PRIVATIZATION OF HIGHEREDUCATION: AN ANYASIS OF THE RESPONSES OF THE COMMUNITY PEOPLEON INSTITUTIONAL COHESION

Sunakar Das

H.O.D., M.Ed. Department of Teacher Education, HariNarain Singh Institute of Teachers Education, Sasaram, Bihar, India.

Abstract: An attempt has been made to analyse the responses of the community peopletowards privatization of higher education particularly in the context of institutional cohesion. Descriptive survey method is undertaken to find out the responses of the community people. The community people consisting of 500 numbers (300 males and 200 females) as sample have been taken through random sampling method from Odisha. Statistical techniques like meanand percentage have been used to analyze data obtained from the questionnaire developed by the investigator for the present study. The findings of the study reveal that quality of higher education managed by the private body can be promoted by the institutional cohesionof community people like cooperation, students' encouragement, improvement of the institution, follow up programme, sources of income of the institution, and by solving the problems.

Key Words: Privatization, Higher Education, institution, institutional cohesion and community people

I. INTRODUCTION

The development of higher educational institution depends on the involvement of the communitypeople. As the community is a part and parcel of the educational institution their roles cannot be neglected. The important functions of the community people are cooperation, students' encouragement, improvement of the institution, follow up programme, supervision, sources of income of the institution, and by solving the problems. In this context the collected views of the administrators are interpreted using statistical techniques like mean and percentage followed by tables and graphs.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Some research studies are reviewed here to bridge up gap with the present study.

Ambani (2000) justified in his study that Government was not in a position to afford private parties, having money, could do privatization of higher education better than the Government. Arcelo and Sanyal (1987) found in their studies in Thailand that unemployment rate among graduates from private universities were about 2.8 times higher than those from public Universities in Philippines. Balan (1990) found in his study that the major advantage of private universities had been in responding more quickly and efficiently to market demands. The private sector suggested relevant economic needs of the individuals in society.

Breneman (1988) expressed in his study that high quality of education can be carried on by private educational institutions by collecting required fees from the guardians. Brokeman (2002) highlighted in his study that the privatization of higher education was a means of bringing of whole development of the people in society. In addition to this, he suggested that modern technology and facilities provided by the private educational institutions would no doubt bring socio-economic development of the society. De Angelo and Cohen (2000) emphasized that the role of private

sector on production and finance as the distinguishing government role in educational institutions not only reducing partnership between government and private service providers but also developing the idea of privatization to run the higher educational institutions. On the other hand the study revealed that shifting of activities, assets and responsibilities should go from Government control to private control. In this connection the idea of privatization, liberalization should function through different agencies of public private partnership, federal corporations, quasigovernment organizations and Government sponsored agencies which would open the door of free marketization. James (1987) in his study found that private education had grown for several reasons as social and differentiated demands for higher education. Social demand for higher education exceeded the public supply and the private markets seek to meet the unsatisfied demand as well as demand for high quality. It is observed from the study of James and Banjamin (1988) that in Japan public higher education provided better facilities, which were significantly related to quality than private Universities and colleges. The number of pupils per teacher in public Universities was only eight, compared with twenty six in private Universities. Private Universities employed the retired, part-time and experienced teachers in Japan, Columbia, Brazil, Argentina, Indonesia and in several other countries. Jandhyal (2015) reflected that privatization of higher education should not provide higher education rather it should promote socioeconomic peace and harmony among the people of a nation.Kadam and Godha (2020) in their studies stated that the State would control over the private aided higher educational institutions to ensure that capitation fee was charged and there was no profiteering. The State would regulate the right to establish an educational institution only within the parameters of maintained by proper academic standards, environment as well as infrastructure and prevention of maladministration by those in charge of the management.Karuppayil (2003) had explained that sixty per

www.ijatest.org

cent of private higher educational institutions had shown quality education through infrastructural development as well as modern technology but research and teaching had taken back seat in most of such government institutions. Maryam Ilyas (2013) focused on quality of social life of people in Lahore, Pakistan through privatization of higher education. The study explored that privatization of higher education influenced various dimensions of quality of social life in strengthening the people's standard of living. But on the other hand the attitude of teachers in this context was more impatient, aggressive and violent due to low financial benefit from these institutions.

Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985) stated in their studies that access to higher education by lower income groups was negatively affected by the rapid growth of privatization. According to the study of Rehfuss (2013) privatization included complete withdrawal of public services and transferring the services to private parties, community group, non-profit organizations and even former employees to provide public services with a focus to achieve a reduction of costs, increased efficiency and managemental flexibility. Singh (2018) attempted in his study that sixty two per cent of people were in favor of privatization of higher education due to the fast changing growth of industries and information technology. Spence (1974) told that talented individuals in private higher educational institutions performed high academic achievement in the examination. Tilak (1990) found in his study that the private colleges received little public support in India expect huge donations and capitation fees and charged abnormally high fees, ten to twenty times higher than those charged by the government colleges. Walford (2019) found that private participation in higher education contributed to socio-economic inequalities in society encouraging elitist bias in education. Privatization gave rise to commercialization and profit oriented, with little consideration for national manpower needs, which might cause serious imbalance in the country.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are as follows.

- 1. To study the role of the community people towards privatization of higher education.
- 2. To study the institutional cohesion of the community people towards privatization of higher education.

IV. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The methodology used for the study is stated below.

Research Method: Descriptive survey method is undertaken to study the responses of the community peopletowards privatization of higher education.

Sample: The community people from Odisha consisting of 500 numbers (300 males and 200 females) as sample have been taken through random sampling method.

Analysis and interpretation:

The responses collected from the community people are analyzed as follows.

TABLE 1: Relation Of Community People With The Private Higher Educational Institutions

Sl. No.	Various ways of connection	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
a.	As a donor of the institution	185	61.66	153	76.50	338	67.60
b.	As a member of the management.	3	1.00	2	1.00	5	1.00
c.	As a parent of the student.	183	61.00	146	73.00	329	65.80
d.	As a member of the institution	181	60.33	139	69.50	320	64.00
e.	As a well-wisher of the institution	179	59.66	138	69.00	317	63.40

It is observed in the table that 67.60 per cent of the community people are connected with the institution as the donors by donating money for the development of the institution. Besides it more than 63.00 per cent of the

community people are associated with the institutions as the parents, people of the institution as well as the well-wishers of the institution.

TABLE 2: Cooperation Of The Community People In Various Activities

Sl. No.	Cooperating with the institution	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
1.	Yes	300	100	200	100	500	100
2.	No	-	-	-	-	-	-

From the table it is seen that all the community in any activity with the private higher educational people have given positive responses about heir cooperation institutions.

TABLE 3: Motivating Parents For Admission In Private Higher Educational Institutions

Sl. No.	Motivating for admission	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
1.	Yes	300	100.00	200	100.00	500	100.00
2.	No	-	-	-	-	-	-

The table reveals that all the community people are cooperating the institution in motivating the parents for admission in private higher educational institutions.

TABLE 4: Problems Arising And Its Solution

Sl. No.	Various problems	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
a.	Land problem	185	61.66	153	76.50	338	67.60
b.	Financial problem	3	1.00	2	1.00	5	1.00

c.	Management problem	183	61.00	146	73.00	329	65.80
d.	Students' academic problem	181	60.33	139	69.50	320	64.00
e.	Students' admission problem	229	76.33	138	69.00	367	73.40
f.	Hostel problem	171	57.00	136	68.00	307	61.40

It is observed in the table that 73.40 per cent of the community people are cooperating the institutions in solving the students' admission problem by discussing with the authority of the institutions. Besides, it 67.60 per cent of the community people are connected with the institutions for

solving the land problems. In addition to it more than 60.00 per cent of the community people are associated with the institutions in solving the academic problems of the students, management problem and hostel problem through discussion.

TABLE 5: Steps Followed For Solving Students' Problems

Various steps followed	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
Meeting with parents, students	206	68.66	178	89.00	384	76.80
and teachers						
Meeting with the authorities of	183	61.00	146	73.00	329	65.80
the management						
Meeting with the students' leaders	192	64.00	159	79.50	351	70.20
	Meeting with parents, students and teachers Meeting with the authorities of the management	Meeting with parents, students and teachers Meeting with the authorities of the management 183	Meeting with parents, students 206 68.66 and teachers Meeting with the authorities of 183 61.00 the management	Meeting with parents, students and teachers Meeting with the authorities of the management 206 68.66 178 61.00 146	Meeting with parents, students and teachers Meeting with the authorities of the management 206 68.66 178 89.00 89.00 146 73.00	Meeting with parents, students and teachers20668.6617889.00384Meeting with the authorities of the management18361.0014673.00329

The table speaks that 76.80 per cent of the community people are cooperating the authorities of the private higher educational institutions in solving the students' problems by consulting with parents and teachers. It is the common phenomenon that neither the teacher nor the parents alone are capable of solving the problems but both of them are involved in it.

70.20 per cent of the community people say that the students' leaders represent the problems before the authority and discussing with them, the problem gets solved.

The management, being the sole authority of the institution, takes keen interest to solve the students' problems in a free discussion with the students as per 65.80% of the community people's responses.

TABLE 6: Keeping Relationship With The Private Higher Educational Institutions

Sl. No.	Various relations	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
a.	Discussion of the examination	233	77.66	188	94.00	421	84.20
	results						
b.	Constitution of Governing Body	206	68.66	178	89.00	384	76.80
c.	Indiscipline situation	231	77.00	188	94.00	419	83.80
d.	Involvement in various functions	271	90.33	168	84.00	439	87.80
e.	Construction of infrastructure	181	60.33	139	69.50	320	64.00
f.	Admission of the students	209	69.66	161	80.50	370	74.00
g.	Inviting the articles for	207	69.00	178	89.00	385	77.00
	publication in the college						
	magazine						

It is concluded that more than 64.00 per cent of community people are keeping relation with the private higher educational institutions in the discussion of examination results, constitution of Governing Body,

indiscipline situations, involvement in various functions, construction of infrastructure, admission of the students and inviting the articles for publication in the college magazine for the development of the institution.

TABLE 7: Donation To The Private Higher Educational Institution

Sl. No.	Sources of donation	Males	%	Females	%	Total	%
a.	Donating study materials	185	61.66	153	76.50	338	67.60
b.	Donating funds	201	67.00	161	80.50	362	72.40
c.	Donating building materials	179	59.66	138	69.00	317	63.40
d.	Donating plants for beautification of the campus	185	61.66	153	76.50	338	67.60
e.	Donating sanitary materials	200	66.66	161	80.50	361	72.20

The table reflects that more than 63.00 per cent of the community people donate study materials, funds, building materials, plants for beautification of the campus and sanitary materials for both academic and non-academic development of the institution.

V. MAJOR FINDINGS

- 1). 67.60 per cent of the community people are connected with the institution as the donors by donating money for the development of the institution.
- 2). More than 63.00 per cent of the community people are associated with the institutions as the parents, people of the institution as well as the well-wishers of the institution.
- 3). All the community people have given positive responses about their cooperation in any activity with the private higher educational institutions.
- 4). All the community people are cooperating the institution in motivating the parents for admission in private higher educational institutions.
- 5). 73.40 per cent of the community people are cooperating the institutions in solving the students' admission problem by discussing with the authority of the institutions.
- 6).67.60 per cent of the community people are connected with the institutions for solving the land problems.
- 7). More than 60.00 per cent of the community people are associated with the institutions in solving the academic problems of the students, management problem and hostel problem through discussion.
- 8). 76.80 per cent of the community people are cooperating the authorities of the private higher educational institutions in solving the students' problems by consulting with parents and teachers. It is the common phenomenon that neither the teacher nor the parents alone are capable of solving the problems but both of them are involved in it.
- 9). 70.20 per cent of the community people say that the students' leaders represent the problems before the authority and discussing with them the problem gets solved.
- 10). The management, being the sole authority of the institution, takes keen interest to solve the students' problems with a free discussion with the students as per 65.80% of the community people's responses.
- 11). More than 64.00 per cent of community people are keeping relation with the private higher educational institutions in the discussion of examination results, constitution of Governing Body, indiscipline situations, involvement in various functions, construction of infrastructure, admission of the students and inviting the articles for publication in the college magazine for the development of the institution.
- 12). 63.00 per cent of the community people donate study materials, funds, building materials, plants for beautification of the campus and sanitary materials for both academic and non-academic development of the institution.

VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The investigator is inclined to suggest a few research studies considering its value in present research scenario noted below.

a) A study can be taken up to analyze the involvement of the parentswith private higher educational institutions.

- b). A study can be taken up on infrastructural facilities available in private higher educational institutions.
- c). A study is needed to investigate the socioeconomic-cultural problems of the community people living in different parts of India being influenced by the privatization of higher education.
- d). A study on quality and equity of privatization of higher education and their practical implication in the life of community people may be taken.
- e). A study may be taken up on the role of the community people in managing privatization of higher education.

VII. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATION

Privatization of higher education plays a vital role in providing higher education to the students. As it is an expensive one most of the talented students are being debarred from getting education. The role of the community people is very important for smooth conduct of the higher educational institutions. The privatization of higher education offers new subjects that are well accepted by the student community. This opens an avenue for solving employment problem of the nation in elevating the socioeconomic standard of the community. It saves the society from the alleviation of poverty and hunger. The smooth conduct of the private higher educational institutions depends on the involvement of the community people with the private higher educational institutions.

CONCLUSION

The investigator has taken attempt to study the views of the community people towards privatization of higher education. The findings of the study will help the learners, planners, policy makers, researchers, administrators to implement the results obtained from the problem for further researches.

REFERENCES

- [1].Azad, J.L. (2010).Financing and Management of Higher Education in India, The Role of Private Sector. New Delhi: Guan Publication House.
- [2]. Chindale, S.V., Impact of Privatization on Education in India. Some Stray Thoughts". University News, (Feb. 16-22, 2004), 42 (07).
- [3].Dubhashi, P.R., "Privatization of Higher Education", University News, Vol.35, (June 30, 1997), p.1.
- [4].Hommad, A.H. (1985). Higher Education in the Third World. New Delhi: Indian Bibliographies Bureau Press.
- [5].Jeffrey, R. Henig, "Privatization in the United States: Theory and Practice", Political Science Quarterly, 104, 4, (1989-90), 649-670.
- [6].Murthy, G.S. (2007). Public and private roles in education. New Delhi: Rajpath Publications.
- [7].Murthy, G.S. (2007). Public and private roles in education.New Delhi: RajpathPublications.
- [8].Pathak, R.P. (2008). Methodology of Educational Research.New Delhi: Atlantic Publications.
- [9].Patnaik, J. (2001). Higher Education in Information Age. New Delhi: Author Press Educational Consultancy Organization of India.
- [10].Qamar, F., "Financing of Higher Education in the Post Economic Reforms".University News, Vol.45, No.52, (2005).
- [11].Ram, M., (2004).Universalization of Higher Education, Some Policy Implications. N. Delhi: Sarup and Sons, pp.1-47.
- [12].Savas, E.S. (2001). Privatization and Public Private

Partnership. NewDelhi: Affiliated East-West Press Pvt. Ltd. [13]. Soundaraj, F., "Role of Private Sector in Higher Education in India", University News, 39 (29), (July 16-22, 2001), p.11. [14]. Stiglitz, J. (2002). Globalization and its Discontents. England: Penguin. [15]. Venkataiah, S. (Ed). (2001). Higher Education. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, pp.1-269.

BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Sunakar Das, H.O.D., M.Ed. Department of Teacher Education, HariNarain Singh Institute of Teachers Education, Sasaram, Bihar,India.Educational Qualification M.Sc. (Chemistry), M.A.(History), M.Ed., LL.B., Ph.D.(Education), D.Litt. (Education) continuing.Teaching Experience- 32 years.Research Experience- 20 years .More than 40 books published for B.A., M.A., M.Ed.,M.Phi., Pre-Ph.D.Courses.25 Articles published Awarded "Sikshyashree" by the State of Odisha and "Jaydev Award" by the Govt. of India.

