THINK INDIA (Quarterly Journal)

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

Impact of Privatization on Higher Education in India: Voices from Central Himalayas

Dr. Urvashi Pandey
Assistant Professor
Department of Higher Education, Uttarakhand

Nousheen Nusrat
Ph.D Scholar
Department of Sociology
Higher Education , Uttarakhand.

Abstract

This paper attempts **to** reflect the impact of privatization of higher education in central Himalayas. It helps to access various factors responsible for the emergence of privatization and its impact on higher education. Based on information collected from students of different colleges their view regarding impact of several variables like Government policy, growth of population, financial burden on government, quality, need of skilled manpower, technological developments e.t.c ,were recorded to analyze their impact on privatization of higher of higher education in Uttarakhand state .Analytical tool was Logit model and using the random and purposive sampling for collecting data, total sample size was 100 students. Several variables which we have used in the model were significant predictors of showing their effect on privatization of higher education. Thus there is an urge to take various possible actions in this regard by the government at the ground level.

Keywords: Logit model, Privatization, Higher education, Financial burden.

Introduction

"*Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world***" Nelson Mandela.**

India's higher education system is the world's third largest in terms of students, next to China and the United States. Unlike China, however, India has the advantage of English being the primary language of higher education and research. India educates approximately 11 per cent of its youth in higher education as compared to 20 per cent in China. The main governing body at the tertiary level is the University Grants Commission (India), which enforces its standards, advises the government, and helps coordinate between the centre and the state. Universities and its constituent colleges are the main institutes of higher education in India. As of 2011, India has 43 central universities, 130 deemed universities, 275 state universities, 90 private universities, 93 institutes of national importance and about 33,000 colleges. Most of these universities in India have affiliating colleges where undergraduate courses are being taught (Gautam, Parihar &
Khare, 2015).

Privatization within government higher education institutions takes place in the form of introducing self-financing courses within government institutions. Second form is converting government aided private institution in to private self-financing institution. Third form of privatization is allowing self-financing private institution with recognition and also without recognition. This may be termed as commercial private higher education institutions there is enough justification for an increased assessment of the Quality of the country's educational institutions. Though India has a long heritage of quality higher education system it has failed to solve the problems of higher education until recent past. The deteriorating administration, unproductive practice, corruption and fund unavailability leads to break down of indigenous educational system. To tackle with the problem of unavailability of funds, instead of setting up new institutions, which require huge investments, priority of the government is to expand the capacity of existing institutions. This also infers that new education institutions in education would only be opened in private sector. None can deny the importance of private sector especially in tertiary education given the magnitude of challenge. But, government abdicating its responsibility for this crucial sector is fraught with grave implications. Public sector versus private sector accounts for about 62 per

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

cent of the total enrolment in higher education in India. The massive privatization of higher education would deprive a large section of Indians from the ambit of higher education.

Review of literature

Higher education in India has expanded rapidly over the past two decades. This growth has been mainly driven by private sector initiatives. There are genuine concerns about many of them being substandard and exploitative. Due to the government's ambivalence on the role of private sector in higher education, the growth has been chaotic and unplanned. The regulatory system has failed to maintain standards or check exploitation. The private institutions of present are motivated by profit. The large growths of these institutions (which make huge profits) represent commercialization of education. These institutions do not hesitate to admit students with poor academic credentials. The contributions of private sector to research and advanced level education are also found to be limited. (Tilak, 2005). It is rightly observed, "higher education is far too expensive to be made privately profitable unless it is reserved for the rich or is of very poor quality" (Patel, 2003). Trends show that of the various forms of institutes of higher education that exists, the number supported by public funding have stagnated by growth (like the central and state universities, aided colleges, etc.) and rather the numbers with private funding have witnessed a speedily rising growth (like the private universities, deemed universities, unaided colleges,etc.) (Agarwal, 2006). Within a small duration of five years from 2001–2006 the unaided private higher education accounted for 63 per cent (from 43 per cent in 2001) of the total higher education institutes and 52 per cent (from 33% in 2001) of the total higher education enrolments (FICCI, 2011). Since 2005–2011, the State Private Universities have witnessed a fifteen-fold rise in the number of institutes from 6 to 94. Of the 130 Deemed Universities, 73 are in the private sector. About 1 per cent of colleges have been granted an autonomous status (FICCI, 2011). Quiet obviously most of this growth of private higher education has happened in the more marketable professional courses like engineering, medicine, management, computer applications, etc. ranging between 50 per cent to 95 per cent of the private institutions. (Joshi & Ahir, 2013). There is a number of private training institutions in our country in which students get enrolled after graduation or post-graduation. After passing out B. Ed / M. Ed, they are eligible for getting jobs. In this way, these private training colleges of nursing, pharmacy, education, engineering, management, medical and law give students a way to go ahead in their lives and get better life. To the number of students in the private technical colleges, a number of students get the diploma or degrees in their respective stream like Diploma Electrical/Mechanical/Computer Science and Engineering. It is regulated by AICTE. India with 1200 approximate engineering Institution, 2 Lac teachers has a tremendous potential to become global distinction for technical education particularly for students from developing nation (Abrol, 2016).

According to Dr. Suhas Avhad , 2013, in his article, based on the Emerging Issues and Challenges in Higher Education., the author points out the variety of problems in higher education in respect to political interference, cast creed and religion problems and corruption etc. India is having more than 125 Cores of population. In India every year lakhs of people get higher education degrees, but the quality of higher education is not up to the mark. Day by day it is seen that the quality of higher education is declining because of various issues. In India after pass out from higher studies maximum number of students are not getting appropriate jobs in the market because of pitiable quality of education. Indian government spends lots of money on higher education but that money is not reached to all the educational institutes because of corruption. Kumar Ravindra, (2004), in his article, based on Privatization of Higher Education and Regulatory Mechanism. The author explains the problems faced by the Indian education system. In India every year many colleges and universities are open, but all that colleges and universities in terms of profit are sound but in terms of quality they are not up to the mark. Many institutes are there who are not providing basic facilities to students and teachers. In infrastructure wise all these universities are worst but they got the permission from the UGC to run their institute. Due to globalization, liberalization and privatization the condition of higher education became worst. Now there is as need of reform to improve the quality of higher education. Reforms required like implementation of total quality management in

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

educational institutes to check their quality standard, NAAC must be compulsory for all kinds of educational institutes whether it is aided or unaided. Individual teacher's assessment must make it compulsory to check the quality and knowledge of the teachers. If all such things started in India then in future definitely the condition of higher education will improve.

Objective

1-To meet the growing demand of higher education with rapid growth in population.
2- To reduce financial burden on government and for decentralization of educational institutions.
3- For imparting quality education and training and shaping of the curriculum according to global national and local needs.
4- To fulfill the need for skilled manpower and to fulfill the need of the country in liberalization, privatization, and globalization.

Research Design:-

Data Collection: In this research, data collection was basically based on primary data which was collected through questionnaire, survey, interval and observation method.

- **Sampling**

Random Sampling was used for collecting data from four higher Education institute viz. two government and two private from Kumaun Region in Uttarakhand.

Methodology

- **Survey Method**

Descriptive survey was used for the study. Total population as a Universe hundred (100) from Colleges were randomly selected as sample size from the education institution from the Kumaun Region in Uttarakhand.

- **Analyzing Tools**

A multivariate logistic regression[13] analysis will be using to examine the relationship between each of the predictor variables and the response variables because the response variables are categorical variables[14] and not normally distributed[15].
In a logistic regression analysis, the relationship between the predictor variables and the response variables is better understood as the influence of other variables is controlled.

Specification of the Model

The ordinary least square (OLS) regression model was not used in this situation because of the following limitations (***Retherfordand Choe 1993***)[16]. First, the estimating value of the dependent variable (Y), impact of privatization on higher education can assume impossible values. However the dependent variable may have only two values, 0 and 1. Second, the linearity assumption of OLS regression is seriously violated, according to which the expected value of the dependent variable (Y) at any given value of predictor variable (X) falls on the regression line. But this is not possible for the parts of the line for which $P<0$ or $P>1$. In these regions, the observing points may be either all above the line or all below the line. Third, the homoscedasticity assumption[17] may be also violating. The variance of the dependent variable (Y) tends to be much higher in the middle range of the predictor variable(X) than at the two extremes, where the values of Y are either mostly zeroes or mostly ones. In such a situation the equal variance assumption is untenable. Fourth, since the linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions may be seriously violating, the usual procedure for hypothesis testing in OLS regression is invalid.
To overcome these limitations, we used logistic regression to find the relation between predictor variables and the response variable that impact of privatization on higher Education
The multivariate logistic function involving K predictor variables (X_1, X_2, X_3, . . . , X_k) is given by where P is the estimated probability (here the probability of impact of privatization on Higher Education).

$$\mathbf{P = 1/1 + e^{- (b0 + b1x1 + b2x2 + \ldots\ldots bkxk)}}$$

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

And **Logit (P) = $b_o + bx_1 + b_2x_2 + \ldots + b_kx_k$**

The quantity e^{bi} is calls the odds ratio, and represents the multiplicative effect of one unit change in the predictor variable Xi on the odds of receiving complete of impact of privatization of the Higher Education. The odds ratio is interpret rather than __b‘‘.
For interpretation to be more intuitive and meaningful we are also calculating the effect of the predictor variable on the percentage change of odds of the response variable. This would be calculating by the following equation:

Percentage change = (Odds ratio -1) *100.

The main purpose of the content analysis is to understand systematically of impact of privatization on Higher Education messages by Predicting variables.

Theoretical Framework – Motivation to Involvement in Higher Education
To analyze the various factors that influence the impact of privatization on higher education with processors (APA)[18], a logistical regression was used to determine the impact of privatization of higher education or not. Privatization of higher education, are influenced in part by the perceived balanced of benefits, opportunities and constraints of various factors. Discrete choice models are used to identify and quantify the factors that affect the impact of privatization on Higher Education and/or well managed institutional arrangement. These models include the linear probability, Logit and Multinomial Logit models.

The Empirical model

Qualitative response models, which are strongly linked to utility theory, have been widely used in economics to investigate factors affecting an individual‘s choice from among two or more alternatives (Amemiya[19] 1981; Greene[20], 2000). The model aims at determining the probability that, given a set of attributes about the individual student and other socio economic character, the individual will know the impact of privatization of higher Education or not. Following the theoretical framework and the choice variables specified in studies by *Philip Tristel et al (2002), Orley Ashenfelter et al (1992), Sadig Rasheed (2000), K.V. Hoover et al (2007),Crozier,G (2013), Ramya R. (2003), ACER (2011), Simmon Mcgrath (2010), Ben Graham (2005),*the impact of privatization on higher education, in this study, is described as a function of impact of privatization on higher education, shift in govt policy on higher education, growth of population, financial burden on govt, desire for more autonomy by institutions, curtailment of corruption by government, quest for quality, fulfilling need for skilled manpower, quest for technological developments. These factors have been decomposed into explanatory variable shown in the Empirical model below. The empirical model is specified as follows:

Decision to know the impact of privatization on higher education.

(Q_1) = β_0 + β_1* Growth of population (Q_2) + β_2* shift in govt. policy in H.E (Q_3) + β_3*Financial burden on govt.(Q_4) + β_4*More desire for autonomy by institution(Q_5) + β_5*Corruption by govt. (Q_6) + β_6* Quest for Quality (Q_7) + β_7* fulfilling need for skilled manpower (Q_8) + β_8* quest for technological developments (Q_9) + ε_i

Where Q_1 denotes the shift in impact of privatization on higher education, Q_2 denotes the growth of population (1 = male and 0 = Female), Q_3 denotes financial burden on government, (1 = APL and 0 = BPL), Q_4 denotes desire for more autonomy by institutions, (1 = autonomy generate no problem and 0 = autonomy generate the problem), Q_5 denotes curtailment of corruption (1 = corrupted and 0= not corrupted), Q_6 denotes quest for quality (1= getting good quality and 0 = not getting good quality), Q_7 denote fulfilling the need for skilled manpower (1 = having skilled manpower. and 0 = not having skilled manpower.),

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

http://www.researchgate.net/publication/261699837_Logistic_regression_analysis_in_higher_education_An_applied_perspective
http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1014858517172#page-1
http://mathworld.wolfram.com/NormalDistribution.html
http://www.eastwestcenter.org/publications/statistical-models-causal-analysis
https://www.google.co.in/#q=homoscedasticity

Q_8 denotes shift in govt. policy in higher education (1 = shift towards higher education and 0 = not shifting towards higher education), Q_9 denotes quest for technological developments (1 = having technological development and 0 =not having technological developments) Formulation of the model is influenced by number of working hypothesis. It is hypothesised that the impact of privatization on H,E is influenced by the combining effect of a number of factors related to the student‘s future objective and socio economic constraint. The a *priori* expectations on the effect of each of explanatory variables on the impact of privatization on higher education.

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach‘s alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. However, there is actually no lower limit to the coefficient. The closer Cronbach‘s alpha coefficient is to1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. While increasing the value of alpha is partially dependent upon the number of items in the scale, it should be noted that this has diminishing returns. It should also be noted that an alpha of 0.79 is probably a reasonable goal. It should also be noted that while a high value for Cronbach‘s alpha indicates good internal consistency of the items in the scale, it does not mean that the scale is one-dimensional

Table 01
Relaibility Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.793	9

Source: Authors computation

The values in the column labelled *Alpha if Item is Deleted* are the values of the overall alpha if that item isn‘t included in the calculation. As such, they reflect the change in Cronbach‘s alpha that would be seen if a particular item were deleted. The overall alpha is .0.72, and so all values in this column should be around that same value. We‘re looking for values of alpha greater than the overall alpha because if the deletion of an item increases Cronbach‘s alpha then this means that the deletion of that item improves reliability. None of the items here would substantially affect reliability if they were deleted.

Table 02
Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Impact of privatization on higher education	3.6400	6.112	.489	.771
Growth of population	3.6700	5.435	.806	.725
Financial burden on government	3.7100	5.764	.650	.749
Desire for more autonomy by institutions	3.6600	5.924	.573	.760
Curtailment of corruption by Government	3.7200	6.022	.532	.765

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

Quest for quality	3.7600	6.326	.405	.783
Fulfilling need for skilled manpower	3.7600	6.790	.210	.807
Shift in government policy in higher education	3.7800	6.577	.302	.796
Quest for technological developments	3.6600	6.328	.394	.784

Source: Authors computation

Output is for a model that includes only the intercept (which SPSS calls the constant). Given the base rates of the two decision options (00/100 = 00 % decided to not know the impact of privatization on higher education, and 100 % decided to know impact of privatization on Higher Education, the best strategy is to predict, for every case, that the subject will decide to know impact of privatization of Higher Education. Using that strategy, you would be correct 77 % of the time.

Table 03
Classification Table

Observed		Predicted		
		Want to get Higher Education		Percentage Correct
		Otherwise	Yes	
Step 0 impact of privatization on higher education		0	23	.0
	Yes	0	77	100.0
Overall Percentage				77.0

Source: Authors computation

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is .500

Under Variables in the Equation you see that the intercept-only model is ln (odds) = 25.857. If we exponentiate both sides of this expression we find that our predicted odds [Exp (B)] = 3.348. That is, the predicted odds of deciding to know the impact of privatization on H.E are 3.348. Since 77 of our subjects having Expectation of knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education and 00 having no impact of privatization on Higher Education, our observed odds are = 25.857.

Table 04
Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	1.208	.238	25.857	1	.000	3.348

Source: Authors computation

Now look at the Block output. Here SPSS has added the gender variable as a predictor. Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients gives us a Chi-Square of 144.80 on 1 *df*, not significant beyond .000. This is a test of the null hypothesis that adding the gender variable to the model has significantly increased our ability to predict the impact of privatization on Higher Education by the students.

Under Model Summary we see that the -2 Log Likelihood statistics is 93.82. This statistic measures how strong the model predicts the decisions -- the smaller the statistic the better the model. The Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.361$ can be interpreted like R^2 in a multiple regression, but cannot reach a maximum value of 1. The Nagelkerke$R^2 = 0.481$ can reach a maximum of 1.

Table 05
Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	44.802	1	.000
	Block	44.802	1	.000
	Model	44.802	1	.000

Source: Authors computation

Table 06
Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	93.828[a]	.361	.481

Source: Authors computation

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/indicator/2009/04/adjustment.aspx
http://garfield.library.upenn.edu/classics1993/A1993KT90800001.pdf
http://stat.smmu.edu.cn/DOWNLOAD/ebook/econometric.pdf

Table 07

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Step 1[a] Q2	3.081	.532	33.582	1	.000	21.779	7.682	61.744
Constant	-1.718	.410	17.510	1	.000	.179		

Source: Authors computation

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Q2.

The Variables in the Equation output shows us that the regression equation is ODDS = a + b x
ODDs = - 1.718 + 3.081 Gender
We can now use this model to predict the odds that a subject of a given gender will decide the impact of privatization on Higher Education. The odds prediction equation is

$$ODDS = e^{a+ bx}$$

If our subject is student is female (Female = 0), then the ODDS = $e^{-1.718 + 3.081 (0)} = e^{-1.718} =$ 0.1826 That is, Female students having the expectation of knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education is only 0.1826 as likely to already knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education, As they are to decide not knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education.

If our subject is Male Student (Male = 1) then the ODDS = $e^{-1.718 + 3.081 (1)} = e = 0.2836$ .That is, male students having the expectation for knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education is only 0.2836 as likely to not knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education,

We can easily convert odds to probabilities. For our Gender basis analysis

$$Y=ODDS/1+ODDS$$

The Variables in the Equation output also gives us the Exp (B). This is better known as the odds ratio predicted by the model. This odds ratio can be computed by raising the base of the natural log to the b^{th} *power*, where *b* is the slope from our logistic regression equation. For our model $e^{-1.718}= 0.1826$ that tells us that the model predicts that 18% of female[21] having the expectation for knowing the impact of privatization on Higher Education, whereas 82% of the Female does not want to know the impact of privatization on Higher Education.

For our model $e^{1.262}= 0.2836$ that tells us that the model predicts that 28% of male know the impact of privatization on Higher Education, whereas 72% of the male students do not want to know impact of privatization on Higher Education.

Table 08

Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	Q2	5.386	1.390	15.010	1	.000	218.410	14.317	3.332
	Q3	.384	1.107	.121	1	.728	1.469	.168	12.850
	Q4	1.654	.863	3.675	1	.055	5.230	.964	28.383
	Q5	3.316	1.054	9.904	1	.002	27.543	3.493	217.180
	Q6	2.126	.961	4.890	1	.027	8.379	1.273	55.133
	Q7	1.141	.949	1.445	1	.029	3.131	.487	20.126
	Q8	1.371	.935	2.148	1	.043	3.939	.630	24.628
	Q9	2.222	1.157	3.692	1	.055	9.228	.956	89.049
	Constant	-7.945	1.923	17.062	1	.000	.000		

Source: Authors computation

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9.

Cox & Snell R Square = 0.610, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.814,-2 Log likelihood = 44.400[a] Hosmer and Lemeshow Test Chi-square = 1.471, df = 8, ρ = 0.993

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 8 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

A Logistic regression analysis on the 100 observation in intermediate student data set was run using the SPSS 19[22] software to determine the effects of the factors that influence the impact of privatization of H.E. Table 08 represents the result of the estimated logistic regression of the model in equation. The Cox & Snell R^2 Value & Nagelkerke R^2 value of 0.61 & 0.814 respectively is acceptable because it is nearer to 1. The *F* statistic 1.471 which tests the overall significance of the mode, is significant at the 1 % level.

- β_1: the odds ratio (exp (5.386) = 218.4) can be interpreted as the odds a Student with male status will attend to Higher Education is 218 (Increase of 21843%) times the odds that a Student of female status will.
- β_2: the odds ratio (exp (0.384) = 1.469) can be interpreted as the odds that there will be more financial burden on government in Higher Education is 1.469 (Increases of 146 %) times the odds that burden will be less.
- β_3: the odds ratio (exp (1.654) = 5.23) can be interpreted as the odds more autonomy in Higher Education is 5.23 (Increases of 523%) times the odds that less autonomy.
- β_4: the odds ratio (exp (3.316) = 27.54) can be interpreted as the odds curtailment in corruption in Higher Education is 27.54 (increases of 2754%) times the odds that no curtailment in corruption.
- β_5: the odds ratio (exp (2.126) = 8.37) can be interpreted as the odds a quest for quality in Higher Education is 8.37 (Increases of 837%) times the odds that no increase in quality.
- β_6: the odds ratio (exp (1.141) = 3.13) can be interpreted as the odds fulfilling the need for skilled manpower in Higher education is 3.13 (increases of 313 %) times the odds that no skilled manpower.
- β_7: the odds ratio (exp (1.371) = 3.93) can be interpreted as the odds shift in govt. policy in higher education is 3.93 (increases of 393 %) times the odds that no competitive efficiency.
- β_8: the odds ratio (exp (2.222) = 9.22) can be interpreted as the odds having technological developments in Higher Education is 9.22 (increases of 922 %) times the odds that there is no technological development.

A logistic regression analysis was employed to analysis the socio – economic and institutional factors that influence of impact of privatization on higher education education in Uttarakhand. The model specification, impact of privatization on as dependent variable and shift in government policy, financial burden on government, desire for more autonomy, curtailment of corruption, quest for quality, need for skilled manpower, technological developments as independent variables .

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

Empirical results from the logistic regression analyse the table 08 revels that Growth of population, autonomy, corruption, quality of education, skilled manpower, competitive efficiency and technological developments are positive and significant predictor, whereas financial burden on government is positive but not significant predictor of impact of privatization on higher education.

Thus the final Logit model will be;

Prob. For impact of privatization on H.E. (Q_1) = - 7.945 + 5.386 Growth of population (Q_2) + 0.384 financial burden on government (Q3) + 1.654desire for more autonomy by institution (Q_4) + 3.316 curtailment of corruption by govt.(Q_5) + 2.126 quest for quality (Q_6) +1.141 filfilling need for skilled manpower(Q_7) + 1.371 shift in govt. policy (Q_8) + 2.222 quest for technological development (Q_9) + ε_i

Discussion and conclusion

Gender of the Students were found significant and positive related to decision about to participation in higher Education and their β coefficient value is very high that is 5.386, it means male having enough desire to enrolment in higher education in the respect of female student. Male student have enough mobility and less social bound[23].

This study also founded that financial burden on government was not significant related to involvement in higher Education. And the β coefficient value is 0.384. Even though financial status playing significant role in their social life, but in the context of higher education involvement playing neutral role. Same as we can see that all the variable including in the model playing significant role for probability to determine the impact of privatization on higher education.

The objective of this study was examining the socio economic and individual factors that influences to student to involvement in higher education in Kumaun region in Uttarakhand. A random sample of 100 students from Kumaun region of Uttarakhand was conducted for the study. A well-structured interview schedule was the main tool for data collection while descriptive statics and logistic regression analysis were the main analytical techniques.

Empirical results from the logistic regression analysis revel that growth of population, financial burden on government, autonomy, corruption, quality of education, skilled manpower, competitive efficiency and technological developments positive influenced to involvement in higher education by the student. The regression analysis finds the growth of population, financial burden on government, autonomy, corruption, quality of education, skilled manpower, competitive efficiency and technological developments as significant predictors of the probability to involvement behaviour in higher Education. It is recommended that viable improving their social and economic life related variable increasing the involvement in higher education.

References

Adetunde, I., Akensina, A. and Peter, A. (2008); *"Factors affecting the standard of female education: A case study of Senior Secondary Schools in Kssena- Nankana District"*, A journal of Social Sciences.**Coley, Richard J. (2013), –***Poverty and Education: Finding the Way Forward",* ETS Center for Research on Human Capital and Education Research and Development Educational Testing Service Rosedale Road Princeton

Dukkipati, U. (2010); *"Higher Education in India: Sustaining Long-term Growth. In Center for Strategic Studies and International Studies*, Washington D.C.

Kainuwa, Ahmad & Yusuf, Najeemah Binti Mohammad. (2013); *"Influence of Socio- Economic and Educational Background of Parents on their Children"s Education in Nigeria"* International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 3, Issue 10, October 2013.

McGrath, Simon. (2007); *"What is Employability?"* UNESCO Centre for Comparative Education Research,

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors

ISSN:0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-4-October-December-2019

School of Education, University of Nottingham.

Rasheed, Sadig (2002); *"Defining Quality in Education"* The Chief, Education Section, Programme Division UNICEF, 3 United Nations Plaza, H-7 New York, New York 10017 USA

Trostel, Philip , Walker, Ian , Woolley, Paul, (**2002);** *"Estimates of the economic return to schooling for 28 countries"* Labour Economics 9. 1–16

V. Kayhleen. Dempsay, Hoover (1980); **–***Explorations Parent school relations*‖ Journal of education.

New References

VI.Agarwal, P. (2006). "Higher Education in India: The Need for Change." ICRIER Working Paper, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations: No. 180.

VII. **FICCI. (**2011). "Private sector participation in Indian higher education," FICCI higher education summit 2011, Ernst & Young Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.

VIII . **Gautam, R.; Parihar, A.S.; Khare, S. (**2015)."Analysis of Globalization/ Privatization of Higher Education in India, International Journal of Science, Technology and Management, Volume 4, Issue No. 1, pp 726-733.

IX. **Jonaki, B.; Prasenjit, P.** (2016)."Higher Education in India: Recent Issues and Trends", Research Journal of Educational Sciences, Volume 4(1), 10-16.

X. **Joshi, K.M.; Ahir, K.V.** (2013). "Indian Higher Education: Some Reflections", Intellectual Economics, Volume 7, No. 1(15), p 42-53.

XI. **Patel, I.G. (2003**). Higher Education and Economic Development in JBG Tilak (ed), Education, Society and Development: National and International Perspectives, APH for NIEPA, New Delhi.

XII **.Tilak, Jandhyala BG (2005).** Private Higher Education: Philanthropy to Profits' in Higher Education in World 2006: The Financing of Universities, GUNI Series on the Social Commitment of Universities, Palgrave, New York and GUNI.

XIII. Times of India, 21st July, 2014, Article "Higher Education in India: An Introspection" Wikipedia- Higher Education in India online https://en.m.wiki pedia.org>wiki>Highe.

XIV. **Manmeet Oberoi Baweja.2017,** Privatization of Higher Education In India: Need, Impact And Suggestions. Int J Recent Sci Res. 8(3), pp. 15973-15975.

XV **.Awadh S. (2013).** Emerging issues and challenges in higher education, International Monthly Refereed journal of research in Management & technology. Vol.II

Literature Cites (Internet)

http://www.ey.com/IN/en/Industries/India-sectors/Education/EY-Higher-education-in-India-Vision-2030
http://siu.edu.in/downloads/pdf/SSRN.pdf
http://csis.org/files/publication/sam_141.pdf7.
http://www.uned.es/dpto-analisis-economico1/doctorado/education/articulos/rdtoseduc3.pdf
https://www.ets.org/s/research/pdf/poverty_and_education_report.pdf
http://usm.maine.edu/sites/default/files/cepare/poverty_achievement_Web.pdf
http://www.unicef.org/education/files/QualityEducation.PDF https://metranet.londonmet.ac.uk/research-units/ipse/research-clusters/gender-in-education.cfm http://www.vanderbilt.edu/peabody/family-school/papers/Explorations.pdf https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Researching-parent-schoolrelationships.pdf http://www.pacificweb.org/DOCS/rmi/pdf/Education%20and%20wages.pdf

 Copyright ⓒ 2019Authors