INDIAN STREAMS RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN NO : 2230-7850
IMPACT FACTOR : 5.1651 (UIF)
VOLUME - 16 | ISSUE - 1 | FEBRUARY – 2026

RECONCEPTUALISING HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY IN INDIA BEYOND QUANTIFIABLE MEASURES

Dr. Arvinder Singh Bhalla
Principal, Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamuna Nagar (Haryana).

ABSTRACT

Discussions on higher education in India usually revolve around visible and measurable signs of progress such as the number of universities, rising enrolment, campus buildings, laboratories, accreditation scores, research papers, and placement figures. These indicators are important, yet they cannot fully reflect the actual condition of the system. This article argues that tangible factors alone fail to capture the lived reality of students and teachers, because the deepest strengths and weaknesses of higher education lie in areas that are difficult to measure. Classroom engagement, quality of mentoring, academic freedom, student wellbeing, fairness in assessment, and social inclusion shape learning far more than statistics suggest. In many cases, institutions expand rapidly in size while the culture of learning remains weak. In other cases, colleges with limited resources create meaningful outcomes through committed teaching and supportive environments. A realistic understanding of Indian higher education must therefore blend measurable data with the invisible forces that determine genuine learning. Higher education in India is often presented like a scorecard. People talk about gross enrolment ratio, the number of colleges and universities, new campuses, faculty strength, accreditation grades, publication counts, and placement percentages. These figures are easy to collect, easy to compare, and easy to display in reports. They help governments demonstrate progress and institutions advertise success. But if we rely only on tangible indicators, we end up seeing only the outer shell of Indian higher education, not its real condition.

KEYWORDS: *campus buildings, laboratories, accreditation scores, research papers, and placement figures.*

INTRODUCTION

Education is not the same as construction. A campus can look impressive, but still fail to deliver deep learning. The presence of buildings, smart classrooms, laboratories, and libraries does not automatically mean that students are learning well. Learning depends on people, relationships, and intellectual atmosphere. Two colleges can have similar facilities and similar student intake, yet the academic life inside them can feel completely different. In one, students may feel encouraged to ask questions, discuss ideas, and explore beyond the syllabus. In the other, students may attend lectures mechanically, fear making mistakes, and treat exams as the only purpose of being there. The tangible features might look similar, but the lived experience is not. India's rapid expansion of higher education proves this point. Over the last few decades, the system has grown massively. Seats have increased,

private colleges have multiplied, and new universities have been opened across states. On paper, this is a success story. Yet expansion in numbers does not guarantee expansion in quality. When growth happens faster than teacher preparation, curriculum reform, academic governance, and student support systems, the result can be a system that looks bigger but feels weaker.

Teaching quality is one of the most important realities that cannot be captured through simple counts. A faculty member listed in an official record does not automatically translate into effective teaching. Real teaching depends on clarity, preparation, curiosity, patience, and the ability to connect with students who come from different backgrounds. In many Indian institutions, teaching becomes focused on finishing the syllabus rather than developing understanding. Students may pass exams, but still struggle to explain concepts in their own words. They may earn degrees, but remain unsure how to read critically, write academically, or solve problems independently. None of this is visible in the usual tangible indicators. Research output is another area where numbers can be misleading. Universities are increasingly judged by publications, citations, patents, and grants. These measures matter, but they can also distort academic priorities. When institutions chase targets, the temptation to produce more papers quickly increases. This encourages superficial research and can even support the spread of low-quality publishing practices. At the same time, meaningful work such as long-term field research, regional language scholarship, and community-oriented studies may not fit neatly into high scoring categories. So the tangible record may suggest research strength while the actual intellectual contribution remains uneven.

Assessment practices also show how the real picture can differ from measurable results. High pass percentages and rising grades can appear impressive. But if exams reward memorization rather than reasoning, the learning behind those results is shallow. In India, many students succeed by reproducing notes instead of developing analysis. When this happens, tangible outcomes like marks and graduation rates become weak signals of real education. They reflect performance within a system, not mastery of knowledge or skills. Student wellbeing is another dimension that tangible measures rarely address. Higher education is not only an academic process but also a social and emotional one. Many students deal with financial pressure, family expectations, anxiety, and uncertainty about the future. First generation learners often carry additional burdens, because they may not have guidance at home about navigating college life. Mental health challenges can affect attention, motivation, and confidence, yet they remain largely invisible in the standard way institutions are evaluated. A college can show strong enrollment and retention numbers while many students silently struggle.

Social inclusion is often reduced to admission statistics, but inclusion is more than entry. India has reservation policies and many institutions report data on representation. However, the real question is whether students feel respected and supported after they arrive. Students from marginalized communities may face subtle discrimination, isolation, or lack of academic confidence, especially when the classroom culture is not sensitive to diversity. They may be present in numbers but absent in participation. Such realities cannot be captured by tangible metrics alone. Language plays a major role in shaping academic experience in India. Many higher education programs, especially those seen as prestigious, rely heavily on English. For students who studied in regional languages, this becomes a serious barrier. They may understand ideas but struggle to express them in essays, seminars, or interviews. Over time, language barriers can reduce confidence and participation, even when students are capable. Tangible indicators like attendance or grades may not reveal how deeply language shapes learning. A student may appear average on paper while being intellectually strong but linguistically constrained.

Mentorship is another invisible factor that often determines outcomes. For many Indian students, especially those from rural or low-income backgrounds, a supportive teacher can change everything. Mentors help students choose paths, apply for scholarships, prepare for exams, and build self-belief. In institutions where mentoring is strong, students often grow beyond their initial limitations. In institutions where teachers are distant or overloaded, students may drift without

direction. Yet mentorship cannot be measured like a laboratory or a classroom. It is felt in the confidence students carry and the choices they dare to make. Institutional culture also matters in ways that are difficult to quantify. A university's culture includes how it treats questioning, debate, disagreement, and creativity. An institution may have excellent facilities, but if students are discouraged from speaking freely or if academic life is reduced to compliance, the university loses its purpose. Higher education should train minds to handle complexity, not just prepare students to follow instructions. The ability to think critically, argue respectfully, and engage with different viewpoints is central to education, but it is rarely included in tangible evaluations.

Governance and administrative practices shape academic reality as well. Many institutions in India struggle with delays, political interference, poor accountability, and weak planning. These issues influence hiring, promotions, admissions, and the use of funds. A college may have resources but fail to use them well due to poor management. Another college with limited resources may create strong learning outcomes through transparent leadership and committed faculty. Tangible factors show what exists, but not how well it is used. The expansion of private higher education illustrates the limits of judging by visible signs. Private institutions often invest heavily in infrastructure because it attracts students. Campuses may look modern and well equipped. Yet the real educational experience depends on academic practices, teacher development, and ethical standards. Some private colleges offer excellent learning environments. Others operate mainly for profit, with high fees and limited academic support. In such cases, tangible assets can become a marketing tool rather than a sign of real quality.

Placement statistics are perhaps the most popular tangible measure of success. Families understandably want assurance that education will lead to jobs. But placement numbers can hide many realities. Some institutions report selectively. Some benefit from location and networks rather than academic strength. Some train students for interviews without building long term skills. A graduate who learns adaptability, critical thinking, and communication may thrive over decades even if their first job is modest. Another graduate may secure an early placement through coaching but struggle later when work demands creativity and independent learning. Tangible placement figures do not capture these long term differences.

Regional inequality also complicates any purely measurable portrayal. Colleges in big cities often benefit from access to industries, conferences, libraries, and exposure to diverse opportunities. Rural colleges may appear weaker in rankings and visible resources. Yet many rural institutions play a crucial role in social mobility. They educate students who would otherwise be excluded from higher education. They produce teachers, administrators, nurses, and professionals who strengthen local communities. Their impact is not always reflected in research output or placement numbers, but it is socially significant.

Digital education offers another example. Many institutions now highlight online platforms, smart classrooms, and internet connectivity. These are tangible indicators of modernization. But the effectiveness of digital learning depends on how teachers design instruction and how students experience access. Technology can support learning, but it can also become a substitute for real engagement. Students may log in but remain disengaged. Others may be excluded due to lack of devices, data costs, or quiet spaces at home. Tangible digital infrastructure does not guarantee equitable learning. Curriculum relevance is another crucial factor that cannot be understood through physical indicators. Many programs still follow outdated syllabi, limited interdisciplinary exposure, and exam focused content. A course may exist on paper and meet regulatory requirements, yet fail to prepare students for contemporary challenges. Students may graduate without strong writing skills, data literacy, ethical reasoning, or creativity. The presence of departments and programs is tangible, but what is taught and how it is taught is often the real issue.

Academic freedom and openness also influence the real state of higher education. Universities are meant to be spaces where ideas can be explored without fear. When teachers and students feel pressure to avoid certain topics, or when dissent is treated as disloyalty, the intellectual mission of the

university is weakened. Such conditions are difficult to measure, but they shape what research is pursued, what questions are asked, and how students learn to think.

Peer learning is another invisible force. Much of what students gain from higher education comes from friendships, discussions, group work, clubs, and informal debates. A campus with a strong peer culture can push students to read more, think more, and develop confidence. A campus with social fragmentation, bullying, or exclusion can damage learning even if facilities are good. Tangible indicators do not reflect the quality of student community, yet it strongly affects outcomes.

Finally, the credibility of degrees itself cannot be measured only by counts. India produces millions of graduates, which is a significant achievement. Yet employers often report gaps in communication, problem solving, and practical application. This shows that graduation numbers do not automatically translate into capability. Credential inflation can occur when degrees become widespread but not always meaningful. The real state of higher education depends on whether society trusts what a degree represents, and that trust is shaped by lived experience and institutional reputation, not only by tangible inputs. None of this means tangible indicators are useless. They are necessary. Without data on access, infrastructure, staffing, and outcomes, policy making becomes guesswork. The problem begins when numbers are treated as the full truth. Education is not only an output but also a process, and the most powerful parts of that process are often invisible. A realistic portrayal of higher education in India must therefore combine measurable factors with qualitative understanding of teaching, assessment, student support, inclusion, academic culture, and intellectual freedom.

In the end, tangible factors can describe the skeleton of higher education, but not its heartbeat. The real condition of Indian higher education lies in what happens inside classrooms, in how students are treated, in whether teachers feel motivated and supported, and in whether campuses nurture curiosity and courage. If India wants not only a large system but also a meaningful one, it must learn to look beyond what can be counted and pay attention to what can be experienced.