

Socio - Economic Impact On Higher Education Choices In India

Dr. B. Satheesh,

Assistant Professor of Economics,
Department of Commerce (SF),
S.T. Hindu College, Nagercoil.

Dr. S. Devika,

Assistant Professor of Commerce,
Department of Commerce (SF),
S.T. Hindu College, Nagercoil.

Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to analyse the status of Indian higher educational system in terms of number of educational institutions, students enrolment and potential demand for higher education in the world scenario. It also highlights the growth of higher educational institutions and students enrolment, growth of general and professional educational institutions and students enrolment and growth of private educational institutions and students enrolment and growth of distance educational institutions and students enrolment in India.

Keywords : Higher Educational Choices, Performance Appraisal.

INTRODUCTION

Education in ancient India was highly advanced in the Buddhist Monasteries from the seventh century BC to the third century AD. A few of the learning centres were large and had several facilities similar to those of the European Medieval universities. However, the first college to impact western education was founded at serampore near Kolkatta in 1818. Moreover, colleges were established in Agra, Bombay, Madras, Nagpur, Patna, Calcutta and Nagapattinam after the advent of the British. In fact, India had earned an imperishable fame in the field of higher education in the international level before her independence. Indian universities like Nalanda, Taxila and Vikramasila were renowned seats of higher learning, attracting students from far and wide including countries like Korea, China, Burma, Ceylon, Tibet and Nepal.

The higher education system in India includes both public and private universities,

university level institutions and colleges. Public and aided higher educational institutions of all types are financially supported by the central and the state governments. On the other hand, private unaided or self- financed higher educational institutions are managed and supported by various bodies or societies or individuals. The University Grants Commission Act 1956 has been empowered to recognize and control the central state, private and deemed universities. Moreover, some institutions have been granted permission to award degrees autonomously and they are known as autonomous bodies which include Indian Institute of Technology.

Literature Review

Chand, Piar and Sharma, Himanshu (2020) have investigated the role of different factors which affect the higher educational choices of senior secondary science students of Himachal Pradesh. The objectives of the study are to

analyze the higher educational choices of the science students studying in higher secondary classes in government and private schools, and examine the factors. Which influence the choice of students. This study uses primary data collected from 450 students of both government and private schools spread over the most literate Hamirpur (89.01%) Una (87.23%) and Kangra (86.49%) districts of Himachal Pradesh. The results of the study demonstrate the most of the science students aspire to join professional courses like engineering, nursing, bio-technology and information technology because of their employment prospects.

Problem of Statement

The ancient society regarded 'education' as a social good meant for intellectual, physical, cultural and spiritual development. In short, it was the source of preparing the child to lead a morally good life. However, the modern society treats education as an economic good which prepares and develops his/her personality in such a way to be fit for socio-economic life. So, higher education is closely association with all round personality development and economic benefits. Further, the development of science and technologies and innovation in agriculture, industry and tertiary sectors have caused knowledge explosion and require, qualified, trained, experienced and skilled human resources. As a result, a number of different vocational,

technical and professional courses are introduced in colleges, universities and institutions. It indicates that every individual is left with the choice of courses. So, the higher educational choices have become an important problem of the present students in the educational markets.

Objectives of study

The main objectives of this paper are:

- (1) to examine the demand and supply of different types of higher education.
- (2) to analysis the socio-economic impact on higher educational choices.
- (3) to find out the problem perception of the respondents in higher educational choices.

Indian higher education in the world scenario

This is the era of growth of the higher educational institutions and increase in the number of students. Enrolment in regional, national and international levels. It is seen that every country gives due importance to higher education and considers it as the basic for human resource and economic development. However, the number of higher educational institutions and students enrolment vary from country to country. So an attempt is made to find out the status of Indian higher educational system with respect to the number of institutions in the world scenario is depicted.

Perception towards Health Constraints

Sl. No.	Constraints	Mean Scores		Overall	F Statistics
		Professional Education	Non - Professional Education		
1.	Physical Feebleness	2.138	1.442	1.566	0.963ns
2.	Mentally Challenged	5.604	4.727	4.722	3.911*
3.	Physically Challenged	1.346	1.881	1.964	1.628ns
4.	Frequent Illness	3.281	1.763	2.617	2.864*
5.	Abnormal Growth	5.147	4.996	4.503	3.792*

Source: Computed Data (*Significant At 5 Per Cent Level) Ns - Not Significant

Health Constraint Index (Hci)

$$Hci = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n HCl_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n MSHC_i} \times 100$$

Here,

- Hci = Health Constraints Index
- Shc = Score on Health Constraints
- Mshc = Maximum Score on Health Constraints
- I = 1 To N = Number Of Health Constraints

Health Constraints Index

Sl. No.	Hci Per Cent	Number Of Respondents		Total
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education	
1.	25 - 50	9(4.50)	22(11.0)	31(7.75)
2.	50 - 75	3(1.50)	10(5.0)	13(3.25)
3.	75 - 100	- (0.00)	1(0.5)	1(0.25)
4.	No Health Constraints	188(94.00)	167(83.5)	355(88.75)
	Total	200(100.0)	200(100.0)	400(100.0)

Source: Computed Data figures in parentheses indicate percentage to total

PERCEPTION TOWARDS GENDER CONSTRAINTS

Sl. No.	Constraints	Mean Scores		Overall	F Statistics
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education		
1.	Dowry	3.661	3.148	3.256	3.432*
2.	Duration Of Education	2.827	2.901	2.784	3.023*
3.	Distance Of Educational Institutions	3.110	2.465	3.009	2.886*
4.	Sexual Harassment	1.206	0.913	1.742	0.497ns
5.	Gender Based Negligence	0.908	0.742	1.104	0.361 Ns

Source: Computed Data (*Significant At 5 Per Cent Level) Ns - Not Significant

Gender Constraints Index (GCI)

$$Gci = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n GCI_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n MSGC_i} \times 100$$

Here,

- Gci = Gender Constraints Index
- Sgc = Score On Gender Constraints
- Msgc = Maximum Score On Gender Constraints
- I = 1 To N = Number Of Gender Constraints

Gender Constraints Index

Sl. No.	Gci Per Cent	Number Of Respondents		Total
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education	
1.	25 - 50	149(74.5)	123(61.50)	272(68.00)
2.	50 - 75	37(18.5)	66(33.00)	103(25.75)
3.	75 - 100	14(7.0)	11(5.50)	25(6.25)
	Total	200(100.0)	200(100.0)	400(100.0)

Source: Computed Data Figures in Parentheses Indicate Percentage to Total

Perception towards Learning Constraints

Sl. No.	Constraints	Mean Scores		Overall	F Statistics
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education		
1.	Medium Of Instruction	4.128	3.647	3.972	4.070*
2.	Mathematical Application	3.419	3.203	3.561	3.632*
3.	Practical Education	1.863	1.328	1.624	1.123 Ns
4.	Records And Assignment	1.557	1.249	1.335	0.937ns
5.	Seminar And Projects	2.634	2.051	3.427	3.126*

Source: Computed Data (*Significant At 5 Per Cent Level) Ns - Not Significant

Learning Constraints Index (Lci)

$$Lci = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n LCI_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n MSLC_i} \times 100$$

Here,

- Lci = Learning Constraints Index
- Slc = Score On Learning Constraints
- Mslc = Maximum Score On Learning Constraints
- I = 1 To N = Number Of Learning Constraints

Learning Constraints Index

Sl. No.	Lci Per Cent	Number Of Respondents		Total
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education	
1.	25 - 50	40(20.00)	51(25.5)	91(22.75)
2.	50 - 75	132(66.00)	127(63.5)	259(64.75)
3.	75 - 100	28(14.00)	22(11.0)	50(12.50)
	Total	200(100.0)	200(100.0)	400(100.0)

Source: Computed Data Figures in Parentheses Indicate Percentage to Total

Perception towards Hostel Constraints

Sl. No.	Constraints	Mean Scores		Overall	F Statistics
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education		
1.	High Hostel Deposit	3.726	2.942	3.416	3.533*
2.	Low Quality Food	3.178	3.447	3.563	3.149*
3.	Unsanitary Environment	3.693	3.706	3.308	3.017*
4.	Lack Of Freedom	3.003	3.110	3.125	3.610*
5.	Inadequate Urinals And Latrines	2.911	2.476	3.114	2.795
6.	Lack Of Protection To The Belongings	1.272	1.348	1.527	1.409ns
7.	Illness	0.468	0.771	0.633	0.866ns
8.	Unhygienic Toilets	2.607	2.860	2.917	3.088*
9.	Home-Sickness	0.714	0.698	1.112	0.991ns
10.	Non-Conductive Atmosphere For Study	1.205	0.883	1.080	1.270ns

Source: Computed Data (*Significant At 5 Per Cent Level) Ns - Not Significant
Hostel Constraint Index (Hci)

$$Hci = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n HCl_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n MSHC_i} \times 100$$

Here,

- Hci = Hostel Constraints Index
- Shc = Score On Hostel Constraints
- Mshc = Maximum Score On Hostel Constraints
- I = 1 To N = Number Of Hostel Constraints

Hostel Constraints Index

Sl. No.	Hci Per Cent	Number Of Respondents		Total
		Professional Education	Non-Professional Education	
1.	25 - 50	83(41.5)	76(38.0)	159(39.75)
2.	50 - 75	108(54.0)	113(56.5)	221(55.25)
3.	75 - 100	9(4.5)	11(5.5)	20(5.00)
	Total	200(100.0)	200(100.0)	400(100.0)

Source: Computed Data Figures in Parentheses Indicate Percentage To Total

Conclusion

The Choice Of Higher Education Varies From Person To Person Based On His/Her Socio-Economic Background. In This Study, Many Social Factors Such As Gender, Caste, Community, Religion, Age Of Marriage, Parental Education, Size Of Family, Success Of Others, Distance Of Educational Institutions, Health And Family Tradition And Economic Educational Loan, Cost Of Education, Number Of Fee Installments, Financial Support Of Others, Employment Chances And Income Opportunity Have Been Identified As Important Factors Which Determine The Choice Of Higher Education. However, Parental Education, Nature Of Employment, Type Of Occupation, Income, Employment Chances, Income Opportunity, Size Of Land, Educational Loan And Financial Support Highly Influence The Choice In Professional And Non-Professional Education. On The Other Hand,

Gender, Caste, Religion, Community, Age Of Marriage, System Of Fee Installment, Success Of Others And Distance Of Educational Institutions Do Not Have Much Impact On Higher Educational Choices In Kanniyakumari District.

REFERENCES

1. Unesco, 2020, *Economic and Social Aspects of Educational Planning*, Paris : Place de Fontenoy.
2. Unni, Jeemol, 2019, *Gender Differentials in Education*, Economic and Political weekly, vol.XLIV.
3. Vaizy, John, 2020, *Economics of Education*, London : George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
4. Veena Poonacha, 2005, *Impact of Gender Politics of Science Policies and Education*. Economic of Political Weekly, Vol. XL. No.3.
5. Veena, D.R., 2019, *Education and Economic Growth*, New Delhi : Ashish Publishing House.

6. Vernon, P.E., 2019, *Education and Psychology in Individual Difference*, Harvard Education Review 28, Pp. 91-104.
7. Warriar, B., 2018, *Correlation Between Socio - Economic Status and School Achievement of Tenth Standard Students in Trivandrum Taluk*, Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
8. Washbhune, N.F., 2019, *Socio Economic Status, Urbanism and Academic performance in College*, Journal of Educational Research, Dembar Publication, London Inco., Pp.34-53.
9. William Ericson, Bibb, 2020, *The Relation Between Per Pupil Expenditure and Student Achievements*, Ed.D., Memphisiii State University, Pp.1-105.
10. Worswick, G.D., 2019, *Educational and Economics Performance*, England : Gower Publishing Company Ltd.
11. Dr.G.Suresh, Dr.A.Senthil Kumar, Dr.S.Lekashri, Dr.R.Manikandan. (2021). Efficient Crop Yield Recommendation System Using Machine Learning For Digital Farming. International Journal of Modern Agriculture, 10(01), 906 - 914. Retrieved from <http://www.modern-journals.com/index.php/ijma/article/view/688>
12. Dr. R. Manikandan, Dr Senthilkumar A. Dr Lekashri S. Abhay Chaturvedi. "Data Traffic Trust Model for Clustered Wireless Sensor Network." INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN INDUSTRY 9.1 (2021): 1225–1229. Print.