

Economic Globalisation and Higher Education Transformation: Comparing the Trends in the States, Kerala and Tamil Nadu of India

Solomon Arulraj David

KU Leuven, Belgium and University of Johannesburg, South Africa

KEYWORDS Globalisation. Privatisation. Cost of Higher Education. Access and Equity

ABSTRACT It is viewed that globalisation, mainly economic globalisation, has severely influenced education, particularly higher education. A comparative case study using document analysis and qualitative interviews is made on the trends in higher education transformation in the states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu of India and at the six selected higher education institutions from the two states. The decline of public fund to higher education has paved ways for the development of self-financed higher education, increase of tuition fee and self-financed courses at public and at state supported private higher education institutions. As a result cost of higher education has increased and the vulnerable are further marginalized from access to quality higher education. Kerala has resisted privatisation of higher education and experienced mass exodus of students going to neighbouring states for higher education. While Tamil Nadu has gone with privatisation of higher education to create more access to higher education, attracting private investment, yet adverse effects of privatisation are evident. The six micro cases (public / not-for-profit-private / for-profit private higher education institutions) have been responding to these developments, differently, given their nature, interest and capacity.

INTRODUCTION

Implications of Economic Globalisation

The term 'globalisation' is very fuzzy, complex, confusing and increasingly elastic and contradictory. It is very tricky and challenging to define globalisation. Giddens (1990) considers globalisation as a shift in our very life circumstances: it is the way we now live. For him, globalisation also refers to the compression of space and time. Coatsworth (2004) thinks that globalisation is about what happens when the movement of capital, goods, ideas and people among countries and regions accelerates. Brooks (2003) understands it as a process which is essentially about increased interdependence. Yang (2003) refers to Giddens (1990), Robertson (1992), Scholte (1993), Axford (1995), Rosenau (1990, 1997), who understand globalisation as a complex intersection between a multiplicity of driving forces, embracing economic, financial, technological, cultural, political, and social change. In sum, it can be defined as "a social process in

which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people became increasingly aware that they are receding" (Morrow and Torres 1999).

There are two explicit positions to globalisation: the supporting and opposing positions. And there are two implicit positions such as the realistic approach and critical realistic approach to globalisation, the researcher positions himself as a critical realistic. The implications of globalisation are multi-fold and inter-related. They are both positive and negative. Defenders of globalisation such as Bhagwati (2003) highlight the human face of globalisation, saying that it has helped to reduce poverty, to protect women, children, and the environment. Critics of globalisation including Guillen (2001) point out that it is not democratic, it creates poverty, inequality, hurts developing countries and degrades environment. Realists such as Giddens (2003) say that globalisation cannot be reverted and therefore it has to be integrated meaningfully. Stiglitz (2006), a critical realist points out that, for globalisation to be beneficial to all, more democratic political processes are needed throughout the world.

Economic globalisation (EG) is defined as the process of increased economic integration and interdependence of world economies, as a result of the growing scale of cross-border trade of commodities and services, flow of interna-

Address for correspondence:

Solomon Arulraj David,
B 418 A, University of Johannesburg,
Auckland Park 2006, South Africa,
Telephone: 0027722597036,
E-mail: solomonarulraj@hotmail.com

tional capital and spread of technologies in a wide and rapid manner (Shangquan 2000). According to Friedman (2005), EG demands individual countries to sacrifice some degree of economic sovereignty to global institutions, such as capital markets and multinational corporations, a situation he has termed as 'golden straightjacket'¹. Martinez and Garcia (2000) observe that neo-liberalism is the ideological package attached to EG. Schugurensky (1999) points out that EG is a worldwide process that helps to spread and flourish free market capitalism. Cavanagh and Mander (2004) consider that transnational organisations play an important role to spread neo-liberalism. The integration of countries in the global economy (through EG) has reduced the influence of the nation-state on local and regional policy making (Carnoy and Rhoten 2002). As a result the idea of a welfare state is said to have become irrelevant (Apple 2001). EG is said to have both opportunities and threats. Critics argue that it is causing massive disruption with little benefits and expanding disparities between countries and between citizens of the same country, while supporters point out the significant role of EG on economic development and wealth creation (IMF 2000). Giddens (2003) points out that EG develops unequally in the world. Countries and regions respond to EG according to their different nature and capacity.

Implications of Economic Globalisation for Higher Education Transformation

Globalisation is a process that eliminates the barriers between diverse worlds and creates new forms of interdependence on a world-wide scale (Brooks 2003). This process is a combination of economic, technological, socio-cultural and political processes: among these economic globalisation is considered to be the dominant force (Giddens 2003). Economic globalisation is a process of increased economic integration and inter-dependence of world economies that facilitates the free flow of goods, capital, people, and ideas beyond borders (Coatsworth 2004). It has both opportunities and risks causing positive and negative implications. Inspired by neo-liberal ideologies, public policies, including educational policies, made at supranational, national and sub-national level institutions are very much influenced by economic globalisation, advocating reduced state intervention, free mar-

ket dynamics and increased entrepreneurialism (Apple 2001).

Higher education experiences a severe decline of public funding due to privatisation policies than primary and secondary education, under rate of return analysis (Varghese 2004). Therefore, higher education has increasingly been advised to engage in market-driven activities and expected to meet the constantly changing global, national and market demands as influenced by economic globalisation: resulting in the shift of higher education from being a social institution to becoming an industry, 'the degree mills' (Gumport 2000).

Samoff (1999) accounts that international influences on public policies has happened through both borrowing and imposing from power centres to the peripheries, with education being the most public of all public policies. Cavanagh and Mander (2004) consider that transnational organisations such as the WB, IMF and WTO influence the public policies of their clients. Marx (2002) argues that public policies of most nations have been induced by the centres of capitalism that demanded de-industrialisation at the peripheries (developing countries) during colonial time. Today the centres of free market capitalism demand re-industrialisation at the peripheries through EG.

Stiglitz (2006) points out the mistrust between the wealthy and weaker nations. The wealthy nations are afraid to outsource the jobs and distribute the wealth while the weaker nations think that the wealthy nations direct the EG regime against them. He says that reforming globalisation is a matter of politics but there is a lack of political will and commitment.

Dodds (2008) points out the consensus amongst contemporary researchers that most of them claim that globalisation affects higher education institutions (HEdIs), rather than HEdIs themselves being implicated in the promotion of globalisation. However, scholars such as Scott (1998) differ from such a position and argue that HEdIs are subject to the process of globalisation partly as objects and victims, but partly as subjects and key agents of globalisation. Wende (2007) identifies, HEd as an instrument of national globalisation policy. She also argues that the ability of a country to generate new knowledge will help it to compete globally. Wende (1996) notes that the internationalisation² agenda (under profit motive) of HEdIs is a proactive way of being a key agent of globalisation.

The researcher assumed that there must be a relationship between EG and HEd transformation. Carnoy and Rhoten (2002) raised an interesting research question: "to what degree does educational change represent regional, national or local responses to global economic transformation? And for them it was fairly clear that if knowledge is fundamental for globalization, globalization should also have profound impact on the transmission of knowledge." It becomes evident with the argument of Schugurensky (1999), that the post industrial economy relies predominantly on science, technology, knowledge and management. Monkman and Baird (2002) remark that globalisation causes educational transformation because educational transformation is a feature of globalisation.

Burbules and Torres (2000) describe the way globalisation is affecting educational policy of nation-states. They say that for some it refers to the influence of the supranational institutions whose policy options are adapted to national policies (with set of global rules), for others it means the impact of new global economic process 'neo-liberalism' as a hegemonic policy discourse, reflected at HEd policy making. Concerns have been raised against the tendencies in which educational policy is firmly held in the grip of the free market principles (having profit as ultimate goal). Economic forces and more in particular, labour market requirements exercise considerable influence on educational decision making. Educational policy is measured mainly in terms of its capacity to be useful and to serve the labour market (having economy as its ultimate goal) (Wielemans 2000).

Porter and Vidovich (2000) identify common effects of EG to HEd policy making and of its impacts at institution levels. They are: decline of public fund to HEd, encouraging to seek alternative sources (through collecting and increasing tuition fees, recruitment of overseas students paying full fees, encouraging private players to invest in HEd, emphasis on consultancies, marketing intellectual product, raising donations, competition for internal funding), marketisation and commodification, university-industry linkages, public-private partnership, reorganisation of HEd is closely associated to the national economic agenda and priorities (ministerialisation), demands of market rational and discourses (such as performance, quality, efficiency, effective, innovation, managerialism, ser-

vice to clients) and the loss of HEdIs autonomy. One emerging global trend is that the market is becoming a powerful actor in education, particularly in HEd. Sharma (2005) observes that the corporate sector has discovered a trillion-dollar industry. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) point out that the theory of academic capitalism moves beyond thinking of the students as consumers towards considering the institution as a marketer.

Bok (2003) in a theoretical exploration draws five major commercialisation trends such as: 1. the influence of economic forces on universities (for example, the growth of computer science majors and departments), 2. the influence of the surrounding corporate culture (for example, the increased use on campuses of terms such as CEO, bottom line, or brand name), 3. the influence of students' career interests on the curriculum (for example, more vocational courses), 4. efforts to economize in university expenditures (hiring more adjunct teachers) or to use administrative methods adapted from business and 5. attempts to quantify matters within the university that are not truly quantifiable, such as trying to express matters of value in monetary terms. Commercialisation of HEd according to Bok (2003) is to make a profit from teaching, research, consultation, selling knowledge products and through other campus activities.

The reduction of funding has caused the HEd institution to become involved in market based resource mobilization in the name of cost-sharing (by means of tuition fees) and cost-recovery (by means of consultation and selling knowledge productions) (Carnoy and Rhoten 2002). Commercialization of education services carries risks of inequality and discrimination (Altbach 2003). Downsizing teaching and non-teaching staff is another important measure of cut back management, which results in the recruitment of the part time and block resource staff (Gumport 2000). While the critics warn that the ruthless pursuit of economic goals, without regards and considerations to moral and social values in education would not help education to serve its purpose. Critics do remind the necessity to guard education against such developments.

METHODOLOGY

As observed by Arnove (1999) globalisation is one of the processes shaping comparative

education. He considers comparative education as a field, ideally to study the dynamic interactions between the global trends and local responses. This research took this consideration seriously by studying the interaction between the global trends of EG and the processes of HEd transformation, particularly in India.

This research began with literature study to develop the theoretical framework on the implications of economic globalisation (EG), on Higher Education (HEd) transformation. Following a contextual analysis was made on India (studied as macro case) and on the two states 'Kerala and Tamil Nadu (as meso cases) and six selected HEd institutions (HEdIs) from the two states (as micro cases) in order to understand the ways different actors (with different backgrounds and capacities) deal with the implications of EG on HEd transformation.

The case study at the three levels was supported with policy document analysis and qualitative interviews, using Kvale's (1996) qualitative interview techniques. The central research question 'what are the implications of EG for HEd transformation?' was further reformulated in relation to the cases studied, as; how do the states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu in India differ from each other with regard to HEd transformation? And how do the six institutions of HEd under study differ from each other with regard to HEd transformation? Cross case comparison was made (between meso and among micro cases) to further explore the differences between the cases, using the comparative techniques developed by Wielemans' (1995).

RESULTS

Economic Globalisation and Higher Education Transformation in India

The theoretical exploration provided necessary base to theorize the issue, yet it was important to see the development in some particular contexts. Therefore a contextual analysis was made at three different levels; India as a macro case, two states in India such as Kerala and Tamil Nadu as meso cases (Kerala as a resisting model and Tamil Nadu as a progressive / liberal model – both with distinct ideologies) and six higher education institutions (from Kerala and Tamil Nadu) as micro cases.

Being open to the world is not a new thing to India; it started right from early human migra-

tion with a diverse and pluralist long-standing civilization that was shaped by a long list of later migrations and invasions. Anthuvan (2006) points out that India was never an island. He says that India had economic links with other nations for a long time. However the term globalisation has become the buzz word in India only after India's accession to WTO and the adaptation to the neo-liberal principles during the early 1990's. Malay and Arindam (2003) remark that the free market ideology came to India by default rather than by design: Four decades of romance with Socialist ideologies and many disappointments later, we now espouse the free-market system as a mean to a better life for our people.

Supporters of EG in India such as Ahluwalia (2006) highlight the benefits of economic reform in India (as a result of EG) such as the growth in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Product (GNP), poverty reduction, job creation, economic and infrastructure developments. Nevertheless, he points out that this reform was uneven, creating a gap among rich/poor individuals, industries, states and regions within India. Critics of globalisation like Anthuvan (2006) remark that globalisation has not changed the face of India; instead, except benefiting few, it has hurt the vast majority.

Anthuvan (2006) distinguishes five major implications of neo-liberalism in Indian economy: 1. greater openness for international trade, 2. cutting public expenditure on social services, 3. reducing regulations for private markets, 4. selling state owned enterprises and 5. displacing the concept of 'public good' to individual responsibility. Position of realists such as Bimal Jalan, the Former Governor of the Reserve Bank of India) on globalisation is noteworthy. 'To my mind, neither view – for or against – is correct. The only rational view is to accept it as an emerging and powerful global reality which has a momentum of its own. Our job as an independent nation and state is to ensure that we maximize the advantage for our country and minimize the risks' (Jalan 2002). While, Anthuvan (2006) observes that neo-liberal agendas (such as privatisation and cutting public expenditure on social sectors) in social sectors such as education and healthcare were not strongly resisted by people in India. Twelfth five year plan (2012) declares that HEd access in India has reached 17.9% with about 25.9 million students (18-22 age group)

enrolled in tertiary education in India during 2011-2012 academic year (among which 4.2 are enrolled in distance mode). However access to HED in India is lower than the world average 27% and lower than other BRICS partners (China 26%, Brazil 36%). It claims that the number of HEDIs and teaching faculty at HED has also proportionately increased. The share of private HEDIs is 63.9% and student enrolment in private HEDIs are 58.9% (in Engineering and other job oriented courses more than 80% of the students are enrolled in private institutions). The document also highlights that there are 35 to 40% faculty shortage in public universities, 62% universities and 90% colleges accredited during 2010 by NAAC are below average level in quality, other factors include serious disparity for access to HED based on gender, rural – urban, states and caste groups.

Chitnis and Altbach (1993) state that systemic reform in Indian HED is difficult, given the complexity of the social context, in which Indian HED exists, there seems to be only little scope for meaningful and systemic reforms. Agarwal (2006) remarks that there has been unplanned growth, sub-standards, limited public resources, unorganised and unregulated private expansion, and political complexities involved in achieving systemic change. Yaspal (2009) considers that the decision making process regarding HED at several levels creates potential chaos in the field of HED in India. Bhushan (2009) points out that though India could expand HED, quality and inclusiveness are not adequately addressed. He thinks that the next wave of HED reform must include strong public investment.

The impacts of EG on HED in India are finance, performance, demand and trade related. One of the recommendations of the neo-liberal principle is the withdrawal of the state intervention which results in the reduction of public funds under the cut back management regime (Tilak 2004). Shrivastava (2006) highlights some of the recent policy initiatives on HED in India for the development of several specialised institutions and agencies, while advocating market activities and privatisation aiming to expand HED access. As a result more self-financed for-profit-private HEDIs emerged, public and state supported private not-for-profit institutions began to introduce self-financed courses, and increase of tuition fees at public and state supported private HEDIs. This development has damaged the

massification vision of HED, and a situation has been fabricated where HED is no longer a public common good and quality HED is available for only those who can afford it. The government has taken several inclusive measures, one such measure was a mandate for the for-profit HEDIs to admit a certain percentage of economically poor students with a low or no fee (under right to education), but the implementation of this mandate has not been successful. Scholarships from public institutions and others, supporting poor students, are usually meagre and do not cover all the costs. Besides, public scholarships are politically sensitive in line with reservation politics. However, it is very essential to acknowledge the importance of scholarships and reservation systems, which helps the poor and marginalized to benefit. Educational loans are another new reform effort in India. But educational loans have mostly strings attached such as interest and guaranty. Thus HED reforms and policy making in India must be critically managed and planned in order to benefit everyone in India.

Comparing the Trends in Kerala and Tamil Nadu of India

Kerala and Tamil Nadu have become our choices of empirical study for several reasons such as: 1. the two states are distinct ideologically, 2. Tamil Nadu is the home state of the researcher, 3. they have different approaches to HED transformation, and, 4. the proximity between them. Cross case comparison is made to understand the differences and similarities of the meso cases and of the micro cases. The comparative research techniques developed by Wielemans (1995) were used to compare the meso and the micro cases.

The comparisons are made at intra state and interstate levels. The intra state comparison is made with three key sub-systems that are relevant to this research; such as the political governing ideologies of the state, global pressures (such as globalisation and EG processes), HED transformation at the state level. The interstate comparison is made between the two states 'Kerala and Tamil Nadu'. The sub-systems within each state are compared within each state and compared with the same subsystems in the other state. The intrastate comparison helps to understand the relationships between the sub-

systems. The interstate comparison is done to understand the way the two states deal with the implications of EG on HED transformation. The interstate comparison helps to understand the similarities and the differences between the two states in dealing with the implications of EG on HED transformation. Do the states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu in India differ from each other with regard to higher education transformation? Was the specific research question at this stage that allowed us to understand the similarities and differences between the two states? Based on the literature studies, document analysis and the qualitative interviews among selected stakeholders, it is understood that; the strong presence of two national political parties, such as the Communist Party of India (known for leftist ideologies) and Indian National Congress Party (known for liberal and progressive ideologies) has influenced the shift of socialist and liberal ideologies in Kerala. For-profit private education was strongly resisted in Kerala for long. Although for-profit private education was permitted in the state during a decade, the state is careful about it.

In Tamil Nadu, the influence of national parties has been less during the past 35 years. The two major regional parties known as Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK), Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (ADMK) have been in power for the past 35 years. Though their ideology is not positioned at left or right extremes (but mixed ideology), they both have been progressively, radically approving for-profit private education in the state. According to the Twelfth five year plan (2012) document, Delhi has highest access to HED 47.9% and Assam has lowest access 9%. Access to HED in Tamil Nadu 19.1% is higher than national average 18%, while access to HED in Kerala 13.1% is lower than national average. However in real sense many tertiary students from Kerala are enrolled in Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. Though Kerala has done well with literacy rate and school education, it has not expanded access to HED relatively, given its resistance to private HED sometimes till 2005. Public expenditure on education in Tamil Nadu 2.6% is lower than Kerala's 3.29% and the national average is 3.46% during 2006. Enrolment in engineering courses in Tamil Nadu 40.68% was higher than Kerala 30.45% and the national average was 7% during 2006 (MHRD).

Tamil Nadu has expanded access to HED as there was huge demand for HED given the in-

dustrial development in the state. Industrialisation has been slow in Kerala given strong labour unions. MNCs preferred to establish in Tamil Nadu rather than Kerala. Tamil Nadu engaged private players strongly, while Kerala resisted. Privatisation of HED in Tamil Nadu though expanded access to HED, private HED only catered to those who could afford. As access to HED was lower in Kerala due to resistance to privatisation of HED, many tertiary students from Kerala went to neighbouring states, particularly to Tamil Nadu for HED, resulting in the expatriate of money from Kerala to neighbouring states. Many HEDs in the borders of Tamil Nadu - Kerala target on students from Kerala. Handful of entrepreneurs from Kerala came to Tamil Nadu to start private HEDs where it was easy for them to flourish. While the ideological resistance in Kerala was not economically promising, it though benefiting economic progress in Tamil Nadu, cost of HED in Tamil Nadu grew higher than in Kerala.

Comparing the Trends among the Six Selected Institutions

In order to see the development at institutional level six HEDs (as micro cases) have been selected from the two states, a public, a state supported not-for-profit private and a for-profit self-financed private institution from each state. These cases are explored both at intra state and interstate levels. The six micro cases are; (three each from Kerala (KL) and Tamil Nadu (TN)) two public (Madras University (MU) and Kerala University (KU)), two not-for-profit state supported private (Loyola College (LY) and All Saints College (ASC)) and two for-profit private self-financing (Mohandas College of Engineering and Technology (MCET) and Sathyabama Deemed University (SDU)) HEDs. These cases were explored at inter institutional and interstate levels.

The researcher first made intra state comparison to understand the way public, not-for-profit private and for-profit state supported private institutions at each state separately deal with the implications of EG on HED transformation and then the way the HEDs among the two states operate is compared in response to EG. This helps to understand the way public, not-for-profit private and for-profit private HEDs deal with the process of EG. And this also helps to

understand, how the institutions from the two states deal with the process of EG.

The cross case comparison of the micro cases helps to understand the process of EG to HED at institutional and practice level. It is then aimed to understand how the four sub-systems (the political ideologies, global pressures, HED at state level and HED transformation at institutional level) are interacting at the intra-state level within the meso and micro cases, and to understand how the public, not-for-profit private and for-profit private institutions deal with the implications of EG on HED transformation at the intra-state level within the micro cases. The inter-state comparison is similar at both the meso level and the micro level as comparisons take place within the states but for different purposes and reasons.

At this stage another concrete research question was formulated; do the six institutions of higher education studied differ from each other with regard to institutional transformation? in order to direct the cross case comparison related to the six micro cases. Among the three cases from Tamil Nadu, all the three offer self-financing courses, however the percentage of self-financing and aided courses and the amount charged for the self-financing courses are different for the three institutions. The for-profit institution SDU/TN has only self-financing courses (100%), the not-for-profit private LY/TN has 50% self-financing courses and the public MU/TN has around 25% of self-financing courses. There are no capitation fees charged at the public MU/TN, while some donation collected at the not-for-profit LY/TN and higher capitation fees charged at the for-profit SDU/TN.

Among the three cases from Kerala KU/KL and ASC/KL have no self-financing courses, while, all courses at MCET/KL are self-financed. The fees at public MU/TN for the aided and self-financing courses are lower than the fees at LY/TN and SDU/TN. LY/TN has a different fee structure for the haves and the have-nots, and it generates resource from the haves that is used for the have-nots. SDU/TN charges relatively higher tuition fees than MU/TN and LY/TN. MU/TN gives public scholarships to all economically poor students; LY/TN gives several public and private scholarships to meritorious (economically poor) students and SDU/TN gives several private scholarships to meritorious students.

It was interesting to observe that MU/TN and KU/KL as public institutions give importance to the national development. MU/TN considered giving labour intense courses due to the industrialisation trend in the state. LY/TN as a not-for-profit charity institution give importance to value education and the social participation of students through outreach programmes and campus ministry and help poor students to cope with education through bridge courses.

For-profit institutions such as SDU/TN and MCET/KL give importance to industrial and market skills such as industry visit, in plant training, entrepreneur development cell, foreign language lessons and internships at industries. For profit HED in Kerala is better regulated than in Tamil Nadu. State funded not-for-profit private HED in Tamil Nadu is much progressive than in Kerala. Public HED in Tamil Nadu is expensive than the public HED in Kerala. HEDIs in Tamil Nadu are more market oriented than HEDIs in Kerala. Cost of HED is higher in Tamil Nadu than in Kerala. Economic benefit from HED sector in Tamil Nadu is higher than in Kerala.

DISCUSSION

This research explored the interaction between the global trends of EG and the processes of HED transformation. That it explored the local responses in India, particularly in two states, namely 'Kerala and Tamil Nadu', and in six HEDIs from the two states. It was observed in this research that HED is increasingly governed by economic discourses and priorities.

This development has severely restricted HED opportunities for economically vulnerable sections (besides inclusive measures). Equality of opportunity, equity and social justice are important concerns for comparative education. The findings of the research reveals that the impacts of EG on HED has severely challenged the notion HED as public common good which has affected the popular democratic attempt to expand HED for all.

It is observed that HED is increasingly governed by economic discourses and priorities. Through this research it is understood that the decline of public funding to HED (as a result of EG) has paved ways for the development of self-financed HEDIs and self-financed courses at public and at state supported private HEDIs in

India. As a result, the cost of HEd has increased and the vulnerable (economically poor, rural, *dalit*³, tribal and girl students) are further marginalized for access to HEd. Double standards of HEd opportunities for the haves and the have-nots emerged in India and are fast spreading which has not been resisted strongly.

The utilitarian goal became stronger in HEd transformation (as influenced by EG). HEd does not seem anymore a public common good. HEDIs have moved from being a social institution to an industry. Kerala as a socialist state has resisted the influence of EG and did neither benefit nor lose very much from EG, while Tamil Nadu as a liberal state engaged with the principles of EG and experience the merits and demerits of EG. The six micro cases (public / not-for-profit-private / for-profit private HEDIs) deal with the implications of EG on HEd transformation differently given their nature, interest and capacity. The findings reveal strong correlation between EG and HEd transformation. The cross case comparison among the meso and micro cases provide relevant differences and similarities of the cases in responding EG.

CONCLUSION

It was observed that the economic rationale that has been shaping HEd in India for the past two decades has severely damaged the value and mission of HEDIs. The liberalisation and commercialisation trends have created and have expanded the duality in India. Educational systems, particularly HEd in India have reproduced the existing inequalities of Indian society, instead of challenging it.

As a result, double standards of HEd opportunities for the haves and the have-nots emerged and are fast spreading. Under such development, financial merit is valued higher than academic merit for access to HEd. Tamil Nadu must regulate private HEd and ensure HEd for all while Kerala must be realistic, yet continue to be critical about EG on HEd.

It is understood that this development in most parts of the world and particularly in India and in the two states is happening not by democratic considerations, but by strong economic and political decisions and developments. It is realised that this development was possible given the weak resistance of the public. It is important that to act and make the decision makers act

in order to make EG to work for the benefit of all, particularly that EG does not hinder HEd to serve its ultimate purpose.

By way of conclusion, some further reflections are made based on the central concerns of this research. Though economic globalisation is an inevitable reality and it is unrealistic to reverse it, a critical analysis remains very important, therefore EG must not be accepted without sufficient resistance, scepticism and negotiation. It is also important to dialogue and negotiate in order to democratise globalisation for the benefit of all.

It is important for HEd to have universal orientation, while being locally relevant. It is important to engage private participation for the sake of HEd development, yet the role of the state is essential to ensure equal opportunity and social justice. It is necessary to engage in ongoing reflections and debates on what type of higher education we need.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this research, some important recommendations are made, that: India must continue to focus on the expansion of higher education and to enhance the quality. Diverse actors, especially educationists must be consulted for educational policies and decisions. Education planning must go beyond economic priorities to achieve UNESCO's four pillars of learning (learning to know, learning to be, learning to do and learning to live together).

Strong and effective regulations are necessary in order to genuinely regulate, monitor and evaluate the operations of private institutions. India must fix regional imbalance, focus on inclusion and protect vulnerable disciplines. India must encourage knowledge diversity and develop intellectual capacity in diverse areas. India must create jobs in diverse sectors in order to make every discipline attractive. India must offer financial, academic and career support for students who study (the seemingly) least attractive subjects.

Tamil Nadu must be cautious in market engagement and privatisation of higher education. Tamil Nadu must regulate private higher education to make them work for the common good of the state and to benefit everyone. Kerala must create space for the growing demands for higher education in the state, which will stop expatriate of students from Kerala to other states.

Public higher education institutions must rethink about the self-financing courses and the raise in fees for students for regular courses under cost sharing rationale as they must stand as public institutions for citizens to access them with affordable price. The state supported not-for-profit private higher education must continue their charity while restricting their business activities and stand as social institutions. The for-profit, self-financing private higher education must be realistic in generating wealth, embracing social justice values by accommodating economically backward students. They must not only offer the job-oriented courses. They must protect the academic integrity by compelling them to follow necessary academic standards.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is part of my doctoral research which was carried out at KULeuven, Belgium under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Danny Wilde-meersch, who has been inspirational to bring out this research. And this paper has been developed for publication during my post-doctoral research at University of Johannesburg, South Africa under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Shireen Motala, whose encouragement has resulted in making of this paper.

NOTES

1. Two key factors that make states lose economic sovereignty are: the flood of individual investment into the global market and the logic of free-market capitalism (Friedman terms it as golden straight-jacket).
2. Dodds (2008) describes how the two notions 'globalization and internationalisation' are used interchangeably (Moran and Wood 1996), some describe globalisation as a particular 'intense' form of internationalisation (Hirst and Thompson 1999). Internationalisation is a national and bi-national process, while globalisation is a non-national process.
3. The word *Dalit* is defined in dictionaries as (in the traditional Indian caste system) a member of the lowest caste, while from sociological view point a *Dalit* is anyone who is suppressed and oppressed.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal P 2006. *Higher Education in India: The Need for Change*. New Delhi: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER).
- Ahluwalia MS 2006. India's experience with globalisation. *The Australian Economic Review*, 39(1): 1-13.
- Altbach PG 2003. Globalisation and the universities: Myth and realities in an unequal world. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, XVII(2): 227-247.
- Anthuvan MVL 2006. *The Dynamics and the Impact of Globalisation: A Subaltern Perspective*. Madurai: Amirtham Publications.
- Apple M W 2001. Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education*, 37(4): 409-423.
- Arnove F R, Torres C A (Eds.) 1999. *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 283-304.
- Bhagwati J 2003. *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brooks C W 2003. Globalisation: A political perspective. In: G Breton, M Lambert (Eds.): *Universities and Globalisation: Private Linkages, Public Trust* Paris: UNESCO, pp. 45-50.
- Burbules N C, Torres C A (Eds.) 2000. *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhushan S 2009. *Restructuring Higher Education in India*. New Delhi, India: Rawat Publications.
- Carnoy M, Rhoten D 2002. What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1): 1-9.
- Cavanagh J, Mander J 2004. *Alternatives to Economic Globalization: A Better World is Possible*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Chitnis S, Altbach P G 1993. *Higher Education Reform in India: Experience and Perspectives*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Dodds A 2008. How does globalisation interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education*, 44(4): 505-517.
- Giddens A 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens A 2003. *How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives: Run Away World*. New York: Routledge.
- Guillen M F 2001. Is globalisation civilizing, destructive of feeble? A critique of five key debates in the social science literature. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 235-260.
- Gumport P J 2000. Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39: 67-91.
- Kvale S 1996. *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publication.
- Malay C, Arindam C 2003. *The Great Indian Dream: Restoring Pride to a Nation Betrayed*. New Delhi: Macmillan India Ltd.
- Martinez E, Garcia A 2000. What is 'neo-liberalism'? A brief definition. *Global Exchange, Global Economy -101*, 26/02/2000.
- Marx A 2002. *Essays on Globalisation and Dalit Politics*. (Book in Tamil Language) Madurai (Puthanatham): Adaiyalam.
- Monkman K, Baird M 2002. Educational change in the context of globalisation. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4): 497-508.

- Porter P, Vidovich L 2000. Globalization and higher education policy. *Education Theory*, 51(4): 449-465.
- Samoff J 1999. Institutionalizing international influence. In: FR Arnove, CA Torres (Eds.): *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 52-89.
- Schugurensky D 1999. Higher education restructuring in the era of globalization, towards a heteronomous model? In: FR Arnove, CA Torres (Eds.): *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the global and the Local*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 283-304.
- Scott P (Ed.) 1998. *The Globalisation of Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Shangquan G 2000. *Economic Globalization: Trends, Risks and Risks Prevention*. CDP 2000/PLEN/32. New York: United Nation.
- Sharma V 2005. Commercialisation of higher education in India. *Social Scientist*, 33(9/10): 65-74.
- Shrivastava SK 2006. *Higher Education System in India: Challenges and Strategies for Reform*. Presented at the Washington Symposium NAFSA, Association of International Educators, 28/03/2006, Washington.
- Slaughter S, Rhoades G (Eds.) 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Stiglitz J 2006. *Making Globalization Work*. London: Penguin Books.
- Tilak J B G 2004. *Higher Education between the State and the Market*. New Delhi: National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.
- Varghese NV 2004. *Institutional Restructuring in Higher Education in Asia: Trends and Patterns*. Paris: IIEP/ UNESCO.
- Wielemans W 1995. *Vergelijken in Opvoeding en Onderwijs(Comparisons in Education and Schooling)*. Leuven: Garant.
- Yang R 2003. Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis. *International Review of Education*, 49(3-4): 269-291.