

# Attitude of HE Students Towards Privatisation of Higher Education

## A Study

LALIT KUMAR\*  
SUDHIR KUMAR\*\*

---

### Abstract

---

*Several researches have shown that attitude has its bearing on so many attributes and capabilities [Kumar (1994, 1998), Singh and Sharma (1995)]. Several other studies have reflected that different variables have their bearing on different types of Attitude [Krishna and Rao (1992), Kumar (1995, 1996, 2003, 2007)] and that is why the researchers undertook this study. In the present study to measure the attitude of higher education students towards privatisation of higher education the tool developed and standardised by Kumar, Lalit. (Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education Scale) has been used to collect the data. In this survey type of research 500 higher education students have been taken as sample by using Stratified Random Sampling Technique. Statistics like Percentage, Mean, Standard deviation and t-value have been calculated to test the hypotheses. The study reveals that most of the Higher Education students do not possess favourable attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and types of courses, Category and Types of Institutions have their bearing on Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.*

---

Privatisation of Higher Education is a burning and comprehensive issue in the context of growing financial need to fulfil the demand of higher education in one way and state obligation to take

care of higher education of the poor and downtrodden to suit the welfare nature of the state in another way. Privatisation of higher education in a country like India where there is a huge population

---

\* Senior Faculty Member, Faculty of Education, Patna University, Patna.

\*\* Research Scholar, Faculty of Education, Patna University, Patna.

of first generation learners is really a tough decision. State alone cannot manage the ever growing financial burden of higher education and so there is a suggestion to allow to the private agency to run the higher education. In this age of knowledge generation and growing financial need, the issue has become even more intense and it needs a survey of opinion to reach at a point as there is no possibility of agreement of both the groups (who favours and who does not favour). Some favours and some does not favour, some favours on certain issue or point and disagrees at another issue and point. Considering the complex nature of the problem and to search a suitable answer to the problem the researchers have undertaken this study.

Attitude research started with the explorations of the nature and structure of attitudes, development of the methods of attitude measurement, and identification of the correlates of attitudes. Influence of attitudes on such psychological processes as learning and remembering; perception and thinking and reasoning has also been investigated in some detail. Maximum work has been done in connection with the survey of attitudes and opinions of various groups of people towards all kinds of social, political, cultural and economic issues that the country is facing. A major bulk of research has been done in area of education – on attitudes of teachers and students towards various academic and psychosocial phenomena.

(Krishna and Rao. 1992)<sup>[1]</sup> found that male teachers expressed more

favourable attitude towards science than female teachers. (Kumar, Lalit. 1994)<sup>[2]</sup> found that attitude towards mathematics plays a significant role in the development of mathematical creativity. (Singh and Sharma 1995)<sup>[3]</sup> found that urban background provides a more fertile land for developing favourable attitude towards population education and small family norm. (Kumar, Lalit. 1995)<sup>[4]</sup> found insignificant difference between the attitude of male and female students towards mathematics. (Kumar, Lalit. 1996)<sup>[5]</sup> concluded that only a few primary school teachers possess high favourable attitude towards mathematics. (Kumar, Lalit. 1998)<sup>[6]</sup> found that attitude towards mathematics is positively and significantly correlated with achievement in mathematics. He further found that high attitude towards mathematics group is significantly superior in his achievement in mathematics in comparison to the low attitude towards mathematics group. (Kumar, Lalit. 2003)<sup>[7]</sup> concluded that most of the B.Ed. students do not possess favourable attitude towards privatisation of Higher Education and male and female B.Ed. students do not differ significantly in their attitude towards privatisation of Higher Education. (Kumar, Lalit. 2004)<sup>[8]</sup> found that General and reserved categories B.Ed. students differ significantly in their attitude towards privatization of higher education. He found General category B.Ed. students group higher on mean values.

Above mentioned studies and few others gave insight to the researchers to select the variables to shape the

undertaken study. Review of attitude researches also directed the researcher to employ suitable tool, statistics and appropriate sampling technique. The researchers are of the opinion that the study will serve the purpose in the way most of the survey researchers do. It will open an issue, will stimulate the researchers, teachers and the policy makers to think on the issue and continue with comprehensive studies to collect more specific views to generalise or to reach at a state of decision.

### **Objectives**

1. To study the Attitude of Higher Education Students Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
2. To compare the Attitude Scores of General Category and Reserved Category Higher Education Students.
3. To compare the Attitude Scores of General Courses and Professional Courses Higher Education Students.
4. To compare the Attitude Scores of Private and Government Institutions Higher Education Students.

### **Hypotheses**

1. Higher Education Students do not possess favourable attitude towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
2. General and Professional Courses Higher Education students do not differ significantly in their attitude towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
3. General and Reserved category Higher Education students do not differ significantly in their attitude towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

4. Private and Government Institutions Higher Education students do not differ significantly in their attitude towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

### **Methodology**

In the present study the researchers have used Descriptive Survey Method to study the Attitude of Higher Education students towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

### **Sample**

Five Hundred graduate and post-graduate students of Patna district were selected as sample by using stratified random sampling technique.

### **Tool used**

Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education Scale developed and standardised by Kumar, Lalit was used to collect the required data. It is a bilingual scale (English and Hindi) and contains 24 items related to Privatisation of Higher Education. In this Likert type scale, Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education has four dimensions – Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare. There are three positively worded and three negatively worded items for each dimension. Thus, out of 24 items – 12 items are positively worded where as 12 items are negatively worded. Scoring of the response is as 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the direction from strongly agree for positively worded items and for negatively worded items as 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0. The dimensions score range from 0 to 24 where as total score on attitude score ranges from 0 to 96. The scale and its

dimensions have high positive reliability coefficient ranging from 0.68 to 0.79. The inventory also has optimum face and content validity as the opinion and suggestions from the experts and students have been taken. The construct validity, A matrix of coefficient of correlation between the scores on four dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education scale and the total score on the scale, ranges from 0.33 to 0.86.

The selection of dimensions has been made after reviewing a large number of articles, and writings. In this process discussions and opinions have also been taken into account. The rationales behind the dimensions are in the form of questions – Will privatisation affect quality of Higher Education? Will it be controlled by the private party to make money? Will the employees of the system be exploited and will the welfare of the higher education related persons be safe-guarded?

#### **Meaning of important terms**

##### **(a) Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education is an internal state which affects an individual's choice of action towards privatisation of Higher Education. In the present study attitude towards privatisation of higher education has been reflected in terms of four distinct dimensions of attitude towards privatisation of higher education – Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare.

##### **(b) Category**

In the study the researchers have taken category as it is defined in terms of (i) General category and (ii) Reserved category.

##### **(c) Types of Courses**

In the study the types of courses have been identified as (i) General courses (Science, Arts, and Commerce) and (ii) Professional courses (Engineering, Medical, Management and Education (B.Ed. & M.Ed. only)

##### **(d) Types of Institution**

Two types of institutions have been taken (i) Private institutions and (ii) Government institutions.

##### **(e) Higher Education Students**

Students studying at Graduation and Post-graduation level have been taken as Higher Education students.

#### **Variables**

In the present study Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education is dependent variable, where as Category, Types of Courses and Types of Institutions are independent variables.

#### **Statistical Treatment of Data**

Percentage, Mean, Standard Deviation and t-value were calculated to test hypotheses. It was decided that the favourable attitude score against a item, against a dimension and against the composite score will be 03, 18 and 72 respectively. The product of the

number of statements and the numerical value assigned to the statement Agree (for positively worded statement) or Disagree (for negatively worded statement) has been considered as the minimum score for the consideration of favourable attitude. All the score below this score has been treated as unfavourable attitude score. 20% High scorer has been considered as Higher group and 20% Low scorer has been taken as Lower group.

#### Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1 reveals that out of 500 students 89 students have favourable attitude on Quality dimension. On Control, Exploitation, Welfare dimensions and on Composite attitude there are 45, 44, 80 and 20 respectively. It indicates that only 17.88% students have favourable attitude on Quality dimension. On Control, Exploitation, Welfare dimensions and on Composite attitude these are 9%, 8.80%, 16.00% and 4% respectively. It further indicates that very few higher education students have favourable attitude towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

#### Findings

- (i) Only 17.80% Higher Education students are of the opinion that the Quality of Higher Education will improve if it is privatised.
- (ii) Only 9.00% Higher Education students are of the opinion that Higher Education will be controlled properly if it is privatised.
- (iii) Only 8.80% Higher Education students are of the opinion that Exploitation in Higher Education will be looked after only if it is privatised.
- (iv) Only 16.00% Higher Education students are of the opinion that Welfare of Higher Education related persons will get attention if Higher Education is privatised.
- (v) Only 4.00% Higher Education students are of the opinion that Higher Education will function, serve and develop only if it is privatised.

(Kumar, Lalit. 2003)<sup>91</sup> has similar findings in his study conducted on 200 B.Ed. students. He has concluded –

TABLE 1  
Number and Percentage of Higher Education Students Bearing Favourable Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Quality	89	17.80%
Control	45	9.00%
Exploitation	44	8.80%
Welfare	80	16.00%
Composite	20	4.00%

- “(a<sub>1</sub>) Only 25% male and 25% female B.Ed. students think that the quality of higher education will improve if it is privatised.
- (a<sub>2</sub>) Only 19% male and 11% female B.Ed. students think that higher education will be controlled well if it is privatised.
- (a<sub>3</sub>) Only 10% male and 5% female B.Ed. students think exploitation in higher education will be managed properly if it is privatised.
- (a<sub>4</sub>) Only 12% male and 10% female B.Ed. students think that the welfare of higher education people in particular and society in general will receive due attention if higher education is privatised.
- (a<sub>5</sub>) Only 7% male and 3% female B.Ed. students think that higher education will function and serve in a better way if it is privatised.”

Table 2 reveals that the obtained t-value between General and Professional courses higher education students on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 2.07, 3.38, 3.72 and 1.51 respectively. On composite Attitude the obtained t-value is 1.74. It further indicates that the obtained t-values on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimensions are significant at 0.05, 0.01 and 0.01 level of significance, but the obtained t-values on Welfare dimension and also on Composite Attitude are not significant.

Mean values indicate that the general courses higher education students are superior to professional courses higher education students on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education (df = 498).

TABLE 2  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between General and Professional Courses  
 Higher Education Students on Different Dimensions of  
 Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	14.46	3.69	250	2.07	0.05
	Professional	13.74	4.06	250		
Control	General	13.52	3.62	250	3.38	0.01
	Professional	12.36	4.03	250		
Exploitation	General	12.78	3.56	250	3.72	0.01
	Professional	11.56	3.77	250		
Welfare	General	13.46	3.71	250	1.51	NS
	Professional	12.94	3.98	250		
Composite	General	52.47	9.31	250	1.74	NS
	Professional	50.90	10.75	250		

TABLE 3  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Higher Group of General Courses and Higher Group of Professional Courses Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	18.60	2.33	50	0.84	NS
	Professional	19.00	2.45	50		
Control	General	17.60	1.62	50	0.30	NS
	Professional	17.60	1.73	50		
Exploitation	General	17.60	1.62	50	0.58	NS
	Professional	17.80	1.83	50		
Welfare	General	18.10	2.07	50	0.24	NS
	Professional	18.00	2.00	50		
Composite	General	67.60	5.16	50	0.09	NS
	Professional	67.50	5.56	50		

Table 3 reveals that the obtained t-value between Higher Group of General Courses and Higher Group of Professional Courses on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 0.84, 0.30, 0.58 and 0.24 respectively; on Composite Attitude the obtained t-value is 0.09. All these values are not significant (neither on 0.01 nor on 0.05 level of significance).

Table 4 reveals that the obtained t-value between Lower group of general courses and Lower group of professional courses higher education students on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of higher education are 2.10, 4.99, 5.03 and 3.37 respectively; on Composite Attitude the obtained t-value is 6.06. All these values are significant at 0.01 level (except on

Quality dimension, on which the t-value is significant at 0.05 level) of significance.

Mean values indicate that General Courses higher education students are superior to professional courses higher education students on all the dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude.

### **Findings**

Following is the summary of the tables 2, 3 and 4 in relation to Types of Courses.

- (i) General Courses Higher Education students are higher on mean values on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education in comparison to Professional Courses Higher Education students.



TABLE 4  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Lower Group of General Courses and Lower Group of Professional Courses Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	9.90	2.47	50	2.10	0.05
	Professional	8.80	2.78	50		
Control	General	9.10	3.18	50	4.49	0.01
	Professional	6.70	1.19	50		
Exploitation	General	8.00	2.24	50	5.03	0.01
	Professional	5.00	2.13	50		
Welfare	General	8.90	2.62	50	3.37	0.01
	Professional	7.30	2.10	50		
Composite	General	42.40	4.56	50	6.06	0.01
	Professional	37.10	4.18	50		

(ii) Lower Group of General Courses Higher Education students is higher on mean values on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education; and also on Composite Attitude in comparison to Lower Group of Professional Courses Higher Education students.

Perhaps General Courses higher education students have more concern about the Quality and Infrastructure of the higher education institutions in comparison to professional courses higher education students and that is why they think in the way (Gupta, P.V. 2003)<sup>[10]</sup> is thinking, "Our main aim has to be expansion of technical and professional education with higher academic standards. Excellence in general education and more so in higher professional should motivate us. To achieve these objectives, privatisation

definitely helps and this has been well established."

Table 5 reveals that the obtained t-value between General Category and Reserved Category Higher Education students on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 1.50, 4.68, 0.98 and 0.87 respectively. On Composite Attitude the obtained t-value is 1.59. All the values are insignificant except on control dimension.

Mean values indicate that General Category higher education students are superior to Reserved Category higher education students on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education (df = 498).

Table 6 reveals that the obtained t-value between Higher Group of General Category and Higher Group of Reserved Category Higher Education Students on



TABLE 5  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between General Category and Reserved  
 Category Higher Education Students on different dimensions of  
 Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	14.36	3.74	250	1.50	NS
	Reserved	13.84	4.03	250		
Control	General	14.08	3.83	250	4.68	0.01
	Reserved	12.46	3.91	250		
Exploitation	General	12.34	3.66	250	0.90	NS
	Reserved	12.02	4.34	250		
Welfare	General	13.36	3.76	250	0.87	NS
	Reserved	13.06	3.97	250		
Composite	General	53.36	9.68	250	1.59	NS
	Reserved	51.94	10.32	250		

TABLE 6  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Higher Group of General Category and Higher  
 Group of Reserve Category Higher Education Students on different dimensions of  
 Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	19.10	2.47	50	1.26	NS
	Reserved	18.50	2.29	50		
Control	General	18.70	2.37	50	3.02	0.01
	Reserved	17.50	1.50	50		
Exploitation	General	17.60	1.62	50	1.10	NS
	Reserved	18.00	2.00	50		
Welfares	General	18.40	2.24	50	1.47	NS
	Reserved	17.80	1.83	50		
Composite	General	67.50	5.68	50	0.19	NS
	Reserved	67.30	5.04	50		

Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are

1.26, 3.02, 1.10 and 1.47 respectively. On Composite Attitude the t-value is 0.19. All these values are insignificant except

on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

Mean values indicate that Higher Group of General Category Higher Education students is superior to Reserved Category Higher group of Higher Education students group (df = 98).

Table 7 reveals that the obtained t-value between Lower Group of General Category and Lower Group of Reserved Category higher education students on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 3.33, 4.86, 3.47 and 1.20 respectively. On Composite Attitude the t-value is 2.80. All these values are significant at 0.01 level of significance (except on Welfare dimension, on which the t-value is not significant even at 0.05 level of significance).

Mean values indicates that the Lower Group of General Category higher education students group is superior to Lower Group of Reserved Category Higher Education students Group on all the dimensions and also on Composite Attitude, except on Welfare dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.

### Findings

Following is the summary of the tables 5, 6 and 7 in relation to category –

- (i) General category higher education students are higher on mean values on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education in comparison to Reserved Category Higher Education students.
- (ii) Higher group of General Category higher education students is higher

TABLE 7  
Mean, SD and t-value Between Lower Group of General Category and Lower Group of Reserve Category Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	General	10.20	2.40	50	3.33	0.01
	Reserved	8.50	2.69	50		
Control	General	9.50	2.69	50	4.86	0.01
	Reserved	7.00	2.45	50		
Exploitation	General	6.90	0.70	50	3.47	0.01
	Reserved	5.80	2.13	50		
Welfare	General	8.40	2.65	50	1.20	NS
	Reserved	7.80	2.32	50		
Composite	General	40.40	4.24	50	2.80	0.01
	Reserved	38.00	4.36	50		

on mean values on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education in comparison to Higher Group of Reserved Category Higher Education students.

(iii) Lower Group of General Category higher education students is higher on mean values on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude in comparison to Lower Group of Reserved Category Higher Education students.

(Kumar, Lalit. 2007)<sup>[11]</sup> in his study conducted on B.Ed. students have similar findings as he found General Category B.Ed. students higher on mean values in comparison to Reserved

Category B.Ed. students. He found significant difference in the attitude means of General and Reserved Category students on Quality, Control and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude. On Exploitation dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education no significant difference was found between General and Reserved category B.Ed. students.

Table 8 reveals that the obtained t-value between Private institutions and Government institutions Higher Education students on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 1.28, 1.98, 0.943 and 3.163. On Composite Attitude the t-value

TABLE 8  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Private Institutions and Government Institutions Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	Private	13.90	3.87	250	1.28	NS
	Government	13.46	3.84	250		
Control	Private	13.30	3.90	250	1.98	0.05
	Government	12.62	3.78	250		
Exploitation	Private	12.38	4.17	250	0.943	NS
	Government	12.04	3.89	250		
Welfare	Private	13.66	3.96	250	3.163	0.01
	Government	12.60	3.52	250		
Composite	Private	53.66	10.30	250	2.21	0.05
	Government	51.66	4.89	250		

is 2.21. Obtained t-value are not significant on Quality and Exploitation dimensions though on Control (0.05 level) and Welfare (0.01 level) dimensions the obtained t-value are significant. On Composite Attitude the obtained t-value is significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Mean values indicate that Private Institutions higher education students are superior to Government Institutions higher education students on Control and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude (df=498).

Table 9 reveals that the obtained t-value between Higher Group of Private Institutions and Higher Group of Government Institutions on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are

1.26, 0.90, 1.66 and 0.71 respectively. On Composite Attitude the t-value is 0.26. All these values are not significant (either at 0.01 level or at 0.05 level).

Table 10 reveals that the obtained t-value between Lower Group of Private Institutions and Lower Group of Government Institutions on Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education are 1.89, 1.70, 1.78 and 0.80 respectively. On Composite Attitude the t-value is 0.23. All these values are not significant (either at 0.01 level or at 0.05 level).

### Findings

Following is the summary of the tables VIII, IX and X in relation to Types of Institutions-

(i) Private Institutions higher education students are higher on

TABLE 9  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Higher Group of Private Institutions and Higher Group of Government Institutions Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	Private	19.10	2.47	50	1.26	NS
	Government	18.50	2.29	50		
Control	Private	17.80	1.83	50	0.90	NS
	Government	17.50	1.50	50		
Exploitation	Private	18.10	2.07	50	1.66	NS
	Government	17.50	1.50	50		
Welfare	Private	18.30	2.19	50	0.71	NS
	Government	18.00	2.00	50		
Composite	Private	78.00	4.47	50	0.26	NS
	Government	77.70	6.86	50		

TABLE 10  
**Mean, SD and t-value Between Lower Group of Private Institutions and Lower Group of Government Institutions Higher Education Students on different dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education**

<i>Attitude Dimensions</i>	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
Quality	Private	9.80	2.67	50	1.89	NS
	Government	8.80	2.60	50		
Control	Private	7.90	2.59	50	1.70	NS
	Government	7.10	2.12	50		
Exploitation	Private	6.90	2.12	50	1.78	NS
	Government	6.20	1.80	50		
Welfare	Private	8.30	2.41	50	0.80	NS
	Government	7.10	2.59	50		
Composite	Private	39.10	4.59	50	0.23	NS
	Government	38.90	3.99	50		

mean values on Control and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude in comparison to Government Institutions Higher Education students. Doubt made by the (Panda, Sudhakar. 2009)<sup>[12]</sup> may be the reason behind comparatively less concern of Government institutions Higher Education students towards privatisation of Higher Education. Panda, Sudhakar speaks, "A debate has also been raised whether the private universities would serve the 'Public interest', particularly the academic pursuits of the students coming from the socially disadvantaged communities. This stands in sharp contrast to the care and benefits which the state universities have traditionally been giving to the poor

and meritorious student in terms of scholarship, book subsidies, hostel facilities and travel grants, etc. In other words, there are genuine doubts whether the private universities can create an education system that will address the problem of social justice and prepare the students from the backward communities for a meaningful and effective participation in society."

### General Conclusions

Considering the findings of the study and taking into account the hypotheses of the study following conclusions have been drawn-

1. Most of the Higher Education students do not possess favourable attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
2. (a<sub>1</sub>) General courses and Professional courses higher

- education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education. General courses higher education students are higher on mean values.
- (a<sub>2</sub>) Lower group of General courses and Professional courses higher education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education. General courses higher education students are higher on mean values.
- (a<sub>3</sub>) "Types of Courses" has its bearing on Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
3. (a<sub>1</sub>) General category and Reserved category Higher Education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education. General category higher education students are higher on mean value.
- (a<sub>2</sub>) Higher Group of General and Reserved category Higher Education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education on Control dimension of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education. General category higher education students are higher on mean value.
- (a<sub>3</sub>) Lower Group of General and Reserved Category Higher Education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education on Quality, Control and Exploitation dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude. General Category higher education students are higher on mean values.
- (a<sub>4</sub>) "Category" has its bearing on Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
4. (a<sub>1</sub>) Private and Government Institutions Higher Education students differ significantly in their Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education on Control and Welfare dimensions of Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education and also on Composite Attitude. Private Institutions higher education students are higher on mean values.
- (a<sub>2</sub>) "Types of Institutions" has its bearing on Attitude Towards Privatisation of Higher Education.
5. Quality, Control, Exploitation and Welfare are the concerns of Higher Education students (in some way or other) with respect to its Privatisation.

**REFERENCES**

- <sup>1</sup> KRISHNA, D.G. and K.V. RAO. 1992. "Attitude of Teachers Towards Science– A Study", *The Educational Review*, Vol. CI, No. 9, Madras, pp. 211-214
- <sup>2</sup> KUMAR, LALIT. 1994. "A study of the relationship between mathematical creativity and Attitude towards mathematics among secondary school students", *Indian Psychological Review*, Vol. 42, No. 11 and 12, pp. 34-39, Agra Psychological Research Cell, Agra
- <sup>3</sup> SINGH, N.P. and M. SHARMA. 1995. "Attitude of Muslim ladies towards population education and small family", *The Educational Review*, Vol. C, No. 7, pp. 115-118, Madras
- <sup>4</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. "A study of attitude towards mathematics among secondary school students in relation to sex", *The Educational Review*, Vol.-CI, No. 3, pp. 56-58, Madras
- <sup>5</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "A study of Primary school teachers towards mathematics—A study", *School Science*, Vol.-XXXIV, No. 4, pp. 50-54, NCERT, New Delhi
- <sup>6</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "A study of the relationship between attitude towards mathematics and achievement in mathematics", *International Educator*, Vol. 13, No. 1 and 2, pp. 47-49, Thiruvananthapuram
- <sup>7</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Attitude of Student Towards Privatisation of Higher Education: An Empirical Study", *Concepts and Currents Journal*, 3rd issue, pp. 34-38, Directorate of Higher Education, Uttaranchal
- <sup>8</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "A study of the Attitude of B.Ed. students towards privatisation of Higher Education", *People's Dialogue on Education Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 154-160, Deptt. of Education, Patna University, Patna
- <sup>9</sup> \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Attitude of Student Towards Privatisation of Higher Education: An Empirical Study", *Concepts and Currents Journal*, 3rd issue, pp. 34-38, Directorate of Higher Education, Uttaranchal
- <sup>10</sup> GUPTA, P.V. 2003. "Privatisation of Professional Education", *Privatisation of Higher Education*, Association of Indian Universities, pp. 50-54, AIU House, New Delhi
- <sup>11</sup> KUMAR, LALIT. 2007. "A study of the Attitude of B.Ed. students towards privatisation of Higher Education", *People's Dialogue on Education Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 154-160, Department of Education, Patna University, Patna
- <sup>12</sup> PANDA, SUDHAKAR. 2009. "War against Private Universities in Orissa", *Mainstream*, Vol. XLVII, No. 38, pp. 5-6, New Delhi