

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT

I  
J  
R  
C  
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

*Indexed & Listed at:*

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A., Google Scholar,

Indian Citation Index (ICI), J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at Infliinet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)],

Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 (2012) & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 6408 Cities in 196 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

# CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	<p><b>REAL ESTATE (REGULATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 2016 – DELIGHT FOR THE CONSUMERS WITH REFERENCE TO THE SIVAGANGA DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU</b></p> <p><i>S. ANITHA &amp; Dr. A. ABBAS MANTHIRI</i></p>	1
2.	<p><b>AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE GEOGRAPHICAL SEGMENTATION IN FMCG COMPANIES</b></p> <p><i>AMANDEEP SINGH &amp; ASHU JAIN</i></p>	4
3.	<p><b>A COMPARISON OF FINANCING PATTERN OF HYDERABAD CENTRAL UNIVERSITY (HCU) AND OSMANIA UNIVERSITY (OU)</b></p> <p><i>B.SUMALTA &amp; Dr. LAXMAN GADDAM</i></p>	10
4.	<p><b>EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT: A TOOL FOR TALENT MANAGEMENT, RETENTION AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION IN THE IT/ITES COMPANIES IN INDIA</b></p> <p><i>RANNA BHATT &amp; MAHIMA SHARMA</i></p>	19
5.	<p><b>IMPACT OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PRACTICES ON SHAREHOLDER VALUE OF SELECTED INDIAN COMPANIES</b></p> <p><i>ARPIT RASTOGI</i></p>	23
	<b>REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK &amp; DISCLAIMER</b>	27

**FOUNDER PATRON****Late Sh. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Former State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana  
 Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri  
 Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

**CO-ORDINATOR****Dr. BHAVET**

Former Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

**ADVISOR****Prof. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

**EDITOR****Dr. NAWAB ALI KHAN**

Professor & Dean, Faculty of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

**CO-EDITOR****Dr. G. BRINDHA**

Professor & Head, Dr.M.G.R. Educational & Research Institute (Deemed to be University), Chennai

**EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD****Dr. SIKANDER KUMAR**

Vice Chancellor, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

**Dr. A SAJEEVAN RAO**

Professor & Director, Accurate Institute of Advanced Management, Greater Noida

**Dr. CHRISTIAN EHIUBUCHE**

Professor of Global Business/Management, Larry L Luing School of Business, Berkeley College, USA

**Dr. JOSÉ G. VARGAS-HERNÁNDEZ**

Research Professor, University Center for Economic & Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

**Dr. TEGUH WIDODO**

Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, Telkom University, Bandung Technoplex, Jl. Telekomunikasi, Indonesia

**Dr. M. S. SENAM RAJU**

Professor, School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**Dr. KAUP MOHAMED**

Dean & Managing Director, London American City College/ICBEST, United Arab Emirates

**Dr. D. S. CHAUBEY**

Professor & Dean (Research & Studies), Uttaranchal University, Dehradun

**Dr. ARAMIDE OLUFEMI KUNLE**

Dean, Department of General Studies, The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Nigeria

**Dr. SYED TABASSUM SULTANA**

Principal, Matrusri Institute of Post Graduate Studies, Hyderabad

**Dr. MIKE AMUHAYA IRAVO**

Principal, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Tech., Westlands Campus, Nairobi-Kenya

**Dr. NEPOMUCENO TIU**

Chief Librarian & Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines University, Laguna, Philippines

**Dr. BOYINA RUPINI**

Director, School of ITS, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi

**Dr. FERIT ÖLÇER**

Professor &amp; Head of Division of Management &amp; Organization, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Economics &amp; Business Administration Sciences, Mustafa Kemal University, Turkey

**Dr. SANJIV MITTAL**

Professor &amp; Dean, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi

**Dr. SHIB SHANKAR ROY**

Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

**Dr. SRINIVAS MADISHETTI**

Professor, School of Business, Mzumbe University, Tanzania

**Dr. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engg. &amp; Tech., Amity University, Noida

**Dr. KEVIN LOW LOCK TENG**

Associate Professor, Deputy Dean, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Perak, Malaysia

**Dr. OKAN VELI ŞAFAKLI**

Professor &amp; Dean, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Cyprus

**Dr. V. SELVAM**

Associate Professor, SSL, VIT University, Vellore

**Dr. BORIS MILOVIC**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Sport, Union Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

**Dr. N. SUNDARAM**

Associate Professor, VIT University, Vellore

**Dr. IQBAL THONSE HAWALDAR**

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, Kingdom University, Bahrain

**Dr. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA**

Associate Professor, Government College, Hodal

**Dr. ALEXANDER MOSESOV**

Associate Professor, Kazakh-British Technical University (KBTU), Almaty, Kazakhstan

**RODRECK CHIRAU**

Associate Professor, Botho University, Francistown, Botswana

**Dr. PARDEEP AHLAWAT**

Associate Professor, Institute of Management Studies &amp; Research, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

**Dr. DEEPANJANA VARSHNEY**

Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Dr. BIEMBA MALITI**

Associate Professor, School of Business, The Copperbelt University, Main Campus, Zambia

**Dr. SHIKHA GUPTA**

Associate Professor, Lingaya's Lalita Devi Institute of Management &amp; Sciences, New Delhi

**Dr. KIARASH JAHANPOUR**

Dean of Technology Management Faculty, Farabi Institute of Higher Education, Karaj, Alborz, I.R. Iran

**Dr. SAMBHAVNA**

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

**YU-BING WANG**

Faculty, department of Marketing, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan

**Dr. TITUS AMODU UMORU**

Professor, Kwara State University, Kwara State, Nigeria

**Dr. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE**

Faculty, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

**Dr. THAMPOE MANAGALESWARAN**

Faculty, Vavuniya Campus, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

**Dr. JASVEEN KAUR**

Head of the Department/Chairperson, University Business School, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar

**SURAJ GAUDEL**

BBA Program Coordinator, LA GRANDEE International College, Simalchaur - 8, Pokhara, Nepal

**Dr. RAJESH MODI**

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**Dr. BHAVET**

Former Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

**FORMER TECHNICAL ADVISOR**

**AMITA**

**FINANCIAL ADVISORS**

**DICKEN GOYAL**

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

**NEENA**

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

**LEGAL ADVISORS**

**JITENDER S. CHAHAL**

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

**CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA**

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

**SUPERINTENDENT**

**SURENDER KUMAR POONIA**

## **CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS**

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** **anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website ([FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)).

## **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT**

### 1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE EDITOR**

IJRCM

**Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF** \_\_\_\_\_

**(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)**

**DEAR SIR/MADAM**

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' \_\_\_\_\_ ' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

**NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR** :

Designation/Post\* :

Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code :

Residential address with Pin Code :

Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code :

Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No) :

Landline Number (s) with country ISD code :

E-mail Address :

Alternate E-mail Address :

Nationality :

\* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation etc. **The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.**

**NOTES:**

- a) The whole manuscript has to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. **pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration.**
  - b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail:**  
**New Manuscript for Review in the area of** (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)
  - c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.
  - d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB**.
  - e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.
  - f) **The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.
  - g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.
2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters, centered and fully capitalised**.
  3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline number (s), and email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.
  4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.
  5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully Italic printing**, ranging between **150 to 300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA**. **Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.**
  6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.
  7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at [www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php](http://www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php). However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.
  8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. **It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end.**
  9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
  10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
  11. **MAIN TEXT:**

***THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:*****INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESIS (ES)****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****LIMITATIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE****The manuscript should preferably be in 2000 to 5000 WORDS, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.**



12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR, centered, separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.**
13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.
14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.
15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. **The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper.** The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
  - Use **(ed.)** for one editor, and **(ed.s)** for multiple editors.
  - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.
  - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
  - The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
  - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
  - **Headers, footers, endnotes and footnotes should not be used in the document.** However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders before the references.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**

**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

**JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES**

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

**CONFERENCE PAPERS**

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

**UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS**

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

**WEBSITES**

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>



## A COMPARISON OF FINANCING PATTERN OF HYDERABAD CENTRAL UNIVERSITY (HCU) AND OSMANIA UNIVERSITY (OU)

**B.SUMALTA**

**RESEARCH SCHOLAR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, OSMANIA UNIVERSITY, HYDERABAD; &  
ASST. PROFESSOR  
GIRRAJ GOVERNMENT DEGREE COLLEGE (A)  
NIZAMBAD**

**Dr. LAXMAN GADDAM  
FORMER DEAN & PROFESSOR  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
OSMANIA UNIVERSITY  
HYDERABAD**

### ABSTRACT

*This paper is about internal and external sources of finance pertaining to central and state university of HCU and OU. Analysis is done by using growth rates, percentage and independent sample T test for testing the hypotheses between HCU and OU. It is observed that plan grants of HCU showing very huge in compare to OU and with respect to non-plan grants of OU have shown more than the HCU and internal sources of finance of OU have been reported higher than HCU. It is found that external sources of finance of central universities are good rather than state universities, but state universities lagging behind in receiving of funds from state government. It is a pressing need to funding to state universities by the state government to develop state universities as like as central universities. A modest attempt is made to discuss central and state university financing pattern over a period of 10 years ranging from 2004-05 to 2013-14.*

### KEYWORDS

HCU, OU, internal finance, lagging.

### JEL CODES

H52, I22.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Universities require finances to prepare knowledgeable and skilled people to the nation, who in turn are employed in various sectors of the economy, so as to place it on the path of development. This Chapter also typically denotes with raising funds from various sources available to Hyderabad Central University and Osmania University. First it devoted with sources of Central University followed by State University. Sources maintaining on components of extreme and internal funds which forms major source of finance for both the Universities. The second major source constitutes Student's fees streamline which has also been presented in this Chapter. An attempt also made to present comparative study of plan and non-plan grants. The University Grants Commission has been providing grants to central and State universities, both under plan (Development) and non-plan (Maintenance) Schemes while assistance to State Universities is being made available only under Plan Schemes Under General Plan Development assistance, the UGC assists each eligible University for the overall development covering the aspects namely, enhancing access, ensuring equity, imparting relevant education, improving quality and excellence. Making their University administration more effective, providing more Faculty Improvement Programmes, enhancing facilities for students, elevate research facilities and any other plans of University. The UGC provides grants to the Central Universities for two purpose-development (plan) and maintenance (Non-plan). The grants are thus called development grants and maintenance grants. The plan grants are provided for the improvement of the infrastructure and basic facilities. The non-plan grant provided on actual basis for meeting the recurring expenditure on salaries and non-salary items, the part of non-salary items includes maintenance of laboratories, libraries and buildings apart from the payments of taxes, electricity and telephone bills, payment of TA/DA etc.

### II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this section, an attempt is made to review of literature focusing on studies related to financing the higher education in central and state universities. Review of related literature is one of the most important steps in any type of educational research work.

1. **Nanjundappa, D.M (1976)**, He has made a study on 'Working of University Finances', with reference to Karnataka University. He pointed out that (i) the enormous growth in aggregate expenditure that not kept pace with the growth in enrolment; (ii) there had been a marked decline in 'per pupil' expenditure reflecting a fall in the facilities for higher education; (iii) the increase in UGC grants was very meager when compared to those of the state government- the per 'pupil' grant UGC was found to be negation a constant prices; (iv) the gap between the cost of higher education and the fees charged was widening as a result of not taking into consideration of the income-earning capacity of the education and (v) therefore, there was a need for closer alignment between costs and fees, and it should be supplemented by a more liberal scheme of scholarships and free ships for the deserving students on merit and on the basis of economic status.
2. **M. Sulochana (1991)** studied the finances of Osmania and Andhra University and found that amongst others, in spite of increase in the student strength, there was 12 no proportionate increase in the fees income. Osmania University has been charging lower rate of fees from correspondence studies just to recover the expenditure but not to earn any margin. It was also observed that budgeting and audit control were not found to be very effective in both the universities. The share of academic expenditure in the total normal expenditure dropped to 45% in 1885-86 from 48% in 1970-71 and the ratio of teaching and non-teaching staff ratio decreased to 1:4.5 in 1980-81 from 1:3.8 in 1972-73 and rose to 1:3.3 in 1985-86.
3. **Panchamukhi, P.R (1996)**, in his study "University Finance in India", He observe that University finances in the form of reduced plan and Non-plan allocation and compressed budget, resulting in poor maintenance of even basic things like buildings and toilets, not to speak of library and research facilities. He finds that plan allocations to university in the total plan allocations to education rising from 9% in the first plan to 25% in the fourth plan and then declining to 72% in the seventh plan. He concludes that a long term impact of pushing the country down in terms of economic development, skilled manpower supply and R&D.

### III. NEED AND IMPORTANCE

In this context, this study assumes importance in analyzing financial resources pattern, cost and fee structure of central and state universities, and offers recommendations to both the central and state government and ton universities for improving the overall financial management of central and state universities. Financial management is not an isolated issue but is linked to the quality of education being offered and the governance of universities. Hence, there is a need to make in depth study into finance issues, systems improvement, academic and government related matters.

**IV STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Universities are suffering from dearth of funds to manage and compete with International Universities.

**V. OBJECTIVES**

1. To study the internal and external funds of the HCU and OU.
2. To examine the financing pattern of both universities.
3. To compare the financing pattern of both universities.

**VI. HYPOTHESIS**

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of financing patterns of both universities.

**VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Analysis is done using the growth rates, percentages and independent sample **t test**.

**VIII. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS****TABLE 1: COMPONENTS OF EXTERNAL FUNDS (PLAN AND NON-PLAN GRANTS) OF HCU (Rupees in Crore)**

Year	Plan grants	% of plan grants to total Grants	Non-plan grants	% of non-plan grants to total grants	Total
2004-2005	2.20	5.74	36.11	94.26	38.31
2005-2006	12.23	26.18	34.47	73.82	46.70
2006-2007	13.66	59.94	43.32	49.06	56.99
2007-2008	22.41	30.20	51.80	69.80	74.21
2008-2009	98.20	55.06	80.15	44.94	178.36
2009-2010	130.19	52.40	118.24	47.60	248.44
2010-2011	26.16	20.99	98.46	79.01	124.62
2011-2012	90.00	39.22	116.36	60.78	229.46
2012-2013	98.44	39.97	145.69	60.03	246.28
2013-2014	44.50	23.48	145.05	76.52	189.55
Total	537.99	-	869.65	-	1432.92

**Source:** Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU

It is depicted in the above table 1, the quantum of both plan and non-plan grants (together known as external sources) provided to HCU by the Central Government during the period 2004-2005 to 2013-2014. From the year 2004-05 the plan grant is showing huge amount, an upward movement is reported during the year (2005-06, 2008-09, 2009-10) while it was almost constant in 2011-12 and 2012-13. It is exhibited from the table that the non-plan grants were reported high for the first time in the year 2004-05 later little fluctuation in the figures but increasing in nature at finally, during study period.

Hence, it is concluded that progressively increasing in internal sources, will be resulted on decreasing on non-plan grant from the government, and subsequently disappeared the development of the university some extent. In this context, Justice Punnayya committee recommended that the UGC may provide a matching grant as an incentive to universities generating additional resources. As a sequel to the table 1 and 2 external and internal sources of finance to analyze the share of each of these sources in total sources to find out the periods in which they have been a major component in the total financing of HCU.

**TABLE 2: COMPONENTS OF INTERNAL FUNDS OF HCU (Rupees in crore)**

Year	Students fee	Receipts From publications	Interest on Bank Deposits	Others	Total
2004-2005	2.04 (42.50)	0.05 (1.04)	1.46 (30.42)	1.25 (26.04)	4.80 (100.00)
2005-2006	2.30 (51.00)	0.07 (1.55)	1.45 (32.15)	0.69 (15.30)	4.51 (100.00)
2006-2007	2.22 (63.25)	0.07 (1.99)	0.36 (10.26)	0.86 (24.50)	3.51 (100.00)
2007-2008	2.09 (51.48)	0.01 (0.25)	0.86 (21.18)	1.10 (27.09)	4.06 (100.00)
2008-2009	2.33 (43.88)	0.02 (0.38)	1.96 (36.91)	1.00 (18.83)	5.31 (100.00)
2009-2010	2.68 (57.63)	0.03 (0.65)	0.90 (19.35)	1.04 (22.37)	4.65 (100.00)
2010-2011	3.87 (41.66)	0.03 (0.32)	3.19 (34.34)	2.20 (23.68)	9.29 (100.00)
2011-2012	4.41 (40.09)	0.02 (0.18)	3.53 (32.09)	3.04 (27.64)	11.00 (100.00)
2012-2013	5.92 (54.51)	0.03 (0.28)	1.39 (12.80)	3.52 (32.41)	10.86 (100.00)
2013-2014	6.01 (39.10)	0.02 (0.13)	4.26 (27.72)	5.08 (33.05)	15.37 (100.00)

**Source:** Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU

Note: figures in parenthesis are percentages total.

It may be seen table 2 from the internal components of finance are presented as student's fee, receipts from publications (including sale of course material and royalties received), interest on bank deposits and others the category of other includes all minor items (like income from building and other prosperities, capitalized value of pensioners benefits of employees received from parent institutions for the period of service rendered prior to joining HCU).

It is observed from the table that, throughout the period under study, fee from the students accounted for a dominant share of internal funds. Its share stood at 40 per cent and above right from the year 2004-05 to 2013-14. The share of HCU went up to 63.25 per cent, in 2006-07 indicating high performance. The remaining sources like receipts from publications interest on bank deposits and other sources had registered a fluctuating share to total internal sources over the period. It can be concluded that the fee from the students has emerged as the dominant source of internal funds to the university. It is therefore, suggested that the university should make its efforts to sustain the student enrolment so as to become increasingly.

TABLE 3: FINANCES OF HCU (Rupees in crore)

Year	External funds to total Sources	% Govt. Grants to total sources	Internal Funds	% Internal Funds to total Sources	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
2004-2005	38.31	88.87	4.80	11.13	43.11
2005-2006	46.70	91.19	4.51	8.81	51.21
2006-2007	56.99	94.20	3.51	5.80	60.50
2007-2008	74.21	94.81	4.06	5.19	78.27
2008-2009	178.36	97.11	5.31	2.89	183.67
2009-2010	248.44	98.16	4.65	1.84	253.09
2010-2011	124.62	93.06	9.29	6.94	133.91
2011-2012	229.46	95.50	11.00	4.50	240.46
2012-2013	246.28	95.78	10.86	4.22	257.14
2013-2014	189.55	92.50	15.37	7.50	204.92
Total	1432.92 (95.13)	-	73.36 (4.87)	-	1506.28 (100.00)

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU.

Table 3 presents the share of external funds and internally generated funds in the overall structure of finances of HCU. The grants consist of both plan and non-plan grants provided by the central government agencies and the state government. These funds may be categorized as external sources of finance to HCU. The internal sources comprise the tuition fee, eligibility test fee, fee charged for issue of various certificates, interest on bank deposits, amount realized for sale of applications and university publications, miscellaneous fee etc.

It can be seen from the table that the external sources of financing accounted for above 90 per cent in the 9 years in out of 10 years and below 90 per cent in 1 year. Thorough out the period under study the share of external funds was releasing grants to the university depending on the availability of funds rather than on set criteria in releasing the grants. The internal funds are below 10 per cent in the 9 years and above 10 per cent in the one year, that the university received in absolute terms was fluctuating between 4.80crores and 15.37crores showing a greater variability in its share. Thus, it can be concluded that OU has been strengthening its financial position by augmenting constantly its internal sources year after year.

TABLE 4: COMPONENTS SOURCES OF FUNDING OF HCU (Rupees in crore)

Year	Grants From Govt.	Students fee	Receipts From publications	Interest on Bank Deposits	Other Sources	Total
2004-2005	6.66 (58.12)	2.04 (17.80)	0.05 (0.44)	1.46 (12.73)	1.25 (10.91)	11.46 (100.00)
2005-2006	15.85 (77.85)	2.30 (11.30)	0.07 (0.35)	1.45 (7.12)	0.69 (3.38)	20.36 (100.00)
2006-2007	10.96 (75.74)	2.22 (15.34)	0.07 (0.48)	0.36 (2.49)	0.86 (5.95)	14.47 (100.00)
2007-2008	55.94 (93.24)	2.09 (3.48)	0.01 (0.02)	0.86 (1.43)	1.10 (1.83)	60.00 (100.00)
2008-2009	29.76 (84.86)	2.33 (6.64)	0.02 (0.06)	1.96 (5.59)	1.00 (2.85)	35.07 (100.00)
2009-2010	34.11 (88.00)	2.68 (6.91)	0.03 (0.08)	0.90 (2.32)	1.04 (2.68)	38.76 (100.00)
2010-2011	28.19 (75.21)	3.87 (10.33)	0.03 (0.08)	3.19 (8.51)	2.20 (5.87)	37.48 (100.00)
2011-2012	45.50 (80.52)	4.41 (7.81)	0.02 (0.04)	3.53 (6.25)	3.04 (5.38)	56.50 (100.00)
2012-2013	35.91 (76.78)	5.92 (12.66)	0.03 (0.06)	1.39 (2.97)	3.52 (7.53)	46.77 (100.00)
2013-2014	1.40 (8.35)	6.01 (35.84)	0.02 (0.12)	4.26 (25.40)	5.08 (30.29)	16.77 (100.00)

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU

Table 4 depicts the individual components of sources of funding HCU. It may be observed from the table from the years 2003-04 to 2013-14 grants from the government of India generated for a dominant share against of total sources of HCU. The grants from Government accounted for 93.18 per cent in 2007-08. However from the year 2008-09 is started declining and by the year 2013-14. It was just 8.35 per cent to total sources; its share was also significant in the year 2007-08. 93.24 per cent in total sources. The fee from the students emerged as a major sources of financing HCU requirements. It can be seen from the table that the fee from the students was just 3.48 per cent in 2007-08 increased 6.64 per cent in 2008-09 touched to a peak level of 35.84 per cent in 2013-14 and stood ultimately at 10.33 per cent in 2010-11 against the total sources fee from student increased in the year 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

This happened so because of increase in enrolment of various programmes offered by the university. The sources like receipts from publications registered a share of less than 0.02 per cent to total sources with loss of volatility in its share over the period under study. Likewise, the interest on bank deposits earned was 25.40 per cent in 2013-2014 as against just 1.43 per cent in 2007-08 indicating that the HCU had invested the idle funds in a more lucrative manner. All the other sources put together was less than 30.29 per cent for the period under study of course, with lots of ups and downs. It is concluded that grants received from government constituted a major share to total sources from the year 2007-2008 to 2012-2013 and then fee from the students emerged as a major sources of finance in the overall structure of financing HCU. This can be regarded as positive trend as the university is generating internal funds to a great extent in the form of student fee, thereby the burden on the government to finance the university being reduced year after year. From the foregoing analysis, it may be understood that HCU has been constantly trying to augment its internal sources especially by increasing its enrolment of students year after year and thus augurs well for the institution.

#### ENROLLMENT AND FEE RECEIPTS OF HCU

The enrolment figures are dependents on the number of programmes and the number of students getting enrolled in these programmes. The programmes offered can be classified as high tag (less technical). The fee structure reflects this classification.

TABLE 5: FEE RECEIPTS FROM STUDENTS OF HCU

Year	No of Enrolment	Fee from students (Rupees in crore)
2004-2005	2530	2.04
2005-2006	2641	2.30
2006-2007	2707	2.22
2007-2008	3067	2.09
2008-2009	3426	2.33
2009-2010	4160	2.68
2010-2011	4746	3.87
2011-2012	4875	4.41
2012-2013	4939	5.92
2013-2014	5159	6.01

Source: Vice-Chancellor's Convocation reports and annual accounts of HCU

It is evidence from the Table 5 that the HCU went on enhancing its internal resources by increasing the enrolment of students in various programmes year after year. The enrolment of the students and fee collected from them stood at 2530 and Rs.2.04 crores respectively in the year 2004-2005 rose to 3067 in enrolment generating a fee 2.09 crores in 2007-2008. It may also be observed that up to the year 2013-2014, the enrolment as well as the fee from the students had been on rise steadily, though the enrolment in computer programmes across the institutions due to fluctuating demand in the industry. The fee charged for these programmes were very high when compared to other conventional programmes, owing to this the increase in enrolment has not resulted in an increase in total fee paid by the students.

#### RESOURCES OF OSMANIA UNIVERSITY

Osmania University was Established in 1918, Osmania University is the third oldest University in South India and the seventh oldest in the entire country. Its territorial jurisdiction for affiliation extends to three districts of Telangana viz. Hyderabad, Ranga Reddy and Medak. However, it fulfills the higher education aspirations of about 60 million people in the entire 10 districts of Telangana State covering un-served and under-served areas. Osmania University is a multi-campus (8 campus colleges, 5 constituent colleges and 5 district PG colleges), multi-faculty (12 faculties), and affiliating University with 750 colleges.

TABLE 6: EXTERNAL FUNDS (PLAN AND NON-PAN GRANTS) OF OU (Rupees in Crore)

Year	Plan Grants	% of Plan Grants To Total Grants	Non-Plan Grants	% of Non-Plan Grants To Total Grants	Total Grants
2004-2005	2.31	3.32	67.32	96.68	69.63
2005-2006	6.50	8.31	71.69	91.68	78.19
2006-2007	1.05	1.13	92.99	98.87	94.05
2007-2008	5.09	5.20	92.99	94.80	98.09
2008-2009	2.78	5.35	49.21	94.63	52.00
2009-2010	2.23	2.89	75.00	97.11	77.23
2010-2011	47.14	26.53	130.52	73.46	177.67
2011-2012	72.29	37.23	121.90	62.77	194.19
2012-2013	182.89	52.40	166.14	47.60	349.03
2013-2014	55.81	24.70	170.14	75.30	225.95
Total	378.09	-	1037.9	-	1416.03

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of OU

It is seen from the table 6 the plan grants divided by central statutory bodies, UGC, etc. The plan grant was a very low 1.05 per cent in the year 2006-2007. It is increasing relatively for the years 2010-11 to 2013-2014. It can thus be concluded that both the State Government and Central Government are providing grants to the university purely on ad hoc basis. In Absolute figures accrued for not even one fourth of the total grants of the university expect in the years 2006-2007 and 2007-08 where it stood at 98.87 per cent and 94.80 per cent of the total grants received by the university further, in the year 2012-2013 non-plan grants was very low. It is observed from the table that a lot of fluctuations in the share of non-plan grants taking place the over the years. It was found that the total grants of the OU are fluctuating over a period under the study ranging from 69.63crores to 1416.03crores. The amount of plan grants is comparatively very low all the years. However, in the year 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13, the amounts of plan grant a lot of variations. In all the remaining years there was no significant change in the amount of plan grants in relation to non-plan grants. It is to be noted that a progressive increase in the share of non-plan grants would enable the university to complete with institutions higher learning not only at the national level but also at the international level as it would be helpful to develop sound infrastructure and also to keep itself abreast of the contemporary developments

TABLE 7: COMPONENTS OF INTERNAL FUNDS OF OU (Rupees in crore)

Year	Student fee	Receipts From publications	Interest on Bank Deposits	Other Sources of Income	Total
2004-2005	35.59 (82.75)	0.39 (0.90)	1.25 (2.91)	5.78 (13.44)	43.01 (100.00)
2005-2006	42.86 (84.15)	0.45 (0.88)	1.44 (2.83)	6.18 (12.14)	50.93 (100.00)
2006-2007	50.46 (90.46)	0.49 (0.88)	0.37 (0.66)	4.46 (7.99)	55.78 (100.00)
2007-2008	58.66 (89.91)	0.54 (0.83)	0.25 (0.38)	5.80 (8.88)	65.25 (100.00)
2008-2009	76.34 (93.32)	0.54 (0.66)	0.18 (0.22)	4.75 (5.80)	81.81 (100.00)
2009-2010	74.23 (92.56)	0.51 (0.63)	0.48 (0.60)	4.98 (6.21)	80.20 (100.00)
2010-2011	94.03 (94.08)	0.59 (0.59)	0.32 (0.32)	5.01 (5.01)	99.95 (100.00)
2011-2012	89.20 (93.67)	0.60 (0.63)	0.26 (0.27)	5.17 (5.43)	95.23 (100.00)
2012-2013	93.71 (93.56)	0.42 (0.42)	0.44 (0.44)	5.59 (5.58)	100.16 (100.00)
2013-2014	103.03 (93.66)	0.18 (0.16)	0.22 (0.20)	6.58 (5.98)	110.01 (100.00)

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of OU

Note: student fee include Tuition fee/Admission fee, Contribution from Self-financing courses and Academic Income.

It is seen table 7 from the internal components of finance are presented as students fee, receipts from publications (including sale of course material and royalties received), interest on bank deposits and others the category of other includes all minor items (like income from building and other prosperities, capitalized value of pensioners benefits of employees received from parent institutions for the period of service rendered prior to joining OU. It is observed from the table that, throughout the period under study, fee from the students accounted for a dominant share of internal funds. Its share stood at 80 per cent and above right from the year 2004-05 to 2013-14. At one stage its share went up to 94.08 per cent, in 2010-11 indicating that HCU has done a good job on this front. The remaining sources like receipts from publications interest on bank deposits and other sources had registered a fluctuating share to total internal sources over the period. It can be concluded that the fee from the students has emerged as the dominant source of internal funds to the university. It is therefore, suggested that the university should make its efforts to sustain the student enrolment so as to become increasingly. Internal sources accounted for more than two-thirds of the total sources of the study period. Thus, it can be concluded that OU has been strengthening its financial position by augmenting constantly its internal sources year after year. A similar trend was visible in the case of HCU also.

TABLE 8: FINANCES OF OU (Rupees in crore)

Year	External funds	% of External funds To Total Sources	Internal funds	% of Internal Funds to total sources	Total sources
2004-2005	69.63	61.82	43.01	38.18	112.64
2005-2006	78.19	60.51	50.93	39.49	129.12
2006-2007	94.05	62.77	55.78	37.23	149.83
2007-2008	98.09	60.05	65.25	39.95	163.34
2008-2009	52.00	38.86	81.81	48.00	133.81
2009-2010	77.23	49.06	80.20	50.94	157.43
2010-2011	177.67	64.00	99.95	36.00	277.62
2011-2012	194.19	67.10	95.23	32.90	289.42
2012-2013	349.03	77.70	100.16	22.30	449.19
2013-2014	225.95	67.26	110.01	32.74	335.96
Total	1416.03 (64.41)		782.33 (35.59)		2198.36 (100.00)

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of OU

Table 8 presents the share of government grants and internally generated funds in the overall structure of finances of O.U. the grants consist of both plan and non-plan grants provided by the central government agencies and the state government. These funds may be categorized as external sources of finance to O.U. the internal sources comprise the tuition fee, eligibility test fee, fee charged for issue of various certificates, interest on bank deposits, amount realized for sale of applications and university publications, miscellaneous fee etc.

It can be seen from the table that the external sources of financing accounted for above 70 per cent in the 1 year in out of 10 years and below 70 per cent in 9 years. Thorough out the period under study the share of external funds was releasing grants to the university depending on the availability of funds rather than on set criteria in releasing the grants. The internal funds are above 20 per cent in the all years, that the university received in absolute terms was fluctuating between 43.01crores and 110.01crores showing a greater variability in its share. Thus, it can be concluded that OU has been strengthening its financial position by augmenting constantly its internal sources year after year.

TABLE 9: COMPONENTS SOURCES OF FUNDING OF OU (Rupees in crore)

Year	Grants from Government	Students fee	Receipts From publications	Interest on Bank Deposits	Other Sources of Income	Total
2004-2005	-	35.59 (82.75)	0.39 (0.91)	1.25 (2.91)	5.78 (13.44)	43.01 (100)
2005-2006	-	42.86 (84.15)	0.45 (0.89)	1.44 (2.83)	6.18 (12.13)	50.93 (100)
2006-2007	0.20 (0.36)	50.46 (90.14)	0.49 (0.87)	0.37 (0.66)	4.46 (7.97)	55.98 (100)
2007-2008	0.25 (0.38)	58.66 (89.56)	0.54 (0.82)	0.25 (0.38)	5.80 (8.86)	65.50 (100)
2008-2009	0.38 (0.46)	76.34 (92.88)	0.54 (0.66)	0.18 (0.22)	4.75 (5.78)	82.19 (100)
2009-2010	0.10 (0.12)	74.23 (92.44)	0.51 (0.64)	0.48 (0.60)	4.98 (6.20)	80.30 (100)
2010-2011	0.03 (0.03)	94.03 (94.05)	0.59 (0.59)	0.32 (0.32)	5.01 (5.01)	99.98 (100)
2011-2012	0.03 (0.03)	89.20 (93.64)	0.60 (0.63)	0.26 (0.27)	5.17 (5.43)	95.26 (100)
2012-2013	50.26 (33.41)	93.71 (62.30)	0.42 (0.28)	0.44 (0.29)	5.59 (3.72)	150.42 (100)
2013-2014	-	103.03 (93.66)	0.18 (0.16)	0.22 (0.20)	6.58 (5.98)	110.01 (100)

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of OU

Table 9 depicts the individual components of sources of funding OU. It may be observed from the table from the years 2003-04 to 2013-14 grants from the government of India generated for a dominant share against of total sources of OU. The grants from Government accounted for 33.41 per cent in 2012-13. It was just 0.03 per cent to total sources; its share was also significant in the year 2010-2011 and 2011-12. The fee from the students emerged as a major sources of financing OU requirements. It can be seen from the table that the fee from the students increased 2004-05 to 2011-12 and it was just 62.30 per cent in 2012-13. 2013-14 was not received grants from government. This happened so because of increase in enrolment of various programmes offered by the university. The interest on bank deposits earned was 2.91 per cent in 2004-2005 as against just 0.20 per cent in 2013-2014 indicating that the OU had invested the idle funds in a more lucrative manner, All the other sources put together was less than 13.44 per cent for the period under study of course, with lots of ups and downs. It is concluded that grants received from government constituted a major share to total sources from the year 2012-2013 and then fee from the students emerged as a major sources of finance in the overall structure of financing OU. This can be regarded as positive trend as the university is generating internal funds to a great extent in the form of student fee, thereby the burden on the government to finance the university being reduced year after year.

From the foregoing analysis, it may be understood that OU has been constantly trying to augment its internal sources especially by increasing its enrolment of students year after year and thus augurs well for the institution.

**ENROLLMENT AND FEE RECEIPTS OF OU**

Having analyzed the financing structure of the university, it is now proposed to study the relationship between the total enrolment and the fee income from the students.

TABLE 10: ENROLMENT AND FEE INCOME OF OU

Year	No of Enrolment	Fee from Students (Rupees in crore)
2004-2005	10948	35.59
2005-2006	11633	42.86
2006-2007	11648	50.46
2007-2008	11200	58.66
2008-2009	10250	76.34
2009-2010	12694	74.23
2010-2011	12021	94.03
2011-2012	11226	89.20
2012-2013	11976	93.71
2013-2014	11453	103.03

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of O.U.

Table 10 shows the enrollment of students and the fee collected from them in the study period. The figures of enrollment present the students registered for various programmes. The fee collected from students comprise tuition fee, examination fee, eligibility test fee, fee reimbursement received from government for the SC and ST category students and other miscellaneous fee.

It may be seen from the Table 3.8 that the HCU went on enhancing its internal resources by increasing the enrolment of students in various programmes year after year. The enrolment of the students and fee collected from them stood at 10948 students and Rs.35.59 crores in the year 2004-2005 rose to 11453 in enrolment generating a fee 103.03 crores in 2013-14. The enrolment as well as the fee from the students had been on rise steadily, though the enrolment in computer programmes across the institutions due to fluctuating demand in the industry. The fee charged for these programmes were very high when compared to other conventional programmes, owing to this the increase in enrolment has not resulted in an increase in total fee paid by the students. Therefore, it is concluded that increase in enrolment may not always results in enhancement of total fee income as the programmes carrying low fee tag may make insignificant effect on total fee. Further, programmes carrying high fee tag, though the enrolment stands low, may produce significant effect on total fee income.

#### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOURCES OF FINANCES OF HCU AND OU

The sources of funding the state university i.e., O.U., as pointed out earlier, are more or less similar to those of national university. However, in relative terms, the share of each component may not be the same for these two universities. It is now proposed to compare the grants position of HCU and O.U over the period of time.

TABLE 11: COMPARISON OF PLAN AND NON-PLAN GRANTS RECEIVED BY HCU AND OU (Figures in percentages)

Year	Plan Grants		Non-plan Grants	
	HCU	O.U	HCU	O.U
2004-2005	5.74	96.68	94.26	3.32
2005-2006	26.18	91.68	73.82	8.31
2006-2007	59.94	98.87	49.06	1.13
2007-2008	30.20	94.80	69.80	5.20
2008-2009	55.06	94.63	44.94	5.35
2009-2010	52.40	97.11	47.60	2.89
2010-2011	20.99	73.46	79.01	26.53
2011-2012	39.22	62.77	60.78	37.23
2012-2013	39.97	47.60	60.03	52.40
2013-2014	23.48	75.30	76.52	24.70

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of O.U

It is observed from the above table that the share of the plan grants the total grants was very meager i.e., 5.74 per cent for the year 2004-05, whereas it was as high as 59.94 percentages in the year 2006-07. The plan grants percentage of OU stands highest ranging over 90 percentages during the period 2004-05 to 2009-10. With regard to non-plan grants receive by HCU, it was maximum during 2004-05, i.e. 94.26 per cent of total grants received by HCU. However, its share started declining year after year with small variations. Contrary to this, OU was receiving substantial grants from Government of Telangana in the form of non-plan grants in almost all the years from 2004-05 to 2013-14 with minor variations. Thus, it is concluded that in respect of non-plan grants also, there are dissimilarities in the funding policies of the government.

Having studied the relative share of plan and non-plan grants received by HCU and OU, it is proposed to examine the relative share of grants (external funds) and internal funds to know their relative importance in the overall financing of the institutions.

TABLE 12: COMPARISON OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FUNDS IN FINANCING OF HCU AND OU (Figures in percentages)

Year	External funds		Internal funds	
	HCU	O.U	HCU	O.U
2004-2005	88.87	61.82	11.13	38.18
2005-2006	91.19	60.51	8.81	39.49
2006-2007	94.20	62.77	5.80	37.23
2007-2008	94.81	60.05	5.19	39.95
2008-2009	97.11	38.86	2.89	48.00
2009-2010	98.16	49.06	1.84	50.94
2010-2011	93.06	64.00	6.94	36.00
2011-2012	95.50	67.10	4.50	32.90
2012-2013	95.78	77.70	4.22	22.30
2013-2014	92.50	67.26	7.50	32.74

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU

A comparison of the outlay Table 12 presents the relative share of funds in the overall financing of HCU and O.U during the study period. The external funds of HCU is accounted for a major share of total sources above 90 per cent in all years except in the year 2004-05 and it started declining with a fluctuating trend indicating that the government funds received by HCU, its funds is compare with more than that of OU. In respect of internal funds of OU is accounted above 20 per cent in the all years and HCU is below 20 per cent in the all years. Internal funds is OU compare with more than that of HCU, is not in consonance with its developmental activities i.e. increase in enrollment, number of programmes, etc. Thus, it is concluded that there are dissimilarities in the funding policies adopted by Central/State government in respect of External funds.

Having studied share of internal and external funds in the overall financing of HCU and OU, it is proposed to take up the aspect of fee income of both these universities to arrive at the trend of fee income over a period of time by chain base method considered every current year as a base year for the subsequent year in a sequential order, to the extent of available data.



TABLE 13: TRENDS IN FEE INCOME RECEIVED FROM STUDENTS AT HCU AND OU

Year	HCU		O.U	
	Fee Income (Rs, in crore)	Per cent change over the previous year	Fee Income (Rs, in crore)	Per cent change over the previous year
2004-2005	2.04	100.00	35.59	100.00
2005-2006	2.30	112.75	42.86	120.43
2006-2007	2.22	96.52	50.46	117.73
2007-2008	2.09	94.14	58.66	116.25
2008-2009	2.33	111.48	76.34	130.14
2009-2010	2.68	115.02	74.23	97.24
2010-2011	3.87	144.40	94.03	126.67
2011-2012	4.41	113.95	89.20	94.86
2012-2013	5.92	134.24	93.71	105.06
2013-2014	6.01	101.52	103.03	109.95

Source: Compiled from Annual Accounts of HCU

Table 13 represents the fee income of HCU and O.U. In respect of HCU column No.3 of the table shows that the fee income right from 2008-09 to 2013-14 was showing an increasing trend (except in the years 2006-07 and 2007-08). This could be due to multiple causes like fall enrollment in high fee tag programmes i.e., Computer, low enrollment in other programmes etc. A consistent rise in fee income reveals that HCU would be better able to withstand any possible deduction in governmental support. With regard to OU the fee income over the previous years for the period observed in the table manifests that except in the years 2010-11, 2012-13, wherein the enrollment in post graduate programmes had drastically fallen and with marginal fall in other three years i.e., 2010-11 to 2012-13, the percentage of the trend for the remaining years, it implies that the state level university is also attempting to consolidate its finances position by generating more and more funds internally on the same lines of HCU at the national level.

Thus, it is concluded that, through the percentage of fee income over the previous year was increasing in most of the years in both the cases, the rate of increase at HCU was more when compared to that in OU. By and large, the trends in both in HCU and OU are similar except in the case of plan and non-plan grants.

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN SOURCES OF FINANCE OF HCU AND OU**

**t-Test Statistic**

TABLE 14: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR PLAN GRANTS

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	53.60	45.848	85.537	50.200	-2.558	18	.020
2.OU	103.80	41.838	40.306				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Plan Grants

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Plan Grants

As shown in table 14, the mean value of plan grants of HCU are Rs. 53.60crores, and that of OU is Rs. 103.80 showing a difference of Rs. 50.200crores. The standard Deviation in the Plan Grants during the period is Rs. 45.848 for HCU and Rs. 41.838 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in plan grants from year to year in case of HCU compared to OU.

The results of independent sample t-test produce a t-statistic value of -2.558. The 'p' value is 0.020 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Plan Grants.

TABLE 15: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR NON-PAN GRANTS

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	86.80	43.954	50.638	49100	2.142	18	.046
2.OU	37.70	57.623	152.847				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Non-Plan Grants

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Non-Plan Grants

It is observed from table 15, the mean value of Non-plan grants of HCU are Rs. 86.80 Crores, and that of OU is Rs. 37.70 showing a difference of Rs. 49100 crores. The standard Deviation in the Non-Plan Grants during the period is Rs. 43.954 for HCU and Rs. 57.623 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Non-plan grants from year to year in case of OU compared to HCU.

The result of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of 2.142. The 'p' value is 0.046 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Non-Plan Grants.

TABLE 16: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR STUDENTS FEE

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	3.30	1.636	49.588	-68500	-9.143	18	.000
2.OU	71.80	23.635	32.918				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Students fee

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Students fee

It is seen from Table 16, the mean value of Students fee of HCU are Rs. 3.30 crores, and that of OU is Rs. 71.80 showing a difference of Rs.-68500crores. The standard Deviation in the Students fee during the period is Rs. 1.636 for HCU and Rs. 23.635 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Students fee from year to year in case of HCU compared to OU.

The result of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of -9.143. The 'p' value is 0.000 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Students fee.

TABLE 17: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR RECEIPTS FROM PUBLICATIONS

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	0.00	.000	000.000	-.500	3000	18	.008
2.OU	0.50	.527	105.409				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Receipts from Publications

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Receipts from Publications



As shown in table 17, the mean value of Receipts from Publications of HCU are Rs. 0.00 crores, and that of OU is Rs. 0.50 showing a difference of Rs.-.500 crores. The standard Deviation in the Receipts from Publications during the period is Rs. 000 form HCU and Rs. 527 form OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Receipts from Publications from year to year in case of OU compared to HCU.

The result of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of 3000. The 'p' value is 0.008 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is Above 0.05, null hypothesis is Rejected and alternative hypothesis is Accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Receipts from Publications.

**TABLE 18: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR INTEREST ON BANK DEPOSITS**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	1.80	1.398	77.690	1.600	3.464	18	.003
2.OU	.20	.422	210.819				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Interest on Bank Deposits

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Interest on Bank Deposits

As shown in table 18, the mean value of Interest on Bank Deposits of HCU are Rs. 1.80 Crores, and that of OU is Rs. 20 showing a difference of Rs. 1.60crores. The standard Deviation in the Interest on Bank Deposits during the period is Rs. 1.398 for HCU and Rs. 422 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Interest on Bank Deposits from year to year in case of OU compared to HCU.

The results of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of 3464. The 'p' value is 0.003 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Interest on Bank Deposits.

**TABLE 19: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR OTHER SOURCE OF INCOME**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	2.00	1.491	74.536	-3.500	-6.450	18	.000
2.OU	5.50	.850	15.452				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Other Source of Income

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Other Source of Income

As shown in table 19, the mean value of Other Source of Income of HCU are Rs. 2.00 Crores, and that of OU is Rs. 5.50 showing a difference of Rs.-3.500crores. The standard Deviation in the Other Source of Income during the period is Rs. 1.491 for HCU and Rs. 850 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation(CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Other Source of Income from year to year in case of HCU compared to OU.

The results of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of -6.450. The 'p' value is 0.000 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Other Source of Income.

**TABLE 20: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR GRANTS FROM GOVERNMENT**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	26.50	17.615	66.471	19.357	2.165	15	.047
2.OU	7.14	18.898	264.575				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Grants from Government

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Grants from Government

It indicates table 20, the mean value of Grants from Government of HCU are Rs. 26.50Crores, and that of OU is Rs. 7.14 showing a difference of Rs.19.357crores. The standard Deviation in the Grants from Government during the period is Rs. 17.615 for HCU and Rs. 18.898 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in Grants from Government from year to year in case of OU compared to HCU.

The result of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of 2.165. The 'p' value is 0.047 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their Grants from Government.

**TABLE 21: TESTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HCU AND OU IN TERMS OF THEIR NO OF ENROLMENT**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV	Mean Difference	t-test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	'p' value
1.HCU	3825.00	1061.764	27.759	-7679.900	-19.373	18	.000
2.OU	11504.90	666.458	5.793				

Source: Computed Based on data Collected from Annual Accounts

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their no of enrolment

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their no of enrolment

As shown in table 21, the mean value of No of Enrolment of HCU are Rs. 3825.00 Crores, and that of OU is Rs. 11504.90 showing a difference of Rs -7679.900crores. The standard Deviation in the Receipts from Publications during the period is Rs. 1061.764 for HCU and Rs. 666.458 for OU. Comparatively higher value of Coefficient of Variation (CV) indicates that the deviations are more in No of Enrolment from year to year in case of HCU compared to OU.

The results of independent sample t-test produces a t-statistic value of -7679.900. The 'p' value is.000 at the degrees of freedom of 18. As the 'p' value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance inferring that there is a significant difference between HCU and OU in terms of their No of Enrolment.

## IX. CONCLUSION

It is concluded that the plan grants of HCU showing very huge in compare to OU and with respect to non-plan grants of OU had shown more than the HCU. With respect to internal sources of finance OU reported higher than HCU. External sources of finance of central universities are good rather than state universities, but state universities lagging behind to receiving of funds from state government. It is a pressing need to funding to state universities by the government to develop state universities as like as central universities in order to compete with the international universities.

## REFERENCES

1. Annual Account of Hyderabad Central University and Osmania University from 2004-05 to 2013-14.
2. Azad,J.L, "Financing of Higher Education in India" with special Reference to Resource Mobilization. University News, 42(52), December 27, 2004- 05 brought out in special volume p. 97.
3. Nanjundappa, D.M., 'Working of University Finances' Sterling publishers, New Delhi, 1976.

4. Narayanan, S.V. and Raju Chandrasekhar, "Financing Higher Education Ideas, Tactics, Specific Measures and Actionable Initiatives", University News, 45(08), February 19-25 2007, p13.
5. Panchamukhi, P.R., "University Finance in India", Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, Vol X, No1, January 1996, PP, 15-24.
6. Sulochna, M. "Financial Management of Higher Education in India", Chug publications, Allahabad, 1991.
7. UNDP and World Bank Report 2013-14.
8. World Development Report (2004).

## **REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**Dear Readers**

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue, as well as on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com).

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

**Academically yours**

Sd/-

**Co-ordinator**

## **DISCLAIMER**

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

## ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

### *Our Other Journals*

