

ness about plagiarism, and at least one compulsory course related to academic ethics should be offered in the early stages of bachelor and postgraduate degrees.

Recently, the Pakistani Higher Education Commission blacklisted 23 academic researchers on charges of plagiarism. However, no adequate actions have been taken against these blacklisted scholars under the plagiarism policy: all of them continue to hold positions at their universities. One of them is a well-known researcher, a former postdoctoral fellow in the United Kingdom currently working as a professor and director of a research center in Pakistan. Due to the widespread corruption in Pakistani academic culture, blacklisting does not have any impact on the reputation or career of such high-profile individuals. A portion of Pakistani R&D funds should be budgeted to enforce antiplagiarism rules, as in the budget of the National Science Foundation in the United States. An infrastructure with a team of specialized experts is urgently needed to enforce laws against plagiarism; to set an example for others, guilty parties should have their research and teaching rights revoked by universities.

Pakistan needs an organized infrastructure to enforce antiplagiarism laws and avoid politics and favoritism in science.

REVISION OF FACULTY SELECTION CRITERIA

Research standards will only improve over the long term by dedicating resources to producing better quality researchers and hiring well-trained faculty members. At present, most faculty members hired as assistant professors in Pakistan have no postdoctoral experience. In developed countries, postdoc experience is often required before being hired in a faculty position, as postdoc positions provide additional research training in a specialized field, allowing for the acquisition of necessary skills before starting in a faculty position. Pakistan needs to revise its faculty recruitment procedure. Higher selection standards and transparency in hiring faculty are critical to save academia in Pakistan. Instead of hiring all PhD graduates as assistant professors, why not appoint them as postdocs for a few years before considering them for faculty positions? This would allow for a more effective screening process. Among those selected for a faculty role, tenure (and further promotion) should only be awarded based on research novelty and creativity, rather than on number of publications.

ENGAGING PAKISTANI RESEARCHERS GRADUATED ABROAD

The Pakistani HEC has run overseas scholarship programs since 2003 and has given awards to 7,537 students to study around the world. This is by far the highest achievement of HEC. The aim of these scholarships is to send students abroad to get training and later return to serve the country (it is a mandatory requirement that students return after completing their PhD). However, many HEC policy makers do not understand the concept of post-PhD research. Between 300 and 400 cases are being pursued in the courts against scholars who refused to return to Pakistan after completing doctoral work. If, as seems likely, the duration of existing scholarships is insufficient for students to be fully trained, HEC must consider extending time limits. Further, if scholars choose to remain abroad, they might easily be engaged as adjunct faculty at Pakistani universities, or by distantly supervising Pakistani students, and/or serving as coprincipal investigators in HEC projects.

Overall, there is an urgent need to change the environment of Pakistani research. Although many of these changes must be implemented by universities and government organizations, some must come from the researchers themselves.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.9932>

Student Diversity and Challenges of Inclusion in Higher Education in India

NIDHI S. SABHARWAL AND C. M. MALISH

Nidhi S. Sabharwal is associate professor, and C. M. Malish is assistant professor at the Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, India. E-mail: nidhis@nuepa.org and malishcm@nuepa.org.

The higher education sector in India has experienced an unprecedented expansion in recent decades. With an enrollment of 34 million students and a gross enrollment ratio passing 24 percent in 2016, India is in a stage of massification of higher education. This massification is accompanied by a growing diversity of the student body. A large number of students from disadvantaged and socially excluded groups, such as former “untouchables” and other lower castes from poor families and rural areas, have been entering the sector and this has changed the social composition of campuses in India. Today, a majority of higher

education teachers and administrators still come from privileged social backgrounds, while a majority of students belong to disadvantaged backgrounds. This is a source of tension and adds to the challenges of addressing the issue of growing student diversity on higher education campuses.

UNDERSTANDING DIVERSITY IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE) has completed a major study on diversity and discrimination. It is based on large-scale, empirical data from a questionnaire-based survey of 3,200 students, interviews with 200 faculty members, and 70 focus group discussions with students in higher education institutions across provinces of India. This study is one of the first detailed empirical analyses on this theme in India. The study shows the need for categorizing the phenomenon into distinct, but related, stages to understand the issue of diversity and to initiate steps to develop inclusive campuses. The following sections describe the classification developed in the study.

Our study finds that social group identity and academic differences become a source of prejudice and discrimination on campus.

STAGE I: SOCIAL DIVERSITY

Social diversity is the most visible form of student diversity and is quantifiable and measurable. Social diversity is reflected in terms of the relative share of enrolled students from different social groups: scheduled castes (SCs); scheduled tribes (STs); other backward classes (OBCs); and higher castes. Empirical evidence shows that the share of students from socially excluded groups (SCs, STs, and OBCs) has increased, making campuses more diverse. We argue that the change in student composition is, in large part, due to a strict implementation of reservation policies and the quota system.

These trends, however, cannot be generalized. Elite institutions—following selective admission policies based on competitive examinations—very often enroll disproportionately large numbers of students from privileged groups (higher castes). These campuses remain less diverse and continue to segregate students based on caste and ethnicity across disciplines. For example, the share of higher-caste students in institutions following competitive test-based admissions is more than 60 percent, while the share of

students belonging to lower castes, such as SCs, is as low as 9 percent. Since most of these institutions specialize in STEM subjects, the selective admissions policies also have a significant effect on choice of study programmes and on employment and earnings after graduation.

STAGE II: ACADEMIC DIVERSITY

While stage I deals with issues of diversity at the entry level, stage II reflects what happens inside the classroom and effects on academic outcomes. Due to differences in pre-college academic conditions, students from disadvantaged groups are severely constrained to compete with students from privileged backgrounds. Many disadvantaged students are the first generation in their families to attend college; they come from government schools where the medium of instruction is a regional language, and have had limited access to precollege support opportunities to acquire the necessary academic level to succeed in college.

The attitudes of university level teachers are not always conducive to overcoming the difficulties faced by students from disadvantaged groups. Many faculty members tend to believe that the increase in the share of students from disadvantaged groups is a reason for the deterioration of academic quality. For them, the former “untouchables” are “unteachable” in the classroom. The resulting low teacher–student academic engagement negatively impacts the academic integration of students from disadvantaged groups. Therefore, we argue that even when students from disadvantaged groups are admitted to institutions of higher education, they fail to compete with others, unless supportive environment and learning conditions are created. In other words, even when diversity in stage I is achieved, diversity in stage II may remain a distant dream.

STAGE III: SOCIAL INCLUSION

The third stage of diversity reflects the extent to which campuses admitting students from disadvantaged backgrounds have a socially inclusive climate. Our study finds that social group identity and academic differences become a source of prejudice and discrimination on campus.

Prejudices and stereotypes along caste and ethnic lines are common and result in overt and covert forms of discrimination both inside and outside the classroom. Teachers give socially disadvantaged students less time in and outside the classroom to discuss academic matters and do not encourage them to organize or to participate in academic and nonacademic events. Students from disadvantaged background face humiliating experiences in their interactions with administration. Derogatory remarks such as *sarkari damad* (“special pupil of the government who gets benefit through reservation”), labelling them as “reserved

category,” and making fun of them are usual discriminatory practices. Their mannerisms, accents, and dressing patterns are subject to ridicule on campus. Fear of discrimination leads SCs and STs to form identity-based peer groups, which further alienates them from the mainstream.

Although there are institutional mechanisms to promote diversity and protect students from discrimination, many of these arrangements do not function effectively. This is primarily due to a lack of sensitivity on the part of faculty members and academic administrators to issues related to diversity and discrimination. Discriminatory practices, no doubt, alienate students from disadvantaged groups and result in social exclusion. Students are left with a feeling of not being welcome and campuses remain non-inclusive. All these issues pose major challenges to realizing individual potential and achieving inclusive excellence.

CONCLUSION

It can be argued that there is a wide gap between policies for higher education expansion and institutional capacity to respond to increasing student diversity. The classification of diversity into different stages, and the identification of problems at each stage help specify areas of intervention and strategies to develop inclusive campuses in India. Institutional leaders and managers need to understand the dynamics of growing student diversity and recognize diversity as an asset rather than a liability to develop socially inclusive campuses in India.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.9809>

The Contradictions of Private Higher Education Expansion in India

ELDHO MATHEWS

Eldho Mathews is head, Internationalising Higher Education—South India, British Council, Chennai, India. The views expressed here are solely those of the author in his private capacity. E-mail: eldhomathews@gmail.com.

The debate on the relative merits of public and private educational institutions has a long history in India. During the last two decades, there have been many interesting parallels between the growth of these two sectors in the country.

Currently, more than 25 percent of elementary and secondary schools in India are in the private sector. Their

share has been growing steadily during the last decade. For many reasons, including quality of teaching and learning, better resources, medium of instruction in English, punctuality, etc., many middle-class Indian parents prefer private schools over government schools for their children.

When it comes to college and university-level education, although various trends regarding the growth of institutions are almost identical (as stated above), there is a marked difference with regard to students' choice in securing admission to institutions. A majority of students and parents still prefer government and government-aided private institutions to their purely private/unaided counterparts.

India has an immensely complex and often confusing higher education system. There are different types of institutions such as central universities, state universities, the Open University, private universities, deemed universities (institutions that are declared by Central Government under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956), and others that are also empowered to award degrees. In addition, there are affiliated and constituent undergraduate institutions of central and state universities, called colleges. Colleges can offer degree programs, but are not authorized to confer degrees on their own.

THE GROWING ROLE OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND SOME FAULTY GENERALIZATIONS

The private unaided sector has had an important role in the massive expansion of Indian higher education in terms of enrollments and institutions. According to the latest official statistics, there are 777 universities in India. Of these, around 261 are private universities. Among the 38,498 mainly undergraduate colleges, more than 77 percent are in the private sector. The massive expansion of professional higher educational institutions in India during the last two decades has also significantly contributed to this growth. Almost 20 percent of the total enrollment in higher education in India is in the professional disciplines, with engineering and technology being the most popular fields.

Since the present gross enrollment ratio (GER) in higher education in India is only 28 percent (calculated for the 18–22 age group), the demand–supply gap will increase and the role of private higher education institutions is going to be very important moving forward.

Recently, Pritam Singh, the former director of the prestigious public Indian Institute of Management–Lucknow, made an important observation about the state of private business schools in India: “While certain private institutes have managed to break away from the stereotypes attached and emerged as quality Institutes, there are still several problems plaguing the private sector today. The most important one is that owners of private colleges consider them