

The Changing Discursive Terrain of Indian Higher Education

Kanchan

Abstract

This paper presents a systematic discussion on the changes taking place in Indian higher education in order to explain their systematicity and organization in terms of a changing discursive knowledge. The paper engages in an innovative and rare methodology used in studying the field of higher education. It adopts an alternate lens using Foucault's ideas to understand the practices and policy instances in Indian higher education for uncovering the dominant discourses underneath its formation. It elaborates how market subjectivities and accountabilities stands apart as the most profound savoir (discursive knowledge) that guides the overall directionality of Indian higher education in the recent times.

Keywords:

Higher Education;
Discourse Analysis;
Market;
Genealogy;
Foucault.

Copyright © 201x International Journals of Multidisciplinary Research Academy. All rights reserved.

Author correspondence:

KANCHAN,
Assistant Professor, Department of Education
University of Delhi, Delhi-110007
Email: Kanchan.cie@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The present article aims to discuss the contemporary events, themes, and practices that inform and circumscribe the descriptions of systems and processes within higher education in India. It attempts to describe the existing formation of higher educational terrain in relation to the current setting of social, political and economic narratives delineating its threshold. In doing so, the paper adopts an alternative lens, a framework, which allows us to re-imagine, re-define, and re-invent the involved practices and ways of looking at and describing the field of study.

Higher education systems, in India and across the globe, are experiencing a wave of transformation concerning their operations, governance and funding. Although it would be difficult to ascertain the exact origins, time frame, and scale of the contemporary shifts experienced within higher education systems of diverse countries, yet some patterns can be revealed which are wide-ranging in reach and expanse. At the heart of contemporary global scenario of higher education is the shifting perspectives on the *raison d'être* of higher education in modern societies. Precisely, locating the shift, it seeks to discover and re-assign a new place and role to the university as "a big, complex, demanding, competitive business" [34]. The role of universities is changing from mere promotion of social and moral well-being through education and learning and moving towards underpinning economic prosperities of the countries. [9]

The transformations in higher education can be best described in terms of the 'higher education/ economic' complex emphasizing an interrelationship between the two within which the mission and roles of the universities and higher education are being re-negotiated- in theory as well as in practice. The higher

education system is no longer conceived as isolated, either from society or from the economy. It is rather perceived now through its elongated and intervening connexions with the both, but prioritizing the economic segment among the two. It has given rise to the renewed interests of policymakers, governments, international agencies, and transnational groups to rethink and reform higher educational territories across the countries. [22] [24]

The major descriptors, of this transformation in higher education, are: complicated intersectoral dynamics between public/private; centrality of knowledge in changing economies; financial austerity; and situating demographic premium as a contingent parameter for national growth. [9] [13] [23] [31] It is noteworthy that these descriptors are bound to operate within the altered economic and social frameworks in higher education. They signify the nature of higher education production function is labor intensive but productivity immune [5] thus, leading to inflation plus trajectory of annual cost increase and thereby, underscoring the imperatives of increasing financial burden [20]. At the same time, they emphasize the sentiments of subordination of education systems to economic utility which can ensure the future social, political and economic viability of nation states. [7] Therefore, one finds varied expressions of these descriptors in the recent transformations and systematic makeovers of higher educational systems functioning at the local/global levels.

This context is further accentuated by the contemporary dispersion of globalization (and internationalization) which underlines the process of increasing the national share in world-production. Globalization is deemed as necessary, inevitable, and irreversible; used as a basis of policy changes [9] in defining the adequacy and quality of higher education. The interlacing of knowledge with globalization has made the 'process of production', world over, dependent on technology and increasingly made capital-intensive. Thus, it creates mounting demands from the systems of higher education to respond harmoniously, by enlarging their scope and nature of academic activities in favour of needs of the producers, employers, and industry in respective nations/ countries. While universities are understood to have a significant publicness in their roles and missions, yet the upcoming formulations highlight their movement away from such a status by questioning the overall governmental- ownership, control, regulation, employment, and financial support. [35] It has induced a contraction in the public policy of higher education domain at the international level. Its noteworthy that the traditional welfare state is now considered as 'overburdened' and 'pressurized' in view of the mounting financial expenditures, restricted taxation revenues, and inflationary deficit financing. [11] [36] Thus, the overall ecosystem of higher education has attained specific articulations of transition towards a more diversified, stratified, and competitively redefined sector, not only theoretically but also in practice. It continually receives new and innovative trajectory built upon newly defined conceptions of knowledge and shifting panorama of academic context.

1.1 Review of Literature

Higher education in India remained largely a publicly funded system up to 1986, and achieved a great horizontal expansion in terms of the numbers of enrolled students as well the number of institutions. In spite of the perceived problems (of quality concerns and lack of funds) higher education continued to grow under the privilege of the state until a shift came in 1990s. The available literature identifies and designates this shift as a significant break in Indian higher education. I propose to discuss, in this section, particular description of the field in reference to the stated shift, as it transpires within the literature.

As mentioned above, the higher education was predominantly a public funded system till 1986; hence, its first and the most significant dilemma post-1991 encapsulates the concerns of a *financial crisis*. The adoption of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) by the Government of India entailed a withdrawal of the state activity from the welfare sector (which mainly included health, education and nutrition). Hence, the economic crisis of 1991 deepened the difficulties of the system which was already observing a persistent decline in the public funding since 1970, that reached an all time low in the eighth plan (that is, 0.3% of the total five-year plan expenditure). [38] [41] Consequently, it is observed by many scholars, the field of higher education experienced a constrained public support in the wake of the enunciated economic reforms. [1] [12][36][41] In this regard, Tilak writes that "the growth in the government expenditures has been very slow during the 1990s after the economic reform policies were introduced". [36] The studies report that higher education presents "disturbing trends in public expenditures during the 1990s" [36] and the total expenditure (plan plus non-plan) registered a decline not only in nominal terms but also in real terms between 1990 to 1996. (ibid) The proportion of public expenditure on higher education drastically came down in the next decades; from 0.55% of the GDP in 1990 to 0.41 % of the GDP in 2010-11 (BE). [28]

The literature also corroborates the data related to the Gross Enrolment Ratios (GER) to facilitate a discussion on the fundamental challenges of the system. GER is considered a window to explain the existing participation of the learners in the system and a mechanism to earmark the future targets. The **enrolment crisis** is the second important aspect of higher education represented in academic as well as political literature. It emerges as an important indicator to outline the quantitative expansion of Indian higher education. Indian higher education has experienced an increasing demand and expansion in numbers (of students as well as institutions). The pattern of growth has remained impressive considering that the number of universities which was 27 in 1950-51 (SES various years) has increased to 799 in 2015-16. (AISHE 2015-16) Similarly the enrolments in the higher educational institutes (HEIs)* have rapidly increased. It is estimated that the GER for the age group of 18-23 years has achieved an all time high to 24.5% in the year 2015-16. (AISHE 2015-16) The specific thrust has been provided by the Eleventh Five Year Plan (FYP) to the enhancement of the GER in higher education after which it has achieved impressive growth. If on the one hand the system is determined to increase the access to HEIs, on the other hand, the concerns of idled capacity loom as a big challenge facing the higher education. Tilak [37] states that “despite the improvements in equity and democratized higher education, it is still not accessible to the poorest group of population.” He also highlights inter-regional disparities in quality, equity, and quantity dimensions as profound and marked. (ibid) Thus, the magnum of imbalance for marginal groups (SC/ST/OBC), women, and regional disparities is very high compared to the existing capacity of HEIs in the country. The National Knowledge Commission 2006, Yashpal Committee 2009 and the N.R. Narayana Murthy Committee 2012 states that the biggest problem in front of Indian higher education is the inadequate number of HEIs.

The third dimension concerns the **quality crisis** in higher education in India. The role of higher education in developing the knowledge based economy is greatly emphasized in literature. Besides, its role in country’s progress is widely accepted knowing that the products of higher education fulfill the demand of labor economy. While India stands second to China in terms of the sizeable expansion (in HEIs and enrolments) of higher education, “this increase...has posed a greater challenge to the nation in maintaining better quality of education in the country”. [30] Altbach [2] states that the “problem of Indian higher education is not so much of quantity ...as their quality”. The higher educational institutions in the country are said to have mediocre academic standards which many scholars find worrisome.[1] [2] [21] The systemic deficiencies of Indian higher education include low and degrading academic standards, poor research standards, colossal and unwieldy affiliating system, inflexible and unproductive academic structure, poor employability of the graduates, lack of diversification and innovation, burdensome ‘reservation’ policies, lack of infrastructure, teacher shortage, and scant funding. [1] [2] [21] [29] The literature presents quality as an important dimension which needs immediate attention for the HEIs of India to attain a global and competitive advantage. Tilak [37] writes, “global competition in higher education puts additional emphasis on the need for serious efforts to improve quality of higher education.”

As we have presented above, the description of Indian higher education can be understood through the discussed predicaments. The above three formulations and the underlying change in perspective raises questions regarding its normative distinctiveness which delineates the higher education and its description. The point of break (1991) emerges as a point of origin for the changing perspective and shifting formulations. It becomes a matter of study to examine and reveal the epistemological relevance of this break in time as an ‘origin’ of the evolved configuration of the field. Thus, the paper examines the grand narrative of Indian higher education by analyzing and articulating these formulations using an innovating method of discourse analysis inspired by the works and ideas of a prominent French philosopher, thinker and scholar Michel Foucault. It is noteworthy that this paper has been developed from the doctoral research work of the author and the data/analysis presented here is therefore, elicited from her doctoral study.

2. Research Method

The recent inclinations towards usage of ‘discourse’ in social sciences, and more particularly higher education, for our interest here, are based on the merging traditions of discourse analysis and social sciences for understanding the reality, social practices, meanings, and “making things visible” critically [40]. The variants of discourse studies- linguistic and textual, critical, psychological, and Foucauldian represent

* The ‘higher educational institutions (HEIs)’ is a term used here for denoting, universities and the affiliated colleges; it also includes private colleges, deemed to be universities and other special institutions of higher learning such as IITs, IIMs, IIITs, and NITs.

enumerable strands of possible methodological interventions that can be taken up by the researchers who wish to integrate discursive and methodological innovations with higher educational issues. The Foucauldian view on discourse has been present in social science since 1970s [32] and it implies a specific way of organizing truth and knowledge and also includes the ways in which they support power in getting installed in society. [3] To employ this lens in studying problems and themes of higher education means to engross with a set of social meanings and power struggles. As Gordon [17] writes, “Foucauldian... [view] seeks to reveal a plane of social conflict in which different narratives are evaluated for their relationship to the truth as opposed to normativity”. (Parentheses added)

Discourse analysis is a flexible method which constitutes many different strands of theorists using it; such as “Discourse analysts, Social Psychologists, and Critical Discourse Analysts”[†][27] with different epistemological frameworks informing them [42]Ball [4] emphasizes what distinguishes a discourse analysis drawn from Foucault’s framework (as compared to other who attend to the linguistic features of the text) is the “*poststructural sensibility*” that “avoids the substitution of one truth with another” [18] because “the claim to truth can itself be...powerful rhetorical practice” [14]. A discourse analysis based on Foucault’s framework “aspires to dissect, disrupt and render the familiar strange” [18] which involves analysis of “those ready-made syntheses, those groupings that we normally accept before examination, those links whose validity is recognized from the outset” [16] At the same time, it involves, in Foucault’s sense, a rejection of any single analytic framework as Foucault believed that the “discourse... is so complex a reality that we not only can but should, approach it at different levels with different methods”. [15]

This paper proposes to understand the formation of the narrative of higher education in India. This has two major connotations; first, it attempts to understand this formation in terms of a discursive regularity and second, to understand it as an effect of the discursive and non-discursive practices. It is notable that the *field* of study (Indian higher education) will be exposed to a Foucauldian ‘reading’ in order to examine its construction as a distinctively emerging discursive formation. As described below the author has engaged with a discourse analysis using Foucault’s ideas. This article therefore is an innovative attempt to see Indian Higher Education through a distinct methodology.

Foucault’s method as found in his later works, *Discipline and Punish (DP)*, and *The History of Sexuality, Volume I (HS)*, focused to describe the effects of practice on discourse. He saw it as a “method of causal explanation which complemented archaeology”. [19] He called it “**genealogy**”. Foucault’s genealogical approach focused on understanding the discourse not only in linguistic terms but in relation to ‘power’. Through genealogy, he attempted to describe the “transformations in the systems of thought in terms of ‘causes’”. [19]The genealogical approach focuses to describe the processes (discursive and non-discursive) that govern the production of discourse as their positive effects. According to Mills [26] Foucault’s “*genealogy* is a development of [his] archaeological analysis which is more concerned with the workings of power and with describing the history of present”. Similarly, Gutting [19] reiterates that Foucault’s *genealogical* approach is an “extension of his archaeological method focused on examining the historical emergence of the problems of contemporary society; and on understanding the practices and their relationship with power”. Thus, *genealogy* consists of a critical ethos towards the constitution of discourse, institutions, and identities formed through the complex interaction of power and knowledge.

2.1 Data Sources and Selection of Documents: The author has chosen the following documents for the purpose of extracting, exploring and understanding the enunciated formation of higher education in India through a detailed Foucauldian reading. These documents have been picked from diverse categories comprising the documents of the State, academic articles and statistical statements. The fundamental idea is to obtain a diverse range of statements which can be exposed to discourse analysis using Foucault’s methods for revealing the configuration of the enunciated discursive formation.

[†] Mills explains that Discourse analysis concerns the analysis of language use in context rather on focusing on idealized versions of language. She differentiates it from discourse theory of Foucault. Many social psychologists use analytical methods developed within discourse analysis along with ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, she considers them as a distinguished group of theorists. Finally, she describes Critical discourse analysts as those who analyze texts from political perspective; where language is central in constitution of individuals as subjects.

See Mills, S.1997. *Discourse* 2nd Edition. London & New York: Routledge.

Policy Documents	National Policy documents post 1986	Post 1986
State documents	Five Year plans	Post 2002
Academic articles	Five selected articles on Indian higher education published in relevant Journals	Post 1990
Institutional Papers	Position papers/ working papers and reports of relevant Institutions	Post 1990

Table 1: The Sources of Data

2.2 Data Statements (DS): The *statements* are considered to be the atoms of discourse [16]. Hence, the Foucauldian discourse analysis involves the *reading* of the statements and the modalities through which they evolve into a discursive field. The data sources for this work are broad ranging documents including policy documents, academic texts and papers, institutional papers, reports, and statistics. The author has extracted various statements (which depict the enunciative function) for the purpose of this reading by a detailed and focused reading of the chosen documents.

In the section below the author has presented the analysis/results and a simultaneous discussion on the data integrated in the form of DS as described above. It is suggested that the discussion below should be read as a composite part made of produced analysis as well as results alongside.

3. Results and Discussion

The discursive terrain of Indian higher education emerges as a “strategic field” [17] of traditional as well as non-traditional narratives, in which new possibilities continually materialize. It is a terrain formed by a *plurality of discourses* which are sometimes competing and at other, negotiating. of Indian higher education manifests itself in the form of a *unity* with clear articulations. In the subsequent sections a *brief of analysis* is presented to showcase the changing discursive knowledge that has dominantly emerged from the contemporary dispersion of market based rationality. The analysis presented by the author represents how market dominates as a significant explanation to changing formulation of Indian higher education.

The expression of ‘*market*’, appears to be the most powerful as it seems to influence the recent transformations in Indian higher education in policy as well in practice. The genealogical positioning of ‘*market*’ seems difficult to ascertain, for it emerges in its peculiarities as an ‘*accidental cause of discourse*’; a ‘*neoliberal rationality*’; a ‘*power discourse*’; and also as a ‘*regime of truth*’. The ideals of ‘*market*’, in the strict economic sense, designates a place for exchange of goods and services at an agreeable price between the interested parties. In this context, the universities and HEIs in India are found to be placed in such a *marketplace* where they ‘*compete*’ for students, faculty, funds, resources, and each of them also compete among each other (locally as well as globally).

DS: “On the one hand, the movement towards privatization and the erosion of the traditional public institutions’ market share suggests that the government needs to provide greater autonomy and leeway to public universities to allow them to more successfully compete against their private counterparts. Privatization in the marketplace means that competition is a given.” (RT-I20i-28-3-1)

DS: “Some institutions with a particular form are in direct competition with another, whereas others have carved out a distinct niche. Some institutions have the potential to capture the clientele from another group of institutions while many are in competition for the services of the same faculty. These forms may be found in many countries but may not have existed only a decade ago in one or another country.” (RT-I20i-19-1-2)

It further emerges as a ‘*common-sense*’ establishing a changed relationship between higher education and economy in order to establish the latter as a facilitator to bring the transformation which provides for India’s future economic growth, by producing the graduates with needed skills who contribute to economic prosperity.

DS: “It [Higher education] equips young people with skills relevant for the labor market and the opportunity for social mobility... Thus, the nation creates an intellectual repository of human capital to meet the country’s need and shapes its future.” (RT-I6iii-89-1-3)

DS: “Higher education trains people to take up different economic roles in society and spurs technological innovation that drives economic growth. It is important that the country’s capacity in higher education is aligned to the demand for skills from the economy, which would include the demand for teachers from the education system itself. Since higher education itself cannot create jobs; a mismatch between the demand and the supply of quality and number of graduates would lead to unemployed graduates and / or a shortage of graduates with certain kind of skills.” (RT-I3-2-1-1)

Hence, it produces the formulations which cite the same as a critical concern to be acted upon, as shown in the DS below. It also forms individual subjectivities, such as, of a ‘**citizen-subject**’, a graduate who can lead the country to the heights of economic prosperity and global excellence.

DS: “Too many of our universities are producing graduates in subjects that are not required by the changing job market, and the quality is also not what it should be...India cannot hope to be competitive in an increasingly knowledge-driven world if our higher educational institutions do not come up to the high standards of excellence needed to be globally competitive.” (RT-I6iii-11-4-7)

DS: “The National Education Policy, 2016 envisions a credible education system capable of ensuring inclusive quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all and producing students/graduates equipped with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that are required to lead a productive life, participate in the country’s development process, respond to the requirements of the fast-changing, ever-globalizing, knowledge-based societies, and developing responsible citizens who respect the Indian tradition of acceptance of diversity of India’s heritage, culture and history and promote social cohesion and religious amity. This vision recognizes the central role of education in India’s social, economic, political, and cultural development.” (RT-11i-5-3-1)

The regime of market, is seen to operate analogously on the public and private domains within Indian higher education. In the sense, that it *alters the application* of a **rationality** in terms of choice of means to particular ends. It *emphasizing a shift of the referent* (for deciding a rational decision) towards a strategic environment (the market) instead of individual preferences and goals. [33] While individual preferences (of students, teachers and HEIs) may be guided by non-comparable idiosyncratic utilities, the strategic environment enables an understanding of comparable payoffs related to the particular situations (such as monetary profits related to markets). Thus, *this rationality* can be adapted and extended by any entity, public or private, who wish to make decisions when placed in the given social situations.

To explicate this, we will engage with the formulations on cost-recovery in Indian higher education. The various formulations of ‘**cost-recovery practices**’ are adopted by HEIs, on the grounds that, first, the students stand to gain from investments in higher education in the form of *higher private returns* as future earnings and second, they have an increasing *willingness to pay*.

DS: “More than 60 per cent of the enrolment in higher education in India is in private institutions. This trend indicates the willingness of the households to invest in higher education and, thus, a transfer of the incidence of the cost burden of higher education from public to the households.” (RT-I20ii-36-2-2)

Thus, the ‘cost recovery’ from the students becomes a ‘*performative micro-practice in the market truth regime*’ as a rational means to obtain financial resources for the HEIs.

DS: “Higher education institutions charge the students tuition fees not only to cover the operating costs, but even generate surplus from self-financing courses.” (RT-I22-11-2-4)

DS: “The issue of raising the fees upwards to meet the cost of education is critical if we are to maintain and sustain the quality of our government and aided institutions as private institutions are already using a higher fee structure. In a competitive setting there is no reason why the fees should not meet a reasonable proportion of the cost of education. A figure of 20 per cent of recurring cost is considered reasonable in the international scale, although in some countries (a la South Korea) it could go up to 40 per cent.” (RT-119-67-5-1)

It is not only considered, as likely, to reduce their (HEIs) ‘dependency’ on the public funds but also to inculcate, in the individual students, the dignity of being a ‘rational-agent’. Thus, it promises to generate

large payoffs moral and pecuniary, for students and HEIs, respectively. The measure of cost-recovery formulated by this truth regime, is also taken as *extension to 'consumer-choices'*; such as, stratified fee structures for the same course implemented by various HEIs in accordance to their performance, creates 'choices' for the students which are considered 'empowering'. At the same time, it installs the practices of 'competitiveness' and 'autonomy' where HEIs strive hard to be more successful. An example of US Higher education is cited in the DS below to substantiate the claims of the regime.

DS: "There is a substantial price and quality differential across higher education institutions. Universities focus on a particular segment, and compete for students within that segment. The students and their parents have access to reliable information on programmes, quality, tuition fees and future income prospects to make informed choices. The success of the US system is largely attributed to the existence of several reliable information sources, independent nation-wide testing services (Education Testing Service) that help to objectively determine merit of prospective students, and a credible quality assurance system." (RT-I22-96-2-2)

The following DS substantiates the operability of individual choice as a mechanism behind installation of various market-based instrumentalities in reshaping and re-informing higher educational practices in the country.

DS: "While some scholars do study just for the sake of knowledge, for the vast majority, higher education implies better job prospects. India needs to focus more on short term as well long term programmes in vocational education and technical skills in collaboration with the private sector. There is no harm in allowing private enterprises to make some profits, provided they are able to maintain quality, accountability, and transparency. Those who can afford to pay for luxury or consumer goods should be made to pay for quality higher education of choice."
(RT-I12-22-3-7)

In the same context, traditionally, the impact of market is considered to promote 'equity', based on its effectiveness and the practices to ensure '**individual freedom**'. Many accounts discuss the tensions between operation of the market vis-à-vis widening participation and equity goals in higher education. The formulations in favor of '**student loans**' (carrying equalizing potential) is projected as market's rational way of dealing with inequities (resulting from increasing pressures to pay/affordability) which it presumes is individual-centric. Also, the provisioning of '**scholarships**' for the *students in need* apportioned from the cost-recovery reserves of the institutions performs as another rational solution/formulation based on the market instrumentalities.

DS: "For example, the Punnayya Committee (1992–93) set up by the UGC suggested cost recovery and income generation to a level of 15 to 25 per cent of the annual recurrent expenditure of a university. The Dr. Swaminathan Panel (1992) set up by the AICTE also suggested cost recovery from students and the introduction of an education cess from industries." (RT-I20ii-6-1-3)

Yet, the standing criticisms are stark, alleging that a multi-layered problem of 'equity' is 'neutralized' by the markets. As, in the Indian context, specific interactions of economic inequities with caste, class, religion, region, gender, and disability as many unequal social categories, apprehend diverse responses. One such formulation can be cited here for more clarity,

DS: "...the place where parents discriminate most against a female child is in the preference for public versus private expenditure. Parents are more likely to incur private expenditure for sons than daughters." (RT-I18-11-1-1)

However, even these formulations of resistance are constrained in and around 'market-oriented' conceptions such as 'market-failure' and 'externalities'. So the truth regime seizes the practices as unambiguous 'regularities' creating 'regulatory eddy-currents' in which the problems, their meanings, and their solutions keep circulating.

DS: "Positive externalities would mean that since the society at large rather than the individual benefits from higher education, the government should finance higher education. It is widely accepted that education helps in social mobility; therefore, it is an effective instrument for promoting equity. Justifications given for public subsidization of higher education include imperfections in capital markets that inhibit students from borrowing against uncertain future

returns of higher education and market failures due to asymmetric information. Finally, the production process in higher education is believed to be subject to economies of scale or decreasing returns to scale. Hence, it is considered more efficient for the government to provide higher education.” (RT-I22-20-1-1)

DS: “To reconcile the objective function of the universities and the nature of competition we may refer to Marginson (2004:178-87) who argues that the market for higher education is essentially a competition for social status (social advantage, social position) or as he says, a market organized as a “status competition”, where the institutions play a key role in the production and allocation of social status.” (RT-I11-4-5-1)

The substantive articulations in Indian higher education showcase the urge for HEIs to be flexible to adjust to the needs of market. The ‘needs’ are determined to be a discursive verbalization of the above performative framework of ‘market’ stressing on “optimizing the performance of the system”. [25] There is an already existing framework, in its specificity, describing ‘market’ being critically important for disabling the failures of state-controlled systems; providing ‘human-freedom’ and ‘economic-efficiency’ [6] achieving equity [39]; being ‘cost-effective’ in providing value for money [9]; extending ‘consumer-choice’ [7] and improving economic growth. The presence of ‘market’ as a regime of truth in Indian higher education therefore, proliferates the subjectivities reinforcing **competition, efficiency, pressures to perform, economic rationality in decision making and placing motives of profit in place of knowledge**, at the center of academic activities for individuals and for HEIs. The major formulations which are found to be influenced by the regime of ‘market’ (assimilating the previous two) focus at specific enunciations of *individual subjectivities*. Such as, an **‘entrepreneurial-subject’** who enlarge the scope of their payoffs in terms of future earnings in labor market by making rational choices concerning what to study and for how long. Further, it incorporates the *subjectivities for HEIs* as education providers who thrive through excellent performance (academic and resource-based) and partnerships and alliances (with other agencies- industry, research bodies, employers) reinforcing their **‘functionalist-subjectivities’**. It also formulates higher education as a domain constituted in the form of a **‘consumer market’ for- students** (degrees and credentials), **for employers** (for skilled and employable labor), **for industries** (knowledge products and research relationships for resources and expertise), and **for professionals** (teachers and faculty for academic jobs and positions).

Hence, the regime of market has brought in to effect specific discursive as well non-discursive practices in Indian higher education. It produces, reproduces, transforms, and validates various subjectivities and micro-practices which grant a knowing performativity to the sanctioned and acceptable formulations, in relation to itself. So much so that the alternatives and criticisms of market which are often presumed as vilified response to the credentials of market driven progress of higher education, establish the presence of an ever strengthening regime of market.

DS: “Although higher education may not be a pure public good, it has the characteristics of one. In the absence of state investment, it will be under-produced and under-supplied since profits cannot be a criterion to decide the optimum amount of investment (Tilak 2008) and markets will not have incentives to produce it to optimum levels.” (RT-I20i-146-3-1)

It establishes that though ‘market’ is an inescapable truth regime producing the present discursive formation of Indian higher education as an ‘effect-in-real’, the subject-positions of resistance will continue to churn the power/knowledge complex to negotiate the ‘effects’ of truth regime or even to challenge, transform, and overthrow it. Thus, we can substantiate The market emerges not only as a truth regime but also as a power discourse in Indian higher education. It has effected not only the acceptable and dominant formulations of discourse(s) but also the formulations of resistance to circulate around the power of constrains of market in the present terrain of higher education in India.

4. Conclusion

The genealogical explanations as presented above have helped to problematize the changing perspective beneath the organization of Indian higher education. Its explanations of market as the dominant regime of truth and economic framework as the will-to-truth indicates the pre-ordained and teleological destinies to emerge in the discursive and non-discursive operability of higher education in India. In this context, it is determined that the interplay of these regimes of power and knowledge, which has given rise to particular subjectivities and technologies, will continue to shape many more innovative ways and techniques to govern

the individuals, institutions, practices and systems of higher education. They demand continual advent of technologies which can govern the system and direct the behavior of its participants in desired directions. The practices such as, branding, academic audit, accreditation, quality audits, plagiarism control, API scores, publication impact factors, students-feedback for evaluation of teaching, choice-based-credits, and skill-qualifications and so on, indicate the readily evident technologies of self as existing techniques of subjectification of individuals (students and teachers) and HEIs.

The technology of 'excellence', 'performance', and 'relevance' has augmented a changed articulation of statements which prescribe differentiated roles and missions for individuals and HEIs. Hence, we are able to describe various changes and 'what is actually said' in higher education in terms of the market regime of truth. It substantiates that higher education is submitted into transformed notions of performativity in terms of its 'value' now being defined by market sensibilities and economic rationalities. The market emerges not only as a truth regime but also as a power discourse in Indian higher education. It has effected not only the acceptable and dominant formulations of discourse(s) but also the formulations of resistance to circulate around the power of constrains of market in the present terrain of higher education in India.

References

- [1] Agarwal, Pawan. 2006. "Higher Education in India: The Need for Change." Working Paper No.180. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations. Retrieved from http://www.icrier.org/pdf/ICRIER_WP180_Higher_Education_in_India_.pdf.
- [2] Altbach, Philip G. 2006. "Tiny at the Top." Pp.84-87 in *A Half Century of Indian Higher Education: Essays by Philip G. Altbach*, edited by Pawan Agarwal. New Delhi: Sage.
- [3] Ball, Stephen, J. 1993. "What is policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes." *Discourse*. 13 (2): 10–17. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>.
- [4] Ball, Stephen, J. 1995. "Intellectuals or Technicians: The Urgent Role of Theory in Educational Studies." *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 43(3):255-271. Retrieved from doi: 10.2307/3121983.
- [5] Baumol, W.J. and W.G. Bowen. 1966. *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- [6] Brennan, Geoffrey. and James M. Buchanan. 2000 [1980]. *The Collected Works of James M. Buchanan- The Power to Tax: Analytical Foundations of a Fiscal Constitution*. Vol. 9. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund
- [7] Brown, P., Hasley, A. H., Lauder, H. and Wells, A. S. 1997. "The Transformation of Education and Society: Introduction." Pp. 1-44 in *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*, edited by A. H. Hasley, H. Lauder, P. Brown & A. S. Wells. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Brown, Roger. 2011. "The March of the Market" Pp. 11-24 in *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*, edited by Mikes Molesworth, Richard Scullion and Elizabeth Nixon. Oxon: Routledge
- [9] Bruce, Victoria. 2006. "Markets and Higher Education: A Regime of Truth?." *Irish Educational Studies*. 25(2): 141-154. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03323310600737289>.
- [10] Bruce, Victoria. 2006. "Markets and Higher Education: A Regime of Truth?." *Irish Educational Studies*. 25(2): 141-154. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03323310600737289>
- [11] Chattopadhyay, Saumen. 2012. *Education and Economics: Disciplinary Evolution and Policy Discourse*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- [12] De, Anuradha and Tanuka Endow. 2008. "Public Expenditure on Education in India: Recent Trends and Outcomes." RECOUP Working Paper No. 18. CORD, India. Retrieved from <http://ceid.educ.cam.ac.uk/publications/WP18-ADfin.pdf>.
- [13] Duczmal, Wojciech. and Ben, Jongbloed. 2007. "Private Higher Education in Poland: A Case of Public-Private Dynamics." Pp. 415-442 in *Public-Private Dynamics in Higher Education: Expectations, Developments and Outcomes*, edited by Ju rgen Enders and Ben Jongbloed . Bielefeld: Transcript.
- [14] Edwards, Richard. And Katherine, Nicoll. 2001. "Researching the Rhetoric of Lifelong Learning." *Journal of Education Policy*. 16(2): 103-112. Retrieved from <https://www.stir.ac.uk/research/hub/publication/5523>.
- [15] Foucault, Michel. 2003 [1973]. *The Birth of the Clinic: The Archaeology of the Medical Perception*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [16] Foucault, Michel. 2015[1972]. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London and NY: Routledge.

- [17] Gordon, Colin. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault. New York: Pantheon Books.
- [18] Graham, Linda. 2005. Discourse Analysis and the Critical use of Foucault. Paper Presented at Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference. 27th November–1st December. Sydney. Retrieved from http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/2689_2005.pdf.
- [19] Gutting, Gary. 2005. *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [20] Johnstone, Bruce, D. and Pamela. N. Marcucci. 2007. “Worldwide trends in higher education finance: Cost-sharing, Student loans, and the Support of Academic Research.” Paper for the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge. Retrieved from http://kiva.org/cms/worldwide_trends_in_higher_education_finance.pdf
- [21] Kapur, Devesh. and Pratap Bhanu, Mehta. 2007. “Indian Higher Education Reform: From Half-baked Socialism to Half-baked Capitalism.” CID Working Paper No. 108. CID: Harvard University. Retrieved from <https://casi.sas.upenn.edu/sites/casi.sas.upenn.edu/files/uploads/half%20baked.pdf>
- [22] Knight, J.ed. 2009. *Financing Access and Equity in Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- [23] Kwiek, Marek. 2009. “The Two Decades of Privatization in Polish Higher Education: Cost-Sharing, Equity and Access.” Pp. 149-167 in *Financing Access and Equity in Higher Education*, edited by Jane Knight. Rotterdam: Sense.
- [24] Kwiek, Marek. 2013. “From System Expansion to System Contraction: Access to Higher Education in Poland.” *Comparative Education Review*. 57(3): 553-576.
- [25] Lyotard, Jean, Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- [26] Mills, Sara. 2003. *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- [27] Mills, Sara. 2013[1997]. *Discourse*. 2nd Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- [28] Mitra, Anuneeta. 2015. “Public Spending in Higher Education in India: A Benefit Incidence Analysis.” *Higher Education for the Future*. 2(1): 71-91.
- [29] Nayyar, Deepak. 2008. *Liberalization and Development*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- [30] Patil, Jagannath and Latha, Pillai. 2016. “Quality Assurance in Indian Higher Education: Role of NAAC and Future Directions.” Pp. 137-162 in *India Higher Education Report 2015*, edited by N.V. Varghese and Garima Malik. London and NY: Routledge.
- [31] Pierson, P. 2001. “Coping with Permanent Austerity: Welfare State Restructuring in Affluent Democracies.” Pp. 410-514 in *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, edited by P. Pierson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [32] Powers, P. 2007. “The Philosophical Foundations of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis.” *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. 1(2): 18–34. Retrieved from www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/.../01/Volume-1_Powers.Pdf
- [33] Riker, William H. 1962. *The Theory of Political Coalitions*. London: Yale University Press.
- [34] Skilbeck, Malcolm. 2001. “The University Challenged: A Review of International Trends and Issues with Particular Reference to Ireland.” Dublin: Higher Education Authority. Retrieved from <http://www.iua.ie/publication/view/executive-summary-the-university-challenged-a-review-of-international-trends-and-issues-with-particular-reference-to-ireland/>.
- [35] Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*. Maryland: JHU Press.
- [36] Tilak, Jandhyala B.G. 2004a. “Public Subsidies in Education in India.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(4): 343-359.
- [37] Tilak, Jandhyala B.G. 2004b. “Absence of Policy and Perspective in Higher Education.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(21): 2159-2164.
- [38] Tilak, Jandhyala B.G. 2012. “Higher Education Policy in India in Transition.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(13):36-40.

- [39] Tooley, James. 1996. "Why Should the State be in Education?" *Economic Affairs*. 16(2):46. Retrieved from doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0270.1996.tb00527.x.
- [40] Van Dijk, Teun, A. 1997. "The Study of Discourse." Pp. 1-34 in *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies 1. Vol. 1. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, edited by T. van Dijk. London: Sage.
- [41] Varghese, N.V. 2000. "Reforming Education Financing." Paper Presented in Unviable Universities: A Symposium on the Crisis in Higher Education. Seminar. 494. Retrieved from www.india-seminar.com/2000/494/494%20n.v.%20varghese.htm.
- [42] Wetherell, Margaret. 2001. "Debates in Discourse Research." Pp 380-399 in *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, edited by Margaret, Wetherell. Stephanie, Taylor and Simeon. J. Yates. London: Sage