.7%). While the overall GAR for women stands at 23.2%, it is much worse for rural women (13.4%) and shockingly low for rural women belonging to the
poorest income docile (3.8%). The Indian higher education system is however, needs-blind; thirds of all government spending towards higher education is spent on individuals, including faculty and students. The quantum growth in the higher education sector is spear-headed by the Universities, which are the highest seat of learning. University word is derived from the Latin word “Universitas,” which means ‘specialized associations between students and teachers.” This Latin word referred to institutions of learning, which granted degrees to its students. In India, “University” means a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act and includes any such institution as may, in consultation with the University concerned, be recognized by the University Grants Commission (UGC) in accordance with the Regulations made in this regard under this Act. Every year, millions of students from within the country and abroad, enter these portals mainly for their post graduate studies while millions leave these portals for the world outside.

The UGC Act, 1956 states —the Constitution of India vests Parliament with exclusive authority in regard to —coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. The UGC Act, clause (f) and (g) of Section 26 guides UGC regarding minimum standards and its maintenance in universities. As education falls under the Concurrent List both union and state governments alone can pass legislations for establishment of universities, which in turn could confer degrees on students upon attainment of qualifications. Further, UGC Act lays down that a university has to be established by an Act of Parliament or of State Assembly.

Jawaharlal Nehru, in his famous convocation address to the University of Allahabad in 1947, extolled the role of a university thus: ‘A university stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for the adventure of ideas and the search for truth … If the universities discharge their duties adequately, then all is well with the nation and the people. The Kothari Commission, dwelling on this role for universities, had stated that the principal object of a university is ‘to deepen man’s understanding of the universe and of himself-in body, mind and spirit, to disseminate this understanding throughout society and apply it for the service of mankind.”
2.2 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AND EDUCATION POLICY IN INDIA

Under Indian Constitution, as amended by the 42\textsuperscript{nd} Amendment in 1976, education is in the Concurrent List. Under Article 246 in the VII Schedule, entry 25 of List III vests the State government with the power to legislate upon —education, including technical education, medical education and the universities, subject to the provisions of entries 63,64,65,66 of List I. Entry 66 of List I in the VII Schedule of the Constitution of India vests Central government with the power to legislate for —co-ordination and determination of standards, in institutions, for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. The Constitutional provision clearly lays down that entry 25, List III by which the state government has the power to establish university is subject to the power of Parliament to legislate under entry 66 to maintain the required standards of higher education. This point was made clearer by the Supreme Court of India (1987) in the landmark case of Osmania University Teachers Association versus State of Andhra Pradesh and others. It is thus the constitutional obligation upon the Central government to regulate maintenance of the standards of higher education.

Higher Education is the shared responsibility of both the Centre and the States. The coordination and determination of standards in institutions is the constitutional obligation of the Central Government. While universities, deemed universities and institutions of national importance are largely autonomous institutions entitled by law to design, develop and offer programs which they consider relevant and appropriate for the national needs, the colleges and institutes are expected to be regulated by the universities with which they are affiliated or associated with. Given the wide reach and variety of institutions and programs of higher education, a number of professional, coordinative and regulatory bodies and councils have also been established to ensure balanced and healthy growth of higher education in the country.

There is a realization that driven mainly by the private sector, the higher education system in India has grown fast over the last two decades; however this expansion has been chaotic and unplanned. From an elite system of higher education, it is moving towards mass system of higher education. Expansion of enrolment without adequate public financing and emergence of the private de facto for-profit
providers of higher education has changed the relationship between the higher education institutions and the government and its regulatory arms. The drive to make higher education socially inclusive has led to a sudden and dramatic increase in numbers without a proportionate increase in material and intellectual resources. As a result, academic standards have become unsettled and have been placed in jeopardy in the university-system in the country since the 1960s (André Béteille, 2005)\(^{21}\)

There are many basic problems facing higher education in India today. These include inadequate infrastructure and facilities, large vacancies in faculty positions and poor faculty thereof, outmoded teaching methods, declining research standards, unmotivated students, overcrowded classrooms and widespread geographic, income, gender, and ethnic imbalances. Apart from concerns relating to deteriorating standards, there is reported exploitation of students by many private providers. Ensuring equitable access to quality higher education for students coming from poor families is a major challenge. Students from poor background are put to further disadvantage since they are not academically prepared to crack highly competitive entrance examinations that have bias towards urban elite and rich students having access to private tuitions and coaching. Education in basic sciences and subjects that are not market friendly has suffered\(^{22}\).

Research in higher education institutions is at its lowest ebb. There is an inadequate and diminishing financial support for higher education from the government and from society. Many colleges established in rural areas are non-viable, are under-enrolled and have extremely poor infrastructure and facilities with just a few teachers. A series of judicial interventions over the last two decades and knee-jerk reaction of the government – both at the centre and state level and the regulatory bodies without proper understanding of the emerging market structure of higher education in India has further added confusion to the higher education landscape in the country. There is an absence of a well-informed reform agenda for higher education in the country\(^{23}\).

2.3 ROLE OF REGULATORY BODIES

Higher education in India is coordinated by several agencies. While most of general higher education falls within the jurisdiction of the UGC, professional institutions are
coordinated by different bodies. The AICTE is responsible for coordinating technical and management education institution. The other statutory bodies are Medical Council of India (MCI), Central Council of Indian Medicine, The Homeopathy Central Council, The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), Indian Nursing Council, The Dental Council, The Pharmacy Council, The Bar Council of India, and The Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) etc. There are also a few such bodies at state level, such as State Council of Higher education that were established currently. There are yet another type of a coordinating agency, called AIU, which was earlier known as Inter-University Board of India. AIU has no executive powers, but plays an important role as an agency of dissemination of information and as an adviser both to the government and/or UGC and University.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Name of Body</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
<th>Overlap with role of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>University Grants Commission</td>
<td>Co-ordination, determination and Maintenance of standards in higher education</td>
<td>Other professional councils and DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>All India Council for Technical Education</td>
<td>Release of grants to individual institutions Proper planning &amp; coordinated development of technical education system throughout the country</td>
<td>UGC, DEC, Pharmacy Council of India, Council of Architecture and the State Councils for Technical Edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Distance Education Council</td>
<td>Promotion of Open University in and Distance Education systems in the educational pattern of the country</td>
<td>Other professional councils and UGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Indian Council of Agricultural Research</td>
<td>Co-ordination of agricultural research and development programmes and develop linkages at national and international levels</td>
<td>UGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bar Council of India</td>
<td>Co-ordination, determination and maintenance of standards in legal education and profession</td>
<td>State Bar Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>National Council for Teachers Education</td>
<td>Achieving planned and coordinated development of the teacher education system throughout the country</td>
<td>DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>mandate</td>
<td>regulatory bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Council of India</td>
<td>Standardization and regulation of training of personnel and professionals in the field of rehabilitation and special education</td>
<td>State governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Medical Council of India</td>
<td>Establishment of standards in medical education and to define medical qualifications in India and abroad.</td>
<td>State Medical Councils and the State Govt; UGC and DEC to a limited extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pharmacy Council of India</td>
<td>Prescription, regulation and maintenance of minimum educational standards for the training of pharmacists</td>
<td>AICTE and State Pharmacy Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Indian Nursing Council</td>
<td>Regulation and maintenance of Uniform standards of training</td>
<td>22 State Nursing Coul. With different Acts have registering powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Dental Council of India</td>
<td>Regulation of the Dental Education and ethics in the country</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Central Council of Homeopathy</td>
<td>Maintenance of the central Register org of Homoeopathy</td>
<td>State Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Central Council of Indian Medicine</td>
<td>Maintenance of the central Register of Indian Medicine</td>
<td>State Councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are at least five factors that increasingly govern such regulation\(^{25}\). The first relates to Central laws and rules concerning universities and higher education. A second concerns laws and rules of State governments. A third relates to rules, regulations and guidelines formulated by the UGC. A fourth one concerns rules, regulations and guidelines formulated by regulatory bodies such as the Medical Council of India and the Bar Council of India. These also have State Councils; and there are overlaps in functions of the national councils and state councils. A fifth concerns orders and directions passed by courts. Ironically, ‘license raj’ went away from the industrial sector in 1991 but it still thrives in education.

There are significant differences in their mandate, powers and functions. The councils have rules and regulations of their own. There is large overlap of their functions with the functions of the UGC, other professional councils and even function of universities in some cases. In five cases, namely - Medical Council of
India, Pharmacy Council of India, All India Council for Technical Education, Indian Nursing Council and the Bar Council of India, there are also State Councils; and there are overlaps in functions of the national councils and state councils.

Review of the existing structure of regulatory system in India and the way it regulates various aspects of higher education show that the existing regulatory procedures are extremely burdensome and counter-productive. They often control supply limiting choice by erecting formidable entry barriers for new institutions to be set up through private enterprise. Time consuming, non-transparent and complex procedures applied arbitrarily, create conducive environment for rent seeking and patronage. It makes higher education institutions less accountable. The system is strait-jacketed and inhibits innovation. Overall, the system works towards standardization in higher education and not for maintenance of standards. There is a widespread feeling that regulatory bodies in India have miserably failed to discharge their responsibility towards maintenance of standards. Summing up the situation, Mehta and Kapur (2004)\textsuperscript{26} conclude that the existing laws regulating higher education in India tend to promote adverse selection. It deters genuine investment in education, but encourages those who are adapt at manipulating the license quota raj in the system.

In a recent survey of the degree of regulatory control of the major higher education systems in the world, The Economist has noted that whereas, most nations in the world (including China) are working towards loosening of statutory control over their higher education systems, India is moving in reverse direction and tightening government control in institutions of higher education. It is also clear from the mapping of the regulatory system in India that there is a diarchy in higher education in India. While, UGC is expected to oversee it, the state governments regulate it in practice. In addition, the higher education institutions are subjected to a multi-layered regulatory and control process involving a number of agencies and bodies. Despite all this, higher education in India has virtually remained an unbridled horse (Pinto, 1984)\textsuperscript{27}.

In view of the above, it is no surprise that many of the better known institutions of higher education in India such as – the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITS), the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), National Institute of Fashion
Technology (NIFT), National Institute of Design (NID), Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) and Birla Institute of Technology and Sciences (Pilani) – are all outside the conventional university system in India. IIMs, NIFT and NID do not even have degree granting powers and offer only diplomas\textsuperscript{28}.

The regulatory environment in higher education is a curious one — which the National Knowledge Commission (NKC) had succinctly described as ‘over-regulated and under-governed’ (2009)\textsuperscript{29}. Higher education regulation controls supply, building from an unarticulated underlying premise that such control is somehow a means of ensuring quality, even in the face of significantly increasing demand. Quality control lies largely in attempting to ensure a basic minimum ‘floor’, designed along inputs, with a standardized formula across various parameters applicable in a largely homogenous manner with little incentive to innovate.

As per the current law, the UGC (and the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) enjoys very wide powers to ‘coordinate and determine standards’ of higher education. This power is often interpreted as ‘harmonization’, which is aimed at ensuring ‘uniformity’, operating in a predominantly centralized framework. Laws made under Entry 66 of the Union List of the Constitution (such as the UGC Act read with its Regulations and the AICTE Act read with its Regulations) will override those made by States under Entry 256 of the Concurrent List. ‘Coordination’ is understood as not just evaluation or making grants, it means harmonization with a view to forge a uniform pattern for concerted action according to a certain design, scheme or plan of development. It, therefore, includes action not only for removal of disparities but also for preventing the occurring of such disparities.

This notion of an imposed ‘uniformity’ includes nitty-gritties on complex details such as curriculum, teaching, examination, evaluation and research qualification, admission, pupil–teacher ratio, practical examination, equipment and many more, all driven by a centralized regulator. Doubts persist as to whether these measures actually ensure any minimum ‘floor’ or whether such complex and specific detailed rules encourage the raising of the quality ‘ceiling’ at all. Where supply is already constrained by regulatory barriers, complex and non-transparent procedures within the interpretation and implementation of the minutiae of rules (and by multiple authorities) in turn encourage information asymmetries, patronage and rent-seeking.
Such a paternalistic centralized system leads to ‘over-regulation and under-governance’ and prevents meaningful utilization of the rich diversity of approaches in a country as large and heterogeneous as India.

Section 2 (f) of the UGC Act, 1956, mandates that universities need to be legislated into existence, by Parliament or state legislature. Starting an institution through parliamentary or state legislation is a very uphill task because of various political vagaries. There is no clear policy or direction on how to reduce such high barriers for new universities. The deemed university route originally allowed reputed institutions such as the Indian Institute of Science (IISc) and the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR) among others to be incorporated as universities, directly through notifications from the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD)\textsuperscript{30}. In fact, the Kothari Commission Report\textsuperscript{31} had highlighted that the bringing of ‘high-level institutions such as the Indian Agricultural Research Institute at Delhi, the Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore’ into the university system ‘by deeming them as universities under Section 3 of the UGC Act’ was a ‘welcome development’ (NCERT 1970: 626). It had added that [t]here is in our educational system a need for institutions having the academic status and privileges which ordinarily belong to a university, but with more specific and limited functions and scope.

High entry barriers to setting up new universities (argued in the name of ensuring quality) have therefore also resulted in a complex affiliated college system within universities, where colleges are ‘affiliated’ to existing public universities. These universities have grown to near unmanageable sizes, with unwieldy administrative and decision-making structures, limited scope for innovation and increased difficulty in monitoring affiliated institutions — all of which often adversely impacts quality, which was ironically the very basis for keeping entry barriers high\textsuperscript{32}.

Besieged by perceptions regarding quality assurance and questions of malpractices in higher education in the private sector, most of the MHRD’s Bills in Parliament are about ensuring ‘accountability’ using traditional regulatory approaches. These approaches are aimed at curbing bad behaviour. Yet, there is need for serious reflection on how good performance needs further encouragement, to
become institutions of excellence. Curbing malpractices may be a necessary but certainly not a sufficient condition in ensuring quality or excellence.

As far as the basic floor is concerned, the Prevention of Unfair Practices Bill, to its credit, seeks to create a transparent disclosure system while making capitation fees and other unfair practices illegal. It explicitly clarifies the not for-profit nature of education, with surplus revenues to be ploughed back for growth and development of institutions. It also makes a clear statement that while ‘there has been unprecedented growth in higher education in recent years’, largely through private participation, ‘there is public concern’ regarding ‘unfair practices’, such as charging of capitation fee and demanding donations for admitting students, not issuing receipts in respect of payments made by or on behalf of students, admission to professional programmes of study through non-transparent and questionable admission processes, low quality delivery of education services and false claims of quality of such services through misleading advertisements, engagement of unqualified or ineligible teaching faculty, forcible withholding of certificates and other documents of students (GoI 2010)33.

The Mandatory Accreditation Bill similarly seeks to create a regime of compulsory accreditation through a new national accreditation authority (GoI 2010c)34. This is a worthwhile measure, but only if guided by regulatory approaches on accreditation that actually enable the development of better institutions and incentivize quality. The Educational Tribunals Bill similarly seeks to create a specialized dispute resolution mechanism within higher education35.

The Foreign Education Providers Bill seeks to create a framework for foreign providers to operate, provided they fulfil all the requirements (with a detailed bureaucratic apparatus) to oversee their functioning36. It seeks to confer autonomy by way of exception, where exceptional institutions of ‘international standing and repute’ could be allowed to frame their own rules, so long as a committee of experts deems fit.

The political economy of higher education seems to be guided by a premise that autonomy has to be the exception, and that largely, what is required is more regulation. Regulation is being understood as an ‘all-or-nothing’ approach. There is no debate or policy initiative yet on how to move beyond this ‘over-regulation but under-governance’ impasse or how regulatory principles can be better evolved that
could help create more autonomous universities of excellence that are also privately funded. The Universities for Research and Innovation Bill however shows some promise\textsuperscript{37}. Intended to set up new public, private as well as Public–Private Partnership (PPP) universities, and develop ecosystems of quality, aspiring to reach internationally competitive standards, the Bill does allow such universities, once established, autonomy on critical parameters of administration, finance and academic matters. However, the fine print remains to be seen as to whether such universities at all have autonomy in their respective documents of incorporation or whether the Bill will at all pass muster in Parliament.

The promise of autonomy also lies in some portions of the new Higher Education and Research (HER) Bill that seeks to create a new regulatory authority, called the National Commission of Higher Education and Research\textsuperscript{38}. This Bill is of importance since it seeks to replace or absorb the various existing regulatory agencies, including the UGC, with the proposed NCHER. It remains to be seen whether this Bill will at all be enacted, given the existing authorities and the plethora of regulations that are already in operation and the understandable resistance to allowing a new super-regulator to subsume existing agencies. The HER Bill does have language that indicates that the proposed NCHER can take measures ‘to promote autonomy’, which, it adds, are not ‘obligatory’ but only to serve as points of reference\textsuperscript{39}.

However, in the same breath, it is only in the actual Regulations of the HER Bill — also to ‘determine [and] coordinate … standards’ (same as the UGC) — that it will finally be determined how much autonomy is really enabled. It is yet unclear as to whether the many UGC Regulations could in turn be ‘retrofitted’ into the new authority or whether ‘measures’ to promote ‘autonomy’ (as mentioned in the Bill) may in any way be different from the specific regulations to coordinate and determine standards. Specific regulations could still be intrusive even with a new regulator without a clearer enunciation of what regulatory principles should govern regulatory behaviour.

There is a case for changing the existing regulatory framework that has a disparaging attitude towards private universities. The model of distinguishing public and private universities in terms of the original source of funding — whether it was created by the state or through private initiatives — is archaic and has to be
reexamined. They have to be assessed on the basis of their contribution, looking at what they are doing as opposed to who created them.

The role of the government in higher education and university governance deserves a serious examination. At present, the role of the government in the case of state universities is significant and the higher education department of the state government is deeply involved in every aspect from the creation of the university to granting of approvals and permissions that need to be obtained for administering the university. This poses serious problems for university governance. The existing framework for the establishment of a university (public and private) in India requires legislation passed in the state legislative assembly or the national Parliament or through a decision of the University Grants Commission (UGC) and the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

There are elaborate procedures in place led by the higher education departments within the state government that are involved in every aspect of institution building even before the creation of the university. While this is desirable, there is a need to recognize that once the university is established, the role of the government departments and agencies will have to undergo a significant change. They ought to become facilitators and ensure autonomy and independence of the universities, so that the institutions are able to grow on their own. The need for seeking approvals and permissions from government departments for starting new academic programmes or new disciplines should be dispensed with so that the internal governance mechanisms of the university are activated to work effectively.

A serious concern for the higher education policy makers and educationists is the need to maintain high academic standards. There is a fear that in the absence of external checks and balances, universities will exercise powers in an arbitrary manner and offer courses and programmes which are devoid of academic content. This argument is problematic at different levels: first, it distrusts the university as an academic institution which is expected to act with a sense of responsibility; second, it creates an atmosphere of suspicion and animosity where faculty members of a university, who are expected to take critical decisions relating to the academic programmes, are not in a position to drive the academic agenda; and third, it creates
opportunities for vested interests and corruption at the level of government departments exercising such powers.

World-class universities are not developed through government departments exercising powers over institutions; they are nurtured only when faculty members, students, staff and other stakeholders of the university are able to take decisions about the university in an independent and transparent manner⁴⁰.

One of the significant challenges of Indian universities is the role and responsibilities of regulatory bodies such as the University Grants Commission (UGC), Bar Council of India (BCI), Medical Council of India (MCI), All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) and such other bodies. On the one hand, there is a need to ensure quality in universities and higher education institutions for which some degree of regulatory assessment and external accountability is essential. On the other, if we don’t achieve the right balance, there is a serious risk of regulatory capture where higher education policies will not be driven by innovation and creativity in institution building, but by bureaucratic timidity, archaic rules and regulations and callous indifference of the regulatory bodies, besides nepotism and outright corruption.

The current approach stifles innovation and creativity in the Indian university system where the regulatory bodies play a significant role in many aspects of university governance. Besides the more pivotal role that the regulatory bodies play in the inspection of universities to determine their suitability and worthiness for state funding, these bodies are also constantly involved in formulating policies that have a direct impact on the governance of universities. Given the fact that there are nearly 700 universities in India, there is little scope for any consultation whatsoever before any set of rules or regulations are drafted by the regulatory bodies and made uniformly applicable to all institutions.

As a result, a good deal of the time of the vice-chancellors and registrars of Indian universities is devoted to ensuring that they are in compliance with these rules and regulations. Indian regulatory bodies tend to exercise enormous powers, often in an arbitrary manner. Arbitrariness in the exercise of regulatory powers of higher education regulators has adversely affected the public image and reputation of these
bodies. Their role and responsibilities have been challenged, primarily because of the lack of trust in the ability of regulatory bodies to perform the tasks of a facilitator.

There is an urgent need in Indian universities to reflect upon the crisis of leadership and its inability to seek reforms relating to institution building. Leadership is central not only for providing an institutional vision that will garner and galvanize academic consciousness among faculty and students to fulfil the goals and aspirations of the university, but also to reflect upon the larger role and responsibilities of the Indian university that connects it with the professions, government, intergovernmental organizations, think tanks and NGOs. Leadership is also about taking responsibility and being accountable for one’s decisions. Unfortunately, the existing model of governance of Indian university system does not recognise leadership as a critical aspect of building institutions of excellence.

Although India's higher education system contributes about 350,000 engineers and 2.5 million university graduates annually to our workforce, yet at any given time about 5 million graduates remain unemployed. A survey done by McKinsey Global Institute shows multinationals find only 25 percent of Indian engineers employable. A piece done by The New York Times indicates that only one in four engineering graduate in India is employable, based on technical skills, English fluency, and teamwork and presentation skills. Out of 100,000 MBAs we produce, only 15 or 20,000 are worthy of being recruited. There is a shortage of 30-40% faculty members as against what we need and what we have. The U R Rao Committee has projected that India needs well over 10,000 PhDs and twice as many M Tech degree holders for meeting its huge research and development needs, but India produce barely 400 engineering PhDs a year. All IIMs put together do not produce even 25 to 30 PhDs every year.

India has the potential to earn 3 to 4 billion per year by providing education to overseas students. India has only 27,000 foreign students and has no special plans for any increase in overseas students. Australia has nearly 400,000 foreign students which contribute $7 billion per year. Even the most conservative estimate is that Indians abroad are spending 3 to 3.5 billion dollars on higher education.
2.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The quest to define effective educational leadership is not new. Since colonial
times, the goals of education in India have been shaped according to the dominant
ideology, which inevitably influenced expectations for administrator leadership.
When the foundations for higher education system were laid, there were no specific
guidelines for evaluating the effectiveness of leaders. Yet, the quality of leadership
was always an area of concern. Contemporary research rarely focuses on examining
the effectiveness of educational leadership at the university level. As a consequence,
examples of effective university system management are few in the educational
literature. What is needed as we move deeper into an era of globalization and
privatization of education is a set of guidelines, establishing a level of excellence
toward which all university leaders should strive.

The concept of effective leadership began to change toward the end of the 19th
century (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). School officials reexamined the
goals of American education and searched for more efficient ways to govern public
education. Scientific thought was seen to emphasize progress, human perfectibility
and reason. Equally influential, universities and colleges came to be seen as having
the responsibility of responding to new social problems such as industrialization,
urbanization, and immigration, which began to dominate social and political thought.

Planners of higher education believed that the informal nature of education
was not sufficient to meet the needs of a growing democracy. Ever since the entry of
private sector in higher education, the progressives aimed to replace it with a new
corporate model of decision making (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 106). Administrative
professionals argued that scientific rationalism could be used to advance educational institutions and improve society as a whole. The efficient use of
private resources, and scientific management then became the dominant definition of
university effectiveness, influencing the leadership style and the meaning of
educational leadership began to change.

Research on the influence of university administrators had been largely
overlooked in school governance work. In 1983, a report entitled A Nation at Risk
highlighted the mediocrity of education and stimulated new interest in work on the
quality and competency of public funded universities, particularly the chief executive
The educational literature was subsequently flooded with data-free articles concerning effective university management, which lasted through the 1980s to the mid-1990s. Review articles highlighted the need for education reforms. As a consequence, emphasis was placed on leadership reform at the institution level (Cuban, 1984; Holdaway & Genge, 1995; Lezotte, 1989; Manasse, 1984; Monk, Musella, 1995; Rutherford, 1985). These initiatives inadvertently directed attention away from the need for improvement in central office administration.

Leadership effectiveness scholars recognized this shortcoming and advocated for future studies regarding the influence of top-level managers (Barr & Dreeben, 1983; Boyd & Crowson, 1981; Bridges, 1982; Crowson, 1987; Cuban, 1984; Murphy, 1989; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986; Pfeffer, 1984; Rowan, 1983). They argued that if leadership has any impact, it should be evident at higher organizational levels, [where] there is more discretion in decisions and activities (Pfeffer, 1984, p. 9). They further argued that it is the failure to come up with satisfactory answers to questions about the impact of senior administrators that is the source of so much of our inability to understand declining standards in education (Musella, 1995, p. 223).

For instance, Salley (1980) conducted a study examining how leader’s ratings of job priorities were influenced by operating circumstances and environmental constraints. The study gathered data on the influence of government; board members; and tenure on leader’s ratings of job priorities (Salley, 1980). The findings, however, provided no information regarding how, or if such priorities contributed to leader’s ability to affect change, or to improve educational achievement. Similarly, Holdaway and Genge (1995) conducted a study regarding how effective leaders understand their job functions. The sample included 15 CEOs, selected because they were perceived as effective leaders. However, the study lacked an operational measure of effectiveness, and offered ambiguous suggestions as to how effective CEOs administered their school system.

Musella (1995) took a different approach, examining how CEOs influenced school system culture. The study provided useful information about improving the daily functioning of school system employees; setting priorities; and working with stakeholders, including community leaders, parents, students, and board members.
Additionally, the cultural changes needed to improve operational effectiveness of a school system were described. However, the study did not link school system culture to improved student outcomes.

Leithwood, Steinbach, & Raun (1995)\textsuperscript{68} aimed to describe the problem solving practices of effective educational CEOs. Similar to Holdaway and Genge’s research, a sample of CEOs were chosen because they were reported to have provided effective leadership, and displayed skills found common in expert problem solvers. This study used a problematic standard to determine leadership effectiveness and did not contribute to our understanding of how these processes impacted the university system.

Studies that used an operational measure of effectiveness also contributed little to our understanding of effective university system management (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986;\textsuperscript{69} Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson 1985).\textsuperscript{70} Although focused on how leadership functions are exercised by administrators, no uniformed picture of how effectiveness could be demonstrated was offered (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986, p. 213).\textsuperscript{71}

In contrast, Johnson’s (1996)\textsuperscript{72} study provides a detailed account of how university leaders exercise authority, and how constituents respond to particular leadership styles. Focusing on 12 newly appointed administrators, Johnson’s work highlighted the contextual roles of the educational CEO, and how effectiveness is largely dependent on their ability to be efficient in each particular role.

Similarly, Kowalski (1995)\textsuperscript{73}, in a volume entitled \textit{Keepers of the Flame}, provided insights on the challenges of administrators of educational institutions working in large urban systems. Kowalski discussed issues ranging from the politics of the urban superintendence to the effects of the position on one’s personal life. However, the study did not offer advice to leaders aiming to improve student achievement. Wimpelberg (1997) explains that although this study of big system CEOs was insightful it does not offer a lot of information about [the superintendents] decisions, behaviors, or motivations concerning hiring central office colleagues or school principals.
Clearly, the above authors believe that when assessing the quality of educational institution leadership, the meaning of effectiveness is contextual. However, we can be certain that at minimum, the term effective evokes notions of leadership that is exceptional, perhaps worth emulating, often in rare supply, or widely valued, and insomuch as educational leadership is concerned, improvement will always be an important variable (Leithwood, 1995).

The literature on university level leadership effectiveness, whether state owned or privately funded, remains sparse and leaves much to be desired. Research continues to lack a clear definition and agreed upon measures of what constitutes effectiveness in university leadership, and offers little information on how leaders can improve their leadership styles. To expand and improve this line of scholarship, more information is needed regarding the practices of leaders in state owned and privately funded universities in a variety of settings in order to enhance our understanding of what it takes to effectively manage a university.

2.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

The present investigation is based on an exploratory study of multifactor experiments of 2x2x2 constitution. Emotional intelligence, locus of control and type of university are the independent variables. Leader effectiveness and its factors, and role efficacy and its aspects and dimensions are the dependent variables. Each independent variable has two levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>(High / low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>(Internal / external)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of University</td>
<td>(State / private)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study is constituted of 24 experiments as shown in table 2.1. Each experiment has 35 research problems and equal number of hypotheses. Out of 35 hypotheses in each experiment, 7 hypotheses have been tested by applying the F-test, and 28 hypotheses have been tested by applying the t-test. Hence, the study has...
attempted to seek answers to a total of 840 research problems – 168 by applying F-test and 672 by applying t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Goal orientation factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Consideration factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fairness factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Subordinate development factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Empathy factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Respect factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Exercises judgement factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Facilitates learning factor of leader effectiveness as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Centrality aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Self-role integration aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Proactivity aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence ×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creativity aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Inter-role linkage aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Helping relationships aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Superordination aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Influence aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Personal growth aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Confrontation aspect of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Role making dimension of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Role centering dimension of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Role linking dimension of role efficacy as a function of (emotional intelligence × locus of control × type of University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research paradigm is a trivariate factorial design of 2x2x2 constitution. It has

(a) State University dimension with high emotional intelligence and internal locus of control,
(b) State University dimension with high emotional intelligence and external locus of control,
(c) Private university dimension with high emotional intelligence and internal locus of control,
(d) Private university dimension with high emotional intelligence and external locus of control,
(e) State university dimension with low emotional intelligence and internal locus of control,
(f) State university dimension with low emotional intelligence and external locus of control,
(g) Private university dimension with low emotional intelligence and internal locus of control,
(h) Private university dimension with low emotional intelligence and external locus of control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Private University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal locus</td>
<td>Internal locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of control</td>
<td>of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High emotional</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low emotional</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | External locus   | External locus      |
|                          | of control       | of control          |
|                          |                  |                     |
| A                        |                  | D                   |
| B                        |                  |                     |
| C                        |                  |                     |
| D                        |                  |                     |
| E                        |                  |                     |
| F                        |                  |                     |
| G                        |                  |                     |
| H                        |                  |                     |

2.6 THE SAMPLE

The elements of the universe were comprised of vice chancellors, registrars, deans, head of the departments and professors at all levels. The final sample of 337 subjects was drawn from a total sample of 521 subjects that was selected on random basis from State and private types of University located in north India comprising of the States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, and Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

The purpose with this thesis is to find an ideal leader that would be perceived as effective in state funded or privately owned universities in India. Due to the globalization and privatization of higher education in India, an effective manager must have skills that are perceived as effective by many different people, despite ownership differences.

In order to find characteristics for this ideal leader our focus have been on finding similarities within the two types of universities and to determine what effectiveness means in each set-up. A questionnaire containing different sets of
questions about leadership effectiveness was formed and sent out to approximately 4000 academicians and administrators holding leaders positions within the state owned and private sector universities, whereas they needed to answer the questions with their current role in mind. The result of this was 541 respondents from different universities. To be able to develop this questionnaire and include as many aspects of leadership effectiveness as possible, three concepts about leadership effectiveness were used as a ground base. These were emotional intelligence, locus of control and role efficacy.

The response sheets that were incomplete in terms of demographic data, tools or measures were screened out. After dropping the response sheets having median score on independent variables, the completed ones were classified into discrete groups for distribution according to the requirements of the research design. The extraneous variables of age, gender, education and such other variables were controlled by randomisation and elimination. The eight research paradigms contained elements as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Private University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
<td>External locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High emotional intelligence</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low emotional intelligence</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 DATA COLLECTION

The theory we used in this thesis are mainly taken from literature. Many of the books I got to know from my interaction with management professors, but I also found a lot of new useful literature in the library across the national capital region. In
addition, Internet has been of much help, as we used several articles found on ebrary, as well as on google and other Internet sites.

Theoretical data is divided in different parts. We will start off by describing leadership and leadership effectiveness in general, with the intention of providing a general understanding about these terms. This part will be based on several books and articles on the Internet, with the purpose of presenting the general thoughts and definitions of several authors and researchers. This will result in a wide understanding of how the terms are understood in general. Included in this part are three theories on leadership effectiveness and different behaviors of leaders. Leadership. Several books and Internet pages have been used in the process of describing the theories in general.

2.7.1 Empirical Data Collection

Empirical data included in this study is the result of a survey, sent out people in state funded or privately owned universities, thus it will only include of primary data. This survey is conducted by mailing a set of questionnaires. The survey consists of 4 sets of questions concerning leadership effectiveness, which the respondents will answer with their direct role in mind. The questions are categorized into different indicators of leadership effectiveness (emotional intelligence, role efficacy and locus of control, etc.). However, we will never know the identity of any leader, as this thesis never publish any kind of personal data or even the name of any university. We only focus on the information we get from the answers and we will analyze these through an academic perspective, thus we do not study any specific individual or university. We intended to select 1000 answers from each type of university in order to get the best validity possible out of the survey. However, the final amount of respondents ended up with 541 respondents from state funded or privately owned universities. These were the final respondents after the selection according to the previous described criteria.

All contacts with the universities are done by e-mail, and some over the telephone (Skype). It is a very easy way of communicating and a very effective and rather fast way as well, although e-mailing might be somewhat impersonal and difficult in some aspects.
Firstly, it is difficult to get through to busy vice chancellors, registrars, deans, heads of departments, or other senior position holders in a university and try to get them to help us. One of the more difficult tasks is that we need the contact information of each possible respondent in order to mail their personal link to them, which will guide them to our questionnaire, whereas the answer will end up in our database. Hence, the problem is to get in contact with people in universities, whom will give us contact information to people in their university. Often one have to go through several hurdles in order to get the information of possible respondents in the specific university, thus if the leader is not willing to get 'evaluated' in our study, he will not help us, hence the loss of several respondents. Another problem has shown to be that it is easy that our e-mail end up in peoples’ junk e-mail, hence we will never get them to read it. Thus, the easiest way to get respondents to answer the questionnaire is simply to use our network and the network of people we know, such as friends, work colleagues, family and relatives. Consequently, the work including gathering data is somewhat complicated in the meaning of that it is about contacting people in other universities, and to get people to take time out of work to answer.

Since it was difficult to get e-mail addresses to that many people which we aimed at, we also have included a 'public link', i.e. a link that is sent out to people that they can forward to others. The answers are sent to us without ever knowing who the respondents really are. Thus, the public link is not as controlled as the personal one, and the respondents of the public link is not 'registered' in the same way in the database. However, this way turned out to be the 'saving link' that made it possible for us to get as many answers as we needed.

Yet, we did not get as many as 1000 answers from each type of university and we ended up with only 541 responses.

2.7.2 Quantitative Empirical Data

Our empirical data consists of the answers of a questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 4 sets of questions. The questions view how the respondents perceive their closest current role. The answers are signified by a scale; 1 to 7, starting with "disagree completely" and ending with "agree completely".
This system forces the respondent to choose one side or another; consequently there are 'easy-middle-way' to go. The questionnaire was sent out to state funded or privately owned universities and the purpose is to find similarities in the answers between the different universities. We seek to find an "ideal leader" that would be perceived as effective in each type of university. In total we got 541 answers, which were then statistically analyzed in SPSS.

Every respondent answered all the questions in the questionnaire, i.e. there is no internal severe loss from the respondents. This is based on a withdraw from the SPSS program concerning the validity of our data. Within the SPSS program a test was also run called Reliability analysis. This calculates the degree of reliability in the used scales, and also provides information about the relationships between individual items in the scale.

2.7.3 Research Approach: Qualitative versus Quantitative

The empirical part of this thesis is as mentioned before the answers of a questionnaire, sent out in two different types of universities. The answers are signified by six alternatives (disagree completely - agree completely), thus there are no open questions.

When it comes to the research approach, i.e. if the study is qualitative or quantitative, our study becomes quantitative. The answers we got from the questionnaire were analyzed in terms of numbers, in the SPSS program. The answers provided us with information about the answers of the respondents, and thereby we were able to analyze the differences between state funded or privately owned universities.

2.8 VALIDITY

This part means to discuss the validity, i.e. to the extent our measuring methods in fact measure what they intend to measure.
Our purpose of this thesis is to answer our research question. We believe that we formulated our research question in an understandable way. Thus, the base of our study is to find out how leaders state funded or privately owned universities perceives leadership effectiveness. In order to get this information the questionnaire was made. The questions are formulated in the way that they are perceived in the same way by every respondent. This is done through a pilot study for testing the understanding of questions.

The questions are the result of our knowledge in former research in the field of leadership effectiveness. Thus, definitions of leadership and leadership in general, the Ohio-State Studies, Transformational- and Transactional leadership and Charismatic leadership are used to grant us with the necessary knowledge. In the questionnaire, we include the important factors of leadership effectiveness, i.e. the effectiveness indicators, which includes a few questions each on emotional intelligence, role efficacy and locus of control. We believe that the questions provide us with the respondents' view of leadership effectiveness. Thus, as we believe the amount of respondents that we got from each type of university is a sufficient amount of respondents, we consider the questionnaire be an appropriate foundation of our analysis.

Through the answers of the questionnaire we will be provided with the data of how leaders in state funded or privately owned universities perceives leadership effectiveness. Thus we are able to find the similarities in state funded or privately owned universities, hence the ideal leader we are looking for.

2.9 RELIABILITY

The reliability is the extent to how precise our measurement measures what they intends to measure. This also means that the same study should get the same answers if it is done a second time.

The questions of the questionnaire are formulated in a way that everyone should perceive them in the same way. We put much emphasis on the formulations and the aim of the questions in order to be certain that they will be understood in the 'right' way. The original questions are in English.
The purpose was to find 1000 respondents from two types of universities included in this research. Thus to be sure that we get the 'right' respondents to answer out questionnaire, the question of ownership is included in the questionnaire. The answers of the questionnaire will be sorted with the intention to make sure we include the 'right ownership'.

We believe that the respondents from each type of university will provide us with adequate data to provide an understanding of the population. The population is as mentioned before people of the university we intend to study, working in the higher education sector. We believe that if sending out the same questionnaire to the same amount of persons with the same requirements as we have, the same results will appear.

2.10 THE TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

For data collection: A set of response sheets containing standardised scales was given to each subject of the sample. The details of tools are as follows:

(A) Emotional Intelligence Scale

Profile

Author : Daniel Goleman
Nature : Verbal.
Structure : Ten items. The scale yields the total score for emotional intelligence.

The respondent is expected to tick mark one of the four responses, A, B, C or D.

Duration : No time limit
Reliability : High
Validity : High

Scoring

a) Scoring is done manually.
b) The responses for each set of statements are scored in the following manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scores for A, B, C and D respectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20, 20, 20 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0, 20, 0 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20, 0, 0 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0, 0, 20 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0, 0, 20 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0, 5, 5 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20, 0, 0 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0, 20, 0 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0, 5, 0 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0, 20, 0 and 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(B) Locus of Control Scale

Profile

Author : J. B. Rotter
Nature : Verbal.
Structure : Ten pairs of statements. The respondent is expected to tick mark one of the two choices i.e. either A or B in each pair.
Duration : No time limit
Reliability : Split half – 0.85
Test-Retest – 0.81
Validity : High

Scoring

a) Scoring is done manually.
b) Each pair of statements that bears the tick mark earns a score of 1 if the respondent has chosen B, A, A, B, B, A, A, B, A out of the statement pairs 1 to 10 respectively. Tick marks for other choices are given no score.


(C) **Leader Effectiveness Scale**

*Profile*

Author : Upinder Dhar  
Nature : Verbal.  
Structure : Fifty items. Seven point scale. Responses are in terms of always, usually, often, sometimes, occasionally, rarely and never.  
Duration : No time limit  
Reliability : 0.9165 (split half method)  
Validity : 0.9573 (Reliability Index)

**Scoring**

a) Scoring is done manually.  
b) The responses are obtained on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(D) Role Efficacy Scale

Profile

Author: Udai Pareek
Nature: Verbal.
Structure: Twenty sets of items.

Each item has three alternatives. The scale yields scores for ten aspects viz., centrality, self-role integration, proactivity, creativity, inter-role linkage, helping relationships, superordination, influence, personal growth and confrontation. On re-composition, these aspects generate three dimensions viz., role making, role centering and role linking.

Duration: No time limit
Reliability: 0.68 (Sen, 1982)
Validity: 0.36 item-total correlation with alpha co-efficient of 0.80 (Sayeed, 1985)

Scoring

a) Scoring is done manually.

b) The scoring procedure suggested is to give weights to the three statements in the role efficacy scale. The scoring pattern would be to give scores as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement items</th>
<th>For a, b and c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 19</td>
<td>+2, +1 and –1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7, 10, 12, 13 and 16</td>
<td>-1, +2 and +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 6 and 17</td>
<td>+1, +2 and –1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 8, 9 and 20</td>
<td>+1, -1 and +2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1, +1 and +2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) The scores of pairs of triads of statements were summed together to represent one
   distinct aspect of role efficacy as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement sets</th>
<th>Aspect of role efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 + 11</td>
<td>Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 12</td>
<td>Self-role integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 + 13</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + 14</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 + 15</td>
<td>Inter-role linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + 16</td>
<td>Helping relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 + 17</td>
<td>Superordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 + 18</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 + 19</td>
<td>Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 20</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) These 10 aspects of role efficacy - centrality, self-role integration, proactivity, creativity, inter-role linkage, helping relationships, superordination, influence, personal growth and confrontation - were then recomposed to create three
   dimensions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of role efficacy</th>
<th>Dimensions of role efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-role integration, proactivity, creativity and confrontation</td>
<td>Role making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality, influence and personal growth</td>
<td>Role centering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role linkage, helping relationships and superordination</td>
<td>Role linking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Administration of the standardized measures/tools

a. All the scales / measures used for data collection were self administering.
b. The subjects were asked to interpret the items / statements for themselves.
c. The actual purpose of the specific measures was not disclosed to the subjects.
d. Unwarranted expectations or apprehensions were not raised in the minds of the subjects.
e. The instructions printed on the scales were sufficient to guide the respondents for completing the scales.
f. The scales were administered, only after establishing rapport with the subjects.
g. There was no right or wrong answers to the items or statements.

**For data analysis:** The tabulated scores were statistically treated to derive the significant results. The statistical tools of ANOVA and ‘t’ – test were used.

**F-Test**

i) Correction Term (C) = \( \frac{(\text{Grand Sum})^2}{N} \)

Where \( \text{Grand Sum} = \sum X_A + \sum X_B + \sum X_C + \sum X_D + \sum X_E + \sum X_F + \sum X_G + \sum X_H \)

And \( N = \) number of respondents

ii) Total sum of squares (TSS) = \( \text{Sum of squares of scores of each observation} - C \)

iii) Between treatment sum of squares (BSS) =

\[
\frac{(\sum X_A)^2}{N_A} + \frac{(\sum X_B)^2}{N_B} + \frac{(\sum X_C)^2}{N_C} + \frac{(\sum X_D)^2}{N_D} + \frac{(\sum X_E)^2}{N_E} + \frac{(\sum X_F)^2}{N_F} + \frac{(\sum X_G)^2}{N_G} + \frac{(\sum X_H)^2}{N_H} - C
\]

iv) Within treatment sum of squares (WSS) = TSS - BSS

v) Type of University sum of squares (BkSS) = \( \frac{(\sum X_{ABEF})^2}{N} + \frac{(\sum X_{CDGH})^2}{N} - C \)

(vi) Emotional intelligence sum of squares (EISS) = \( \frac{(\sum X_{ABCD})^2}{N} + \frac{(\sum X_{EFGH})^2}{N} - C \)

(vii) Locus of control sum of squares (LoCSS) = \( \frac{(\sum X_{AEFG})^2}{N} + \frac{(\sum X_{BFDH})^2}{N} - C \)
viii) Sum of squares of interaction between type of University and emotional intelligence =
\[ (\sum X_{AB})^2 + (\sum X_{EF})^2 + (\sum X_{CD})^2 + (\sum X_{GH})^2 - C - BkSS - EISS \]

\[ \frac{N_A + N_B}{N_E + N_F} \frac{N_C + N_D}{N_G + N_H} \]

Where \( N_A, N_B \) etc is the number of respondents in Cell A, B etc of the research design.

ix) Sum of squares of interaction between type of University and locus of control =
\[ (\sum X_{AE})^2 + (\sum X_{BF})^2 + (\sum X_{CG})^2 + (\sum X_{DH})^2 - C - BkSS - LoCSS \]

\[ \frac{N_A + N_E}{N_B + N_F} \frac{N_C + N_G}{N_D + N_H} \]

x) Sum of squares of interaction between emotional intelligence and locus of control =
\[ (\sum X_{AC})^2 + (\sum X_{BD})^2 + (\sum X_{EG})^2 + (\sum X_{FH})^2 - C - EISS - LoCSS \]

\[ \frac{N_A + N_C}{N_B + N_D} \frac{N_E + N_G}{N_F + N_H} \]

xi) Sum of squares of interaction between type of University, emotional intelligence and locus of control SS = BSS - (Type of University SS + emotional intelligence SS + locus of control SS + SS interaction between type of University and emotional intelligence + SS interaction between type of University and locus of control + SS interaction between emotional intelligence and locus of control).

These values are presented in the ANOVA SUMMARY table. The calculated values of F are compared to the table values for the applicable degrees of freedom. If the calculated value of F is equal to or greater than the table value at the pre-assigned level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. Otherwise, the null hypothesis is accepted.

2.10.1 ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence (EI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (LoC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of University</td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence x Locus of Control</td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence x Type of University</td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control x Type of University</td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI x LoC x Type of University</td>
<td>k-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between treatments</td>
<td>k-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td>N-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K= number of groups   N = number of subjects

According to the formula:

\[ F = \frac{\text{Between variance}}{\text{Within variance}} \]

\[ t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE} \]

\[ M_1 \text{ and } M_2 = \text{mean of two cell} \]

Standard deviation (SD) = \[ \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{n} - M^2} \]

SD = Standard deviation of various cells

M= mean of various cells

n = number of respondents in various cells

Standard deviation combine (SDC) = \[ \sqrt{\frac{SD_1^2 * (n_1 - 1) + SD_2^2 * (n_2 - 1)}{(n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - 1)}} \]

Standard Error (SE) = \[ SDC \sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1n_2}} \]

SDC = Standard deviation of two cells

SE = Standard error of two cells
If the calculated ‘t’ value equals or exceeds the table values for applicable degrees of freedom, it can be concluded that the difference in means is significant.

2.11 DISCUSSION

The empirical data is the foundation of our analysis and conclusion in order to find an ideal leader, who will be seen as effective in each type of university. In order to do so it is important to find out what is perceived as effective in a university, i.e. the skills/behaviors/believes of the manager.

Within the questionnaire there are some control questions, which means that some questions are similar to others but expressed in another way. The aim of this is to get as valid answers as possible and to be confident that the respondent was clear in her or his answers. We find it interesting to determine some correlations between certain questions. These correlations are used in the analysis in order to find the answer of how the leaders are perceived as effective in a university.

This analysis leads us to the conclusion, where we seek to find the answer of what makes a leader effective in a university. Hence it is then possible to find the similarities between the universities. When detecting the similarities, it becomes possible to find out how a leader will be able to become effective in their roles in state funded or privately owned universities, i.e. the ideal leader.

2.12 CRITICISM

The results from this thesis will hopefully and probably provide us with useful knowledge, both in our continuing study life and future working life. The journey through this thesis has been an experience in both pleasant and less pleasant moments, and there have been many setbacks along the way. The main problem with our work has been to get in touch with leaders in universities. Lots of time was spent on mailing questionnaires. Universities were chosen from my own and friends’ network, but we also mailed, for me, unknown universities. The process of trying to get 1000 respondents from each type of university took longer time than expected and therefore we had to cut the limit and use the respondents we got, which was much
fewer than 2000. As a result of this our respondents represent a small range of the population, which may seem too shallow when seeking to generalize a type of university. However, we believe the amount of respondents we got from each type of university is good enough in order to evaluate the leadership effectiveness. Another problem that we had to face was that the e-mails with the link to the questionnaire ended up in people's junk-boxes and thereby where some respondents lost.

Since the topic of leadership effectiveness is such a huge field we believe the time devoted for this thesis was inadequate. Leadership effectiveness is a very important subject for many people, mostly for leader and managers, but also for other people. We believe that there are so much more to study in this subject, and the knowledge should reach more people in order to become more effective in the education sector. In addition, as a result of the expansion of education sector and emergence of knowledge economy more people start working in institutions of higher education, and therefore it is even more important to be aware of differences and have the knowledge of what behaviors are accepted in different types of ownerships of a university. However, to become effective one must be able to be innovative and situation-oriented.

We hope our thesis will be useful for those who read it, especially those who answered the questionnaire. Our thoughts and our results might at least open up the interest for leadership effectiveness and provide some people with interesting and for them undeveloped aspects.

2.13 FINAL THOUGHTS

Overall this journey has been interesting and fun and we have learned a lot from the results. From the beginning we were not aware of all the aspects included in the term leadership effectiveness, and it showed to be a much broader topic than expected. This thesis has brought us a greater knowledge about leadership effectiveness, which we believe we will gain tremendously from. We feel that the results provide us with useful information when working in universities regardless of ownership type. This thesis has given us a greater knowledge in importance of making the aspects of leadership effectiveness understandable in a way that people from different types of universities would perceive them similar. We had ideas about
some of the differences between the state funded or privately owned universities before we started this work, but the similarities between these types of universities were more unknown for us. The similarities, which helped us understand what characteristics the ideal leader must have, came visible for us after analyzing state funded or privately owned universities. We believe our minds have opened up in a wider range than it was before, and we are sure this will provide us with deeper understanding of people in leadership positions in state funded or privately owned universities and facilitate possible future work in the education sector.

END NOTES

3 The Despatch was considered to be the "Magna Carta of Education of in India". It was the first authoritative declaration on the part of the British Parliament about the educational policy to be followed in India.
15 Supra note 10
16 Ibid.
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35 Raj Kumar, C (2014), *Building World Class Universities in India*, *Seminar*, (January), No 653.
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