



On Complexity Of Governance In Higher Education In India

Dr. Kumar Anand^{1*}, Dr Smita Tiwary Ojha², Dr Smita Singh³, Anupam Sinha⁴, Ritu Sinha⁵, Ekata Kumari⁶, Rajnish Kumar⁷, Sujeet Prasad⁸

^{1*}Assistant Professor, Amity University Patna, E-mail: kanand@ptn.amity.edu, ORCID ID:0009-0003-7455-5324

²Assistant Professor, Amity University Patna, E-mail: smitaditya123@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3644-1169, Google Scholar id: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=ewPIDWMAAAAJ>

³Assistant Professor, Amity University Patna, E-mail: ssingh1@ptn.amity.edu, ORCID ID: 0009-0000-2367-4145, Google Scholar id: https://scholar.google.co.in/citations?view_op=list_works&hl=en&user=UUYsDooAAAAJ

⁴Assistant Professor, Amity University Patna, E-mail: asinha@ptn.amity.edu, ORCID ID: 0009-0001-9271-438

⁵Research Scholar, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara E-mail: ritu03042@gmail.com

⁶Research Scholar, Patliputra University, Patna E-mail: bhardwajekata@gmail.com

⁷Research Scholar, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara E-mail: rjrajnishsinha@gmail.com

⁸Research Scholar, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara E-mail: sujeetp024@gmail.com

Citation: K. Anand, Smita. T Ojha, Singh et al (2024), On Complexity Of Governance In Higher Education In India *Educational Administration: Theory And Practice*, 30(4), 3295-3303

Doi: Xyz

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Although the presence of industrialism (or market) is, as Polanyi (2001) made clear, neither non existential ever before last century nor went undisputed about its length and depth in modern society but sheer shift from state to market in recent decades has attracted enormous attention from different scholars. In this sense, education that has been closely attached with market and state-or its institutional mechanism- inevitability undergoes changes but what would be scale of market is on-going debate especially in a country where the requirement of expenditure, even at elementary level, on education neither met during colonial regime nor in more than six decades of independence. Unfortunately, however, most of the assumptions regarding the predominantly benign and progressive origins of higher education under state apparatus remain for the most part untested and abstract. This paper attempts to address this scholastic lacuna based on secondary data. It is divided into three parts. First, this paper critically assess the main existing understanding about 'education' that purport to explain the causal mechanisms behind the rational of education with state and the establishment of state apparatus around education. Second, it suggests that the trend toward complexity of governance structure is hardly driven by politicians' genuine commitment to democracy, social justice, or universal rights. Rather, it is best understood as the product of a strategic interplay among hegemonic yet threatened political elites, influential economic stakeholders, and bureaucracy. Above mentioned self-interested groups tend to form coalitions to determine the timing, extent, and nature of governance structure of higher education leading to the rise of private players. Thirdly, it analyses the opening of market and jobs demands the 'skilled' base knowledge to which government institution seems to be insufficiently equipped with.

Key Words- governance, state, market, and bureaucracy

Introduction

The beginning of twentieth century saw rise of universities with disciplinary boundary across world, making universities the centre of knowledge production and dissemination. However what twentieth first century is witnessing is blurring of disciplinary boundary along with de-legitimation of universities. Moreover, the inner contradiction of modern university (or the difficulty of interplay between three board pillar of university - preservation, generation and diffusion of knowledge) especially how it does oscillate (or more precisely meditate) between state and market. Moreover, specific attention would be paid to the challenge posed by

changing nature of market that has accompanied with the massification of universities degrees and bulk of unemployment and underemployment among educated youth, what sort of values of education can be imagined? It must be acknowledged that there is little or almost no empirical work available in this context and much is based on some scholar's experience of being the insiders of academia. It is general tendency that higher education rarely gets critical scrutiny across globe;

Since Independence one question has of how India could manage to provide education to all within limited economic base; it is where the issue of priority become paramount and craft ship of state and policies backed by politics comes into fore. Interestingly, post-independence expenditure was heavily pushed into higher education along with nation building in which bureaucracy played crucial role, and central government role assumed significant height with planning (Kapur & Mehta, 2004, Tilak2001, Kumar, 1998). To maintain consistency over an identification of phase wise changes in India would be done with help of Kaviraj (2010). On the second phase, 1970s-1980s, the education started shifting from centre to state (Desai,2013) amid of political changes and tilting towards market Kohli (2009) and Kaviraj (2010, 2011). In much known manner that by1990s the opening of economy propelled to shift towards privates sectors in which diverse actors swiftly swim to which often 'neo-liberal'. Notwithstanding the excessive overlap among different scholars, there seem to be broader agreement of two-phase; one is, of course, from independence to 1980, and another one is from 1980 till present time.

This paper heavily relies upon second phase which indicates, in crude and blunt way, the clash between state education system and private players in which former has eagerly tightened the nose of education system whereas later is striking back through diverse means or ends. In combination, one of the strongest possibilities in term of effect is provocative enough to reconsider the uneasy relation between democracy with fail amount of market and education thereby characterization of 'public goods' is deeply invaded on theoretical as well as empirical ground simply because every actor would like their own ways and heightened the cost of acquiring skills.

The order of paper is arranged in the three crucial set. Firstly, it explains the basic premise of welfare economics in which education becomes subject of state that is seen to be democratic but even on this ground the overall public expenditure has been minimum since colonial time, especially in India. In parallel, the disagreement over minimum threshold of education to be provided by state widened since there is room to take education as own taste (or preference). Second would pin point prominent feature of Indian's state in which 'degree' becomes charm to be acquired, and higher education under grip of state and its apparatus. Third section deals with higher education, in particular college and universities education, in which the deeper penetration of state is carried out and 'degree' has been sought. However, the opening of market and jobs demands the 'skilled' base knowledge to which government institution seems to be insufficiently equipped with. This explain the onset of private college, deemed university and private university by diverse players like corporate, political leadership to tap an advantage of government institutions.

State and Market in education

In welfare economies as well as human capital approach of education, the role of state has long been recognized but something which is uneasily sits in India; so let in turn deal separately. Desai (2003) writes 'when Samuelson took up 'public goods' the concept in the 1950s, economists and the world at large favoured an active role for the state in the economy. Keynesian macroeconomics and Pigouvian welfare economics were basic to the paradigm, and many countries practiced planning and state control of the economy. Thus it was in a way natural to presume a large role for the state in the provision of public goods' (p.67). Desai (2003) goes on 'the broader rationale was to provide the singular kinds of goods under state whether it is education or medical. It was a response to a presumed preference on the part of the public for public goods' (p.67).Needless, India can be taken as liberal democratic state with having state planning after independence that scholars like Kaviraj (2010) concedes. These types of states began to provide education and so on which was seen to be purely public goods, part and parcel of democracy.

Anyway, as Desai (2003) put the state's growth was most marked during the "golden age" of Keynesianism, from 1945 to 1975. Higher incomes and higher public revenues were matched by growing populations with higher expectations of public provision. Public provision changed on three fronts:

- Goods and services already publicly provided, such as roads and education, were provided more generously and more widely.
- Public provision was extended to new areas, such as health, housing, higher education, and social services.
- Transfer payments were made to new claimants, and enhanced payments to old claimants, through pensions, social security, and poverty-related benefits (p.68).

Even on the empirical ground, Meyer et al. (1992) argued that massification of education picked up after Second World War across the globe as nation development with secular and democratic politics to be accorded in education get currency, even though there is variation among various nation- states due several factors. Hence, it must not get unnoticed that the expansion of education has taken different route in different countries, yet the most strikingly point is of modern nation-state involvement in spreading some level of education, e.g. up to elementary, or secondary. The expansion of education from nineteenth century to present does suggest of two constituents of which modern nation- state, market and religious authorities played crucial role in it (Meyer et al.1992).

These challenges at conceptual level met with, Samuelson's 'reveal preference', stiff criticism over public goods might turn to be private goods. For instance, education is having both characteristic, namely public as well as private; private benefits, at least, higher level exceed public benefit. In fact, there can be distinction between two sort of education: 1) where the intended benefit largely goes to individual 2) where the larger benefit is to society through fostering democracy-or what he calls as 'neighbourhood effect' (Friedman 1972/2010). Further, Friedman (1972/2010) made this distinction in order to argue that those usually higher education, especially technical education, tended to yield lower or negligible neighbourhood effect compared to the elementary education; extension of same argument is made in 'human capital' theory and subsequent reports to which we shall return shortly. Thus, the education as pure public goods faded away.

One of the main rationales for the governmental provision of (higher) education has to do with a public good character of educational services as is indicated earlier. In the strict sense, education is not a public good in the sense that marginal cost of its provision to an additional individual is not zero and it is not difficult to exclude a person from consuming it thereby the possession of particular knowledge could be held exclusively¹. In this sense, education has usually been referred to as a public or quasi- public good mainly because of the externalities it yields to society or spill over among other.

In combination, one of the strongest possibilities in term of effect is chilling and provocative enough to reconsider some 'Ideal' about education- namely whether time has come to recognize the uneasy relation between democracy with fair amount of market presence and education. The very defining criterion of 'Public goods' is deeply invaded on theoretical and empirical ground by taking the case of India, which shall be shown by looking at diversities of players .

Indian and education as 'state apparatus'

The marked peculiarity of India in the realm of education over state expenditure, as earlier noted and will be elaborated slightly later, easily sits with post-independence nation-state building in which it resumes larger territory. The offshoot of such construction has had solidifying the bureaucracy along with public sectors enterprise (Chakravarty,1987; Kaviraj,2010). And the civil services of India come to be promising careers that was well established even before Independence (Kohli,2009, Kaviraj,2010). As matter of our interest, Kohli (2009) writes 'the civil service constituted the heart of the state that India inherited from the colonial period... this civil service contributed to effective government and imparted political stability'(p.5).

In such model of educational structure, it might not be surprising to concede that degree was major purpose of college and universities goer, as bright young often inclined to join state bureaucracy of which degree was initial condition to the requirement. Interestingly, in Beteille (2010) own acknowledgment, he has found only one bureaucrat who left that career and joined academics. It might be taken to be narrower observation but it does suggest of euphoria of state building that was surrounded by bureaucracy thereby research profession or other profession were having lesser importance for youth. That is, by the way, crucial for any planned economy and state. However, the planning of economy were cracked down by 1970s and 1980s yet instead of the power of bureaucracy dwindle further consolidated with deeply politicized and under clout of political whim (Kohli, 2010 Kaviraj, 2010).If this juxtaposition is accepted, part of the story is easier to tell in subsequent discussion.

However, this was accompanied by inconsistent expenditure on education continued till 1990s where major government funds went to higher education, (Tilak, 1993, Kumar, 1998, Kapur & Mehta, 2004) yet in absolute term it was far then what was required. Within it, huge portion went to the professional institution like IITs- which initially thought to take certain cost from students but could not do so rather relied upon government provision.

Hence, it seems difficult to concede the 'public' nature of education in which the arbitrary divisions of funding and allocation of resources are followed. Or even the 'human capital' view that stress upon elementary education doesn't seem to land in the direction of India's experience at least on the ground of resources allocation.

At the same time market started opening for trades as well as the private institutions, e.g. engineering college, begin to emerge with help of communities in state like Andhra Pradesh, or Karnataka, with having capitation fee and so on (Kaul,2000).

Ideals and model of higher education

Higher education and its institution aim -what may be broadly called as 'trinity of university'-, namely university, was (and is) ideally envisaged to be following; 1)arrange prior(or present) all knowledge, 2)generate/expend knowledge through research, and 3)train young who would later become crystal of society; indeed a champion of this view is Wilhelm Von Humboldt- who is considered as father of modern high school and university (See Desai et.al.1960, Beteille, 2000, Davies, 2008, and Calhoun, 2011). Indeed, Humboldt wanted the youth of middle class and ruling families to be civilized though such education in North Germany and the quest still holds strong grip over educational discourses of present time (Davies: 2008).

¹For detail see; Fuller (2011) 'The Sociology of Knowledge'. Who argues that knowledge is 'positional' goods (p.3). That means who's position one is taking while discussing about 'Knowledge'.

Similarly, Napoléon opened up institution of higher learning to be specialized in the particular field, e.g. engineering, or military training, which would be available for talent; that led to the birth-based achievement thereby the selection on basis of birth withered away in educational discourses (Beteille:2010). Combination of two led the modern journey of higher education in general and university in particular that were intertwined with modern occupation (or employment). Therefore, there are, ideally, two model of higher education institution; 1) Institution with specialized filed of orientation, e.g. Indian Institute of Technology, Indian Institute of Management, or similar institution across globe, and 2) university where all sort of knowledge is perused in teaching-learning and research.

State & Higher education in India

It must be noted that neither Humboldt nor Napoleon model is adopted. Rather, particular British model of university was replicated in India whereby the university has to concern with examination and conferring degree and actual classes of teaching learning takes place in affiliated colleges² that were existed before coming of 'university' as institutions since 1813 in Calcutta (today Kolkata), or the establishment of Hindu college in 1817 (Ghosh,2009). In this model research was absent from all three universities established by British, namely Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and so on. However, these initiatives accelerated the demand of education, it had had wider implication on Indian society (Beteille,2010 Kaviraj, 2011) to which more often met by private players in realm of higher education the Indian Act of university, 1904, paved the way for university to be site of teaching and research³. In fact, in the convocation address to the Calcutta University (1922) Sir Ashutosh Mukherji- who is widely known as person to make university the place of research as well that goes beyond British model (Beteille,2010)- said on the ideal of University;

"To my mind the University is a great storehouse of learning, a great bureau of standards, a great workshop of knowledge, a great laboratory for the training as well of women/men of thoughts as of men/women of action. The University is thus the instrument of the state (underline by author) for the conservation of knowledge, for the discovery of knowledge, for the distribution of knowledge, and above all, for the creation of knowledge-makers⁴."

Thus, it is not difficult to trace the similarity of idea about the core of modern university, as is pointed out several times, but underlying relation between state and university seems to be not ill-conceived for subsequent development of higher education in general, university in particular. Especially, the expansion of universities since independence have been driven by state, as Gaudino (1965) writes that 'universities in India are invention of law; to put it in other way, it is created under the legislative authorities in which it does lay down purpose and what it would do'(p.3). He goes on saying that 'although each university shape itself according to its own situation and uses its own constitution in different ways through different norm' (p.3). Indeed, there was feeling among political leaders of that time to see formation of university via state; one might link it with 'public goods' nature of education. This was matched by the state planning with heavy industry and welfare.

Here it is important to be reminded of the distinction between dilemma and paradox matters because "paradox" often implies a statement that seems on the surface contradictory but may be shown to conceal some deeper truth that responds appropriately to the apparent contradiction. This distinction provides a useful marker between those who think there is a paradox, resolvable or not, and those who think there is merely a dilemma that faces one with a choice between state law and expenses and yet having own autonomy of university, as one can see not only Humboldt, but also in both the nineteenth-century discussion that laid the ground for many universities across globe and debates in the current era.

In this respect, the paradox of autonomy of universities by taking the state to have two modes of being. It presents itself, on the one hand, as a matter of social fabric that facilitates overall knowledge of society, on the other, as a legal and financial repository of these universities. In its social side, there are constraints on the state's power—the constraints set by the needs the state must satisfy and by the other locations of social power in society. In its legal side, on the other hand, the state may legislate as it pleases to govern universities, but it has to leave appropriate room of universities to develop autonomous—as a system of legal norms.

This is perfectly consistent with what enlightenment thinkers like Humboldt has taken universities to be. Hence, attention was paid to develop universities and higher education in general-the establishment of IITs, or IIMs - although these institutions are specialized in nature as Napoleon started in France that is countered

² Gaudino (1965) 'University in India'; Singh, A. (2006) 'Understanding versus Postgraduates Education' tracing the historical root that has later become the endemic crisis in governance of university on the whole business of college affiliation. Das (2007) too identified two types of universities - unitary as well as universities affiliated to college for teaching learning (p.48). Also, Gosh (2009) 'The History of Education in Modern India:1757-2007', especially pp.110-115.

³Singh, A. (2006) 'Undergraduate versus Postgraduate Education'. Ghosh (2009) points out that 1904 Act provided the first step toward the autonomy of university whereby the substantive power was given to VC (or more broadly academicians).That Act goes beyond that and identified some major challenges of higher education, namely the narrowness of its scope (it means that if student don't job by such education, it doesn't help them to engage in other occupational activity) among others (p.122-123).

with Humboldt's ideal of universities, but the universities usually stands for unity of all knowledge in term of generation and teaching learning - are brain child of such vision to develop nation. Desai et.al. (1960) writes that 'the industrial development of future society demands move to establish university based on the advancing knowledge'. Indeed the second model of universities were introduced in which it stands for teaching-learning and research, one would find this tradition in the establishment of Jawaharlal university or other universities after independence.

All of this broader aim of university has been founding stone across globe, even though each of these aims is vary in reality across globe. Equally important, the higher education across the globe was affair of elite in which very few could have attended the university (Colhaun, 2011). Only after the Second World War the education at all levels was opened for massed, including higher educational institution; that could be even demonstrated by the fact that prior to second world war, the presence of university was limited, and many countries could not have crossed single digit in quantities terms (ibid.). The decolonization of many countries at that juncture and armed with the popular notion that education would lead to the greater prosperity of people and nation-state has led the expansion to be reality with having at core 'knowledge'(Suzy:2010, Betellie2010). Notice that the mobility of people that was attached to higher education rested upon the assumption of education leading to *employment* as modern occupation whether being administration, or researcher. Modern notion and form of education is explicitly driven from enlightenment and later fuel by industrial revolution and nation state formation of which the demand of newer kind of jobs and employment have been met (Olson,2003, and Weber 2007). That point is earlier made in the context of India as soon after independence the civil service and bureaucracy was alluded as major career prospects of youth in which 'degree' as initial qualification prerequisites.

It is enough to note here that it has deeper implication for the consequent development of universities in India in term of its governance as well as very ideal of universities as centre of advancing the knowledge.

Research at universities and college

On the research, the discussion has been around what sort of knowledge is generated by university and who benefit from such knowledge (Maxwell: 2008)⁵. Although coming to the one of the major aims of university, namely research, one would find agreement over the fact most of them(universities) are non-researching and teachings are hole and sole of their activities figure out there is something deep seated problem with Indian university (Beteille:2000, and Ramaswamy; 2013). Thus, the Humboldt's ideals are at deeper pain to reconcile in the university of India which raises the question of how and what effect the researching universities make in compression of non-researching; or is it enough ground to claim of distinction between mass-elite universities in India in which elites are able to transform degree into skills. And within the same research universities do every disciple enjoy same footage. This in turn leads to the disciplinary distribution of higher education in which claims by some scholars like Deshpande (2012) and Kare (2014) is made to have shifting territory from non-professional coursers to professional as demands for these courses have increased. It certainly seems to be true, but it does not explain as to what kind of skills is demanded and met (or unmet) of institutions and how such high level of disagreement over, say language skills, allow to be taken in consideration.

Disciplines in higher education

The story of disciplines and university is reciprocal and one cannot exist without other because the legitimacy of any sort of knowledge deep down dependent on the particular disciplines. Moreover, modern universities stand for the unity of different disciplines under the departmentalization of universities which started with nineteenth century. And many disciplines were established formally in university by the end of nineteenth century or beginning of twentieth century⁶. Since the generation of now knowledge and mode of enquiry have to have some sort of implication. And such implication of knowledge growth could be found in proliferation of discipline which largely started in enlightenment period (Neumann,2009). It has reached a stage where scholar like Beteille (2010) does see the difficulty of each and every discipline to be incorporated in universities, expansion of higher education and universities are made on the line of narrow disciples, what is called specialized institutions.

Thus, the emergence of different disciplines in twentieth century is not solely driven by the single factors and all dimension, ranging from local, national, international, and above all epistemologies play role in emergence and declines of disciplines (Neumann,2009, 492). But the growth and fragmentation of

⁵ Maxwell (2008) for instance argued that modern universities model of research as knowledge for own sake substantially violate the societal implication and reasoning in particular. Thus, universities based research does from too little reasoning in which wisdom is completely missing.

⁶ Wallerstein examines evolution of social science in modern world However, there have been always convergence as well as divergence of disciplines, and that never been firmly under grip of single boundary, as the twentieth century development of discipline would reveal. For detail, Wallerstein, I. (1996). Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences. USA: Stanford University Press

knowledge (or disciplines) in last century made it hard for many universities to include all sort of knowledge and contribute towards it. For instance, there are courses of travel and tourism management that seems to scholars like Pathak (2007) to be closely intertwined of history, yet paradoxically, some sort of knowledge is subjected to severe crisis of its existence. For instance, on curriculum and discipline level, the humanity disciplines have become obsolete as student of these course are not able to find the demand (Nessumbem:2010). Given such situation Beteille (2000) writing in the context of sociology at university level in India, laments over its inability to attract sufficient vigour among students even though it is generally considered as most happening subject in the western countries; it has become just scoring subject for administrative services and perused for such regard. They identified the serious defect in the curricula at university and needed correction if the revival is necessity of days. One may find similar challenge is, to some extent, confronting basic science as market has expanded, and the attraction to it has been weakened over period of time in India at both level number of enrolment dropped as well as research activities. Yet such explanation seems to be partial, if one considers in the term of post-independent expansion of higher education with embedded bureaucracy under which it has to perform with

Thus, it produced immense tension in university space and uneasiness among the students (or scholars) of social sciences and humanity. Indeed, Pathak (2007) goes on arguing that the differentiation of disciplines has two negative consequences on universities : 1) it creates and preserve the narrowly specialist in their domain.2) the young students of humanities (or languages) feel wounded- what might be called hierarchy of disciplines- as it could not offer lucrative job opportunities, even he quotes from daily news report the case of underemployed (Ph.D.) scholars (Scholars working as Dhabawala) in languages of JNU in order to support his to argument⁷. Pathak's (2007) argument rest on the assumption that science are inherently in dominant position and that would never be subjected to the decline. And, the market is major force of shaping the morals of students (or researchers) of discipline. He also argues that there is need of going beyond the narrowly disciplinary specialization in order to broaden the horizon of knowledge. It seems that he is supportive of interdisciplinary. Here it must be pointed out that there has been proliferation of interdisciplinary courses even with social sciences in universities of India.

For instance, the emergence of development studies- in Beteille (2010) account this discipline has enjoyed extra privilege through research grant and so in the initial year of Independence simply because it was thought that the poverty, hunger and huge unemployment need to be tackled immediately- as distinct area of teaching and research in Indian university, which is broadly drawn from economics, sociology and political sciences, is quite consistent with his thinking. But it is unknown that to what extent the teaching is leveraged with interdisciplinary wherever it is incorporated and which ways it did help students.

Beteille (2010) reflecting on the recent universities' formation (or establishment) note that those who see the territory education as preparation of young for economic growth tend to accept university as place where science, technology and management would be at core of university whereas social science would be at periphery (ibid.118). Many critics have pointed out against such development that the very process has undermined the democratic ethos of education⁸. Although, as Stehr (2005) observes that 'it is widely shared assumption that social science and humanities knowledge is somehow less useful than the natural science, and perhaps increasingly so as 'modernization' advance'⁹(p.130). But, it seems both Scholars have missed the larger picture as Neumann (2009) argues that disciplines emerge, grow and decline and there are cases of decline of some discipline within science itself, those which are static (ibid.490).

It brings us to the question of education and economy-as society become complex there would be much mismatch between education and economy. Moreover, the numerous disciplines and its different orientation of curriculum demand thorough security as in any discipline everyone does not enter to become the specialist and teaching and curricula must be nuanced to meet the both sort of requirements. However, it is very doubtful that there is no such issues because there universities education of India is known for its outdated curricula and so which is pointed out in writing of Kamat (2012), Sanyal (1987). In fact, Ghosh (2009) goes as far as to claim that since 1947, there has been no change in the curricula of higher education mostly in social sciences and the result has been disastrous for developing countries like India (p.191). Even though it is well known that economics as discipline enjoy the greater privilege over almost all social sciences, how could be other disciplines within social sciences are exempted from such difficulty is beyond imagination.

Expansion of higher education and diversity of players

On the matter of expansion, it has been astonishing; for instance, according to annual report 2017-18 (Ministry of human resources), there were only 20 Universities and 500 Colleges at the time of independence,

⁷ Also see the changes taking place in Communication studies of USA in, Gross (2011) 'Rethinking Doctoral Education And Careers'. However, the central concern of this chapter is not P HD education in India, but it gives clue about complexity of Ph.D. research.

⁸For instance, Nussbaum (2010) argues in this way.

⁹ Even more interesting is that the secularization of modern knowledge, as Beteille (2010) pointed out, has side-line the religious (or more precisely theology).In fact, there are only few universities where theology is still taught. It seems that there is lesser clarity over which knowledge (in the sense of disciplinarity) are more relevant to society, as Brew (2009) pointed out.

but number have increased and reached to 903 in absolute number in 2011-2012 as in the case of the Universities and 390505 in the case of Colleges (p.1). Further, report goes estimating that there has been tremendous growth in the enrolment also. At the beginning of Academic year 2011-12, the total number of students enrolled, in the formal system, in the Universities and Colleges has been reported to be 6.6 million of which 19.2 million are boys and 17.4 million are girl (p.2) Also the foremost earliest universities of India, mainly Calcutta University, is now having more than one hundred affiliated colleges (Alatbach,2011). In the sense, the expansion of higher education is not only promised but executed but velocity is controlled without undergoing reform. As Alat Bach (2011) writes 'despite many reports and much criticism, higher education expanded between independence and the end of the twentieth century, although there were few structural changes'. Also, it might not need distinct imagination to concede that ground has been made available to bureaucratization. Thus the pertinent question would be of universities and college responses amid of coming closer to government through funding and regulation on the question of preparation for employments (jobs).

Also there is emergence of private as well as philanthropic universities in India in recent years in which many politicians are directly involved. For instance, Praful Patel, a leader from Maharashtra from National Congress Party (or NCP), is having more than 1, 00 schools and 70 colleges (Kapur & Mehta, 2004). It is one of the state which went for privatization of higher education as early as 1990s that seems not entirely different from southern state like Karnataka, or Andhra Pradesh. In the sense, democratization of education in India does also come to mean direct involvement of political class through private route, although it is called as philanthropy.

Similarly, other actors like major corporates supportive like Shiv nadir University (2011), Azim Premji University (2011), or O P Jindal university (2009) are glaring example of changing face of university and loosing grip of state over higher education in India. On the institutional level, some the philanthropical institution like Tata institute of Social Sciences (hence after, TISS)- off lately conferred as Deemed University- were established in India, but they are also changing on many frontiers. According to twelfth plan (2012-2017), it has been subjected to rapid change whether it is in term of expansion, diversification of disciplines it does offer, or the mode of funding. Indeed, the significant portion of funding is mobilized which is nearly 200 crore compare to foundation contribution 160s crores (p.99).

In spite of all these intention and support of higher education in India, they have fallen short on almost all major grounding whether it research or in many institution lack of teaching. Most strikingly, the fall of degree credential from universities and college is widely acknowledged (Jayaram, 2004, Kapur & Mehta, 2004, and also Beteille, 2010). Then the question of university as institution of enlarging knowledge get crippled in a society where still millions of children are still out of education system and above all loss of credential. Part of reason may be detected in earlier discussion that fraught education system of labyrinth of challenges and goes at unresolved as well as some are creation in the course of journey. Thus, the role of state (here it means central government) in higher education has been minimized and it is highly doubtful to ignore the presence of private players by anyone who is looking at university. Indeed, they are armed with internationalization of curricula and exchange programme, which has earlier crafted from some higher education institution of India.

Conclusion

To sum up, it tells the story of state's incapacity to fulfil minimal role, but part is also fuelled by taking, the different preferential level provided by diverse players and fend-off of institutional functioning, up into consideration. In consequence, education becomes almost the burden of on shoulder of parents, even at elementary level, in India.

Since 1980s, the higher education, namely universities, of India further solidify the bureaucratic structure, which was inherited from colonial time, but its limits have been also becoming apparent whether it is on funding, or credential of degree, or stepping out of conventional discipline of education. It has opened new challenges. On the one hand, if higher education is all about skills itself in term of its constituent parts, the question of whether it is able leverage students with skill or not, given the fact most of students are having science and social science disciplines course. Some scholars assume that these disciplines inability to become skill leveraging yet it opens endless questions; for instance, how and which ways transformation of these institutions would be made to achieved desired result, if employment matters at all. Also, is there differential treatment based on disciplines, say between management and political science, by institutions in leveraging with skills and liaison with market. In the recent years, the growth of private university in India has eked out the government ability to deliver education as public goods, almost all major corporate along with political actors in different state of India now having institution of higher learning.

References

1. Abrol, D. (2010). Governance of Indian higher education: An Alternate Proposal. *Social Scientist*, 38(9/12), 143-177.

2. Altbach, P.G. (2011). The Past, Present, and Future of the Research University. In P. G. Altbach, & J. Salmi, (Eds.), *The Road to Academic Excellence* (pp. 11-32). Washington DC: The World Bank.
3. Beteille, A. (2000). Teaching and research. Seminar, November, #495.
4. Beteille, A. (2010). *Universities at crossroads*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
5. Camoy, M. & Dossani, R. (2013). Goals and governance of higher education in India. *High Education*, 65,595–612.
6. Chanana, K. (2000). Treading the Hallowed Halls: Women in Higher Education in India. *Economic and political economy*,35(12), 1012-1022.
7. Chanana, K. (2007). Globalization, higher education and gender: Changing subject choices of Indian women students. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(7), 590–598.
8. Chatterjee, P. (2003). Institutional context of social research in south Asia. *Economic and political weekly*, 37(35), 3604-3612.
9. Chakravarty, S. (1987). *Development Planning: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
10. Calhoun, C. (2011). The public mission of the research university. In: R. Diana & Calhoun, eds. *Knowledge matters: the public mission of the research university* (pp.1-33).USA: Columbia University Press.
11. Das, S. (2007). The Higher Education in India and the Challenge of Globalisation. *Social Scientist*, 35(3/4), 47-67.
12. Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource. (2018). All India Survey on Higher Education: 2017-2018. https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/statistics-new/AISHE2017-18.pdf (Accessed on 26-04-2019)
13. Desai, I.P., Kothari, R.F. and Gulati, I.S. (1960). Our Universities. Seminar, March, 10-13.
14. Deshpande, S. (2011). Social justice and higher education in India Today Markets, States, Ideologies and inequalities in a fluid context. In: Z. Hasan & M.C. Nussbaum, eds. *Equalizing access: Affirmative action in higher education in India, United State, and South Africa*(pp.212-238). New Delhi, India: Oxford university press.
15. Davies, T. (2008). *Humanism*. UK: Routledge.
16. Feigenbaum, A. & Lqanib, M. (2013). Quality after the cuts?: Higher education practitioners' accounts of systemic challenges to teaching quality in times of 'austerity'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2013.778961.
17. Fishman, G., Igo, S.E. & Rhoten, D. (2011). Great expectations past promises and golden age: Rethinking the "crisis" of public research universities. In: R.Diana & Calhoun, eds. *Knowledge matters: the public mission of the research university*(pp.34-66). USA: Columbia University Press.
18. Friedman, M. (2010). *Capitalism and freedom*. USA: University of Chicago press.
19. Fuller, S. (2011). *The sociology of knowledge society*. London, UK: Sage.
20. Gaudino, P.L. (1965). *The Indian university*. Bombay: Popular publication.
21. Ghosh, S.C. (2009). *The history of education in modern India 1757-2007*. New Delhi, India: Blackswan.
22. Gross, L. (2011). Doctoral education and careers. In: B.Zelizer, ed. *Making universities matter* (pp.41-50).New York: USA, Routledge.
23. Harland, T. (2009). The university, Neo- liberalism reform and the liberal educational ideal. In: M. Tight, K, M., Mok, J. Huisman and C.C. Morphew, eds. *The Routledge international handbook of higher education*(pp.511-521). New York, USA: Routledge.
24. Hedge, S. (2003). *University's purpose: Second thought*. Unpublished lecture delivered at university of Pune: India.
25. Indira, R. (2012). Introduction. In: R. Indira, ed. *Theme in sociology of education* (pp.1-32).New Delhi, India: Sage publication.
26. Jayram, N. (2004). Higher education in India: massifications and challenges. In: P.G. Altbach, & T. Umkoshi, eds. *Asian universities: Historical perspective and contemporary challenges*, JHU Press.
27. Jeffrey, C. (2009). Fixing Futures: Educated Unemployment through a North Indian Lens. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*,51(1),182–211.
28. John, M.E. & Nair, J. (2011). Commission, reports and the difference they make. Seminar
29. Jeferey, C., Jefery, P. & Jefery, R. (2008). *Degrees without Freedom?: Education, Masculinities, and Unemployment in North India*. USA: Stanford University Press.
30. Kamat, A.R. (2012). Education policy in India: Critical issues. In: R.Indira, ed. "Theme in sociology of education" (pp.139-155). New Delhi, India: Sage publication.
31. Polanyi, K. (1944/2001). *The great transformation: the political and economic origins of our time*. Boston & Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
32. Kapur, D. & Mehta, P. B. (2004). *Indian Higher Education Reform: Half Backed- Socialism to Half Backed-Capitalism*. Centre for International Development at Harvard University. Working Paper.108
33. Kaul, R. (2000). Wither equity? Seminar, # 494.
34. Kaviraj, S. (2010). *The Imaginary Institution of India*. Columbia, USA: Columbia University Press.
35. Kohli, A. (2010). *Democracy and Development in India: From Socialism to Pro-Business*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

36. Kumar, K. (1998). Education and society in post independent India: Looking towards future. *Economic & Political Economy*, 33:23, 1-6.
37. Limin B. (2006). Graduate Unemployment: Dilemmas and Challenges in China's Move to Mass Higher Education. *The China Quarterly*, 185, 128-144.
38. Maxwell, N. (2009). From Knowledge to Wisdom: the need for an academic revolution. In: R. Barnett. & N. Maxwell., eds. *Wisdom in the university* (pp.1-19). London, UK: Routledge.
39. Meyer, J.W., Ramirez, F.O. & Soyal, N.Y.(1992). World Expansion of Mass Education, 1870-1980. *Sociology of Education*, 65 (2), 128-149.
40. Neumann, R. (2009). Disciplinarily. In: M.,Tight, K,M.Mok, J.Huisman and, C.CMorphew., eds. *The Routledge international handbook of higher education*.(pp.487-500).New York, USA: Routledge, 487-500
41. Nussbaum, M.C. (2010). *Not for profit: why democracy needs the humanities*.USA: Princeton university press.
42. Olson, D.R. (2003). *Psychological theory of educational reform: how school remakes mind and society*. New York, USA: Cambridge university Press.
43. Pathak, A. (2007). *Recalling the forgotten: education as moral quest*. New Delhi, India: Akar books.
44. Planning commission of India (2013). *Twelfth Five year plan 2012-2017*. Planning commission of India: New Delhi.
45. Polanyi, K.(2001). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. USA: Beacon Press.
46. Ramaswamy, R. (2013). Science, education and research in India. *Economic & political economy*, XLVIII(42),20-23.
47. Sanyal, B. (1987). *Higher education and employment: An international comparative analysis*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
48. Stehr, N. (2005). The texture of knowledge society. In: N.Stehr and R.Grundmann, eds. *Knowledge: Critical concpets', Knowledge and economy*(pp.112-135).Vol.3,USA: Routledge.
49. Suzy, H. (2011). *Universities in transaction*. London. UK: Continuum.
50. Tilak, J.B. & Varghese, N.V. (1991). Financing Higher Education in India. *Higher Education*, 21(1), 83-101.
51. Tilak, J.B.G., 1993. Financing Higher Education in India: Principles, Practice, and Policy Issues. *Higher Education*, 26(1), 43-67.
52. Wallerstein,I.(1996). *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*. USA: Stanford University Press
53. Weber, M. (2005). Extract from Max weber: essays in sociology. In N.Stehr, and R.Grundmann, ed. *Knowledge: critical concepts, Knowledge and economy* (pp.151-162) Vol.3, UK: Routledge.