

4. DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

The data collected is analyzed using SPSS. Cross tabulation on various variables has been used to understand the nature of the gap that exists between the expectations and benefits from NAAC accreditation process.

Data collected from the various institutes are summarized to give a broad profile of the institutes that participated in the study.

A total of 322 Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) participated in this study where questionnaires were sent to them for their responses on expectation and benefits from NAAC accreditation. Of the 322 HEIs participating in the survey, 304 are NAAC accredited HEIs and 18 are not accredited by NAAC. A large number of affiliated colleges (270) participated in the survey.

The following table exhibits the number of institutions representing each state:

Table 4.0.1: State wise distribution of number of respondents participated in the survey

State	Nos.	Madhya Pradesh	5
Andra Pradesh	12	Maharashtra	71
Arunachal Pradesh	1	Manipur	2
Assam	12	Meghalaya	4
Bihar	1	Mizoram	1
Chandigarh	2	Nagaland	7
Chattisgarh	2	Odisha	7
Delhi	1	Punjab	13
Goa	1	Rajasthan	5
Gujarat	23	Sikkim	1
Haryana	10	Tamil Nadu	32
Himachal Pradesh	1	Telengana	5
Jammu and Kashmir	4	Uttar Pradesh	26

Jharkhand	1	Uttarakhand	5
Karnataka	33	West Bengal	19
Kerala	15	Total	322

As could be seen from table 4.0.1 the maximum number of respondents to the survey is from Maharashtra, from where 71 HEIs have responded. The second highest number of respondents, 32 are from Karnataka while 32, 26 and 23 HEIs have responded from the states Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and Gujrat respectively.

The best part about the state wise distribution of respondents is that there are responses from 29 states of India. Such diversity in the states responding to the survey gives true representativeness to the study.

The table below shows the affiliation of the institutes:

Table 4.0.2: Distribution of respondents by the status of Institutions

Type of Institution	NAAC accredited		Total
	No	Yes	
State University	11	7	18
State Pvt. University	1	2	3
Deemed University	0	1	1
Government College	0	2	2
Autonomous college of UGC	0	25	25
Constituent college	0	2	2
Private Aided college	0	1	1
Affiliated college	6	264	270
Total	18	304	322

The table 4.0.2 shows distribution of respondents by the type of institution. From the table it could be seen that the maximum number of respondent of 270 are affiliated colleges whereas the second highest number of respondents

are type of Autonomous college of UGC. It could also be seen from the table that all types of HEIs in India have responded to the study.

The table below shows the year of establishments of the participating institutes:

Table 4.0.3: Distribution of respondents by year of establishment

Year of Establishment			
	NAAC accredited		Total
	No	Yes	
Before 1990	5	180	185
Between 1990 – 2000	1	54	55
Between 2001 – 2010	10	70	80
After 2010	2	0	2
Total	18	304	322

It is interesting to note that a large number of accredited institutions that participated in the survey were established before 1990, pre- liberalization, globalization and privatization era. The other institutions participating in the survey are young. This combination of old and new institutions in our data gives a good mix for a study of expectations and benefits from NAAC accreditation.

This mix of data helps us in our analysis of expectations and benefits in HEIs established pre-globalization, liberalization, privatization era and post-globalization, liberalization, privatization era.

In terms of number of students enrolled in the institutes, again a mix of small to large institutes were selected for the study. There are institutions that have less than 150 students and there are institutions with more than 10000 students. Moderate sized institutions with 1000 to 2500 students constitute the larger sample. The following table exhibits institution numbers based on student enrollments:

Table 4.0.4: Distribution of respondents by institutions' student strength

	NAAC accredited		Total
	No	Yes	
Less than 150	2	53	55
151 – 500	3	36	39
501 – 1000	2	58	60
1001 – 2500	3	96	99
2501 – 5000	4	45	49
5001 – 10000	2	13	15
Above 10000	2	2	4
Total	18	303	321

A mix of the different type of institutes have also been considered in the study and the following table shows the numbers participating in the study are largely from co-educational colleges. Exclusive women or men college forms a small part of the data. There are 17 institutions in the sample that are not classified as any of the categories.

Table 4.0.5: Distribution of respondents by the type of Institutions

Type of Institution	Frequency
Co- education	244
For Men	3
For Women	58
Total	305
Missing data	17
	322

The sample consisted of 43% institutions funded by the government followed by self- financed and partially funded institutions. The numbers of participating institutes are given in the table.

Table 4.0.6: Distribution of respondents by financial status of Institutions

Financial Status	Frequency
Government funded	139
Partially Government funded	88
Self-financed	95
Total	322

The sample comprised of 60% institutions that have been classified as “B” grade by NAAC with 28% as “A” and 5% as “C”. There are 18 institutions that responded to the survey are yet to go through the accreditation process.

Table 4.0.7: Distribution of respondents by Grade of NAAC accreditation

Present Grade	Frequency
A	91
B	196
C	17
NA	18
Total	322

The data has been collected from respondents like academic or faculty administrators and senior leadership. The numbers of each are in the table below:

Table 4.0.8: Distribution of respondents by the person responding to the survey

*Designation of the respondent	
	Frequency
Academic Administrator	53
Faculty Administrator	73
Senior Leadership	196
Total	322

4.1 Data analysis to address research objective # 1 - “Evaluate the expectations that NAAC accredited and non-NAAC Accredited HEIs in India have from NAAC accreditation process”

In the following tables it is attempted to analyze the extent of expectations of benefits of accreditation, among both NAAC accredited and non-NAAC accredited HEIs surveyed for the study. To measure the extent of Expectations that HEIs have with respect to each of the benefits claimed by NAAC, the tables below list - cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs and the extent of expectation on each of the benefit claimed by NAAC.

Table 4.1.1: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 1, i.e. *“NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”*^{*1}

Benefit 1: Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process.			NAAC Expectation 1			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	0	12	6	18
		% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	0.00%	5.70%	5.90%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.00%	3.70%	1.90%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	8	200	96	304
		% within NAAC accredited	2.60%	65.80%	31.60%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	100.00%	94.30%	94.10%	94.40%
		% of Total	2.50%	62.10%	29.80%	94.40%
Total	Count	8	212	102	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	2.50%	65.80%	31.70%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 1	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	2.50%	65.80%	31.70%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.1, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates

¹ Italicized part of the table title could be seen on the NAAC website as the benefit claimed http://www.naac.gov.in/benefits_of_accreditation.asp. This pattern of table titles in this work could be seen in all other tables henceforth.

“Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation helps “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”; on the other hand 66.70% of these respondents comprising, 12 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 33.3% of these respondents comprising 6 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 8 of them comprising 2.6% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to understand their SWOT as part of the strategic intent. On the other hand 200 HEIs comprising 65.80% ‘Expect’ and 96 HEIs comprising 31.6% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 8 (2.5%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, 212 (65.80%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 102 (31.70%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate the “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 212 (65.80%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”

Table 4.1.2: Chi-Square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 1, i.e. *“NAAC accreditation helps institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.492 ^a	2	.782
Likelihood Ratio	.939	2	.625
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.492) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value (p =0.782). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institutions to know their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”.

Table 4.1.3: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 2, i.e. “*Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

<u>Benefit 2:</u> Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation			NAAC Expectation 2			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	1	11	6	18
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	61.10%	33.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	3.00%	5.90%	5.90%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.30%	3.40%	1.90%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	32	177	95	304
		% within NAAC accredited	10.50%	58.20%	31.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	97.00%	94.10%	94.10%	94.40%
		% of Total	9.90%	55.00%	29.50%	94.40%
Total	Count	33	188	101	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	10.20%	58.40%	31.40%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 2	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	10.20%	58.40%	31.40%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.3; the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates Institution to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 1 (5.6%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”; on the other hand 61.10% of these respondents comprising, 11 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 33.3% of these respondents comprising 6 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 32 of them comprising 10.5% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” as part of the strategic intent. On the other

hand 177 HEIs comprising 58.20% ‘Expect’ and 95 HEIs comprising 31.3% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 33 (10.2%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, 188 (58.4%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 101 (31.4%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 188 (58.40%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”

Table 4.1.4: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 2, i.e. “*Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.457 ^a	2	.796
Likelihood Ratio	.534	2	.765
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.457) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit institution to identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value (p =0.796). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Table 4.1.5: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 3, i.e. *“Collegiality on the campus”*

Benefit 3: Collegiality on the campus.			NAAC Expectation 3			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	2	13	3	18
		% within NAAC accredited	11.10%	72.20%	16.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 3	6.70%	6.40%	3.30%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.60%	4.00%	0.90%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	28	189	87	304
		% within NAAC accredited	9.20%	62.20%	28.60%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 3	93.30%	93.60%	96.70%	94.40%
		% of Total	8.70%	58.70%	27.00%	94.40%
Total	Count	30	202	90	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	9.30%	62.70%	28.00%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	9.30%	62.70%	28.00%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.5, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates in creating “collegiality on the campus”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 2 (11.10%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”; on the other hand 72.20% of these respondents comprising, 13 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 16.70% of these respondents comprising 3 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 28 of them comprising 9.20% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”. On the other hand 189 HEIs comprising 62.20% ‘Expect’ and 89 HEIs comprising 28.2% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 30 (9.30%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”, 202 (62.70%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 90 (28%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate “collegiality on the campus” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 202 (62.70%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “collegiality on the campus”

Table 4.1.6: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 3, i.e. “*Collegiality on the campus*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.208 ^a	2	.547
Likelihood Ratio	1.332	2	.514
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.68.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 1.208) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit institution to create collegiality on the campus and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value ($p = 0.547$). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”.

Table 4.1.7: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 4, i.e. *“Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”*

Benefit 4: Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding.			NAAC Expectation 4			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	1	10	7	18
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	55.60%	38.90%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	4.50%	5.80%	5.50%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.30%	3.10%	2.20%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	21	162	121	304
		% within NAAC accredited	6.90%	53.30%	39.80%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	95.50%	94.20%	94.50%	94.40%
		% of Total	6.50%	50.30%	37.60%	94.40%
Total	Count	22	172	128	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	6.80%	53.40%	39.80%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	6.80%	53.40%	39.80%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.7, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 1 (5.60%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”; on the other hand 55.60% of these respondents comprising, 10 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 38.90% of these respondents comprising 7 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 21 of them comprising 6.90% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to helps in making “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”. This is

surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want funding agencies to look at their data objectively so that they get more funding. On the other hand 162 HEIs comprising 53.30% ‘Expect’ and 121 HEIs comprising 39.80% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 22 (6.80%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, 172 (53.40%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 128 (39.80%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 172 (53.40%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”

Table 4.1.8: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 4, i.e. *“Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.065 ^a	2	.968
Likelihood Ratio	.068	2	.966
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.23.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.065) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit institution for making funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value (p =0.968). This level of significance indicates

that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”

Table 4.1.9: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 5, i.e. *“Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

Benefit 5: Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy			NAAV Expectation 5			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	1	12	5	18
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	66.70%	27.80%	100.00%
		% within NAAV Expectation 5	7.70%	6.50%	4.10%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.30%	3.70%	1.60%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	12	174	118	304
		% within NAAC accredited	3.90%	57.20%	38.80%	100.00%
		% within NAAV Expectation 5	92.30%	93.50%	95.90%	94.40%
		% of Total	3.70%	54.00%	36.60%	94.40%
Total	Count	13	186	123	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	4.00%	57.80%	38.20%	100.00%	
	% within NAAV Expectation 5	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	4.00%	57.80%	38.20%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.9; the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 1 (5.60%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”; on the other hand 66.70% of these respondents comprising, 12 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 27.80% of these respondents comprising 5 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 12 of them comprising 3.90% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to initiate innovative and modern pedagogy to enhance learning experience. On the other hand 174 HEIs comprising 57.20% ‘Expect’ and 118 HEIs comprising 38.20% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 13 (4.00%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, 186 (57.80%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 123 (38.20%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 186 (57.80%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”

Table 4.1.10: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 5, *i.e. “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.912 ^a	2	.634
Likelihood Ratio	.944	2	.624
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.912) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit

institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value ($p = 0.634$). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Table 4.1.11: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 6, i.e. *“New sense of direction and identity for institutions”*

Benefit 6: New sense of direction and identity for institutions			NAAC Expectation 6			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	2	10	6	18
		% within NAAC accredited	11.10%	55.60%	33.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	12.50%	6.30%	4.10%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.60%	3.10%	1.90%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	14	150	140	304
		% within NAAC accredited	4.60%	49.30%	46.10%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	87.50%	93.80%	95.90%	94.40%
		% of Total	4.30%	46.60%	43.50%	94.40%
Total	Count	16	160	146	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	5.00%	49.70%	45.30%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 6	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	5.00%	49.70%	45.30%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.11, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 2 (11.10%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”; on the other hand 55.60% of these respondents comprising, 10 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 33.30% of these respondents comprising 6

HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 14 of them comprising 4.60% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want a sense of direction and identity at all times. On the other hand 150 HEIs comprising 49.30% ‘Expect’ and 140 HEIs comprising 46.10% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 16 (5.00%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”, 160 (49.70%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 146 (45.30%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 160 (49.60%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitate a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”

Table 4.1.12: Chi square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 6, *i.e.* “*New sense of direction and identity for institutions*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.186 ^a	2	.335
Likelihood Ratio	1.883	2	.390
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .89.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 2.186) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation that it benefits

institutions by facilitating a new sense of direction and identify for institutions and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value ($p = 0.335$). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Table 4.1.13: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 7, i.e. *“The society look for reliable information on quality education offered”*

Benefit 7: The society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered		NAAC Expectation 7			Total	
		Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected		
NAAC accredited	No	Count	3	9	6	18
		% within NAAC accredited	16.70%	50.00%	33.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	17.60%	4.20%	6.60%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.90%	2.80%	1.90%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	14	205	85	304
		% within NAAC accredited	4.60%	67.40%	28.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	82.40%	95.80%	93.40%	94.40%
		% of Total	4.30%	63.70%	26.40%	94.40%
Total		Count	17	214	91	322
		% within NAAC accredited	5.30%	66.50%	28.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	5.30%	66.50%	28.30%	100.00%

It could be seen from the table 4.1.13, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “society look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 3 (16.70%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”; on the other hand 50.00% of these respondents comprising, 9 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 33.30% of these respondents comprising 6 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates

“society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 14 of them comprising 4.60% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to keep the important stakeholders – society informed on the quality of education offered. On the other hand 205 HEIs comprising 67.40% ‘Expect’ and 85 HEIs comprising 28.00% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 17 (5.30%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “society look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, 214 (66.50%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 91 (28.30%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 214 (66.50%) HEIs ‘expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”

Table 4.1.14: Chi square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 7, i.e. *“The society look for reliable information on quality education offered”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.633 ^a	2	.060
Likelihood Ratio	4.083	2	.130
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 5.633) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation facilitates society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value (p =0.060). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Table 4.1.15: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 8, i.e. “Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”

Benefit 8: Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits.			NAAC Expectation 8			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	1	13	4	18
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	72.20%	22.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	5.60%	6.10%	4.30%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.30%	4.00%	1.20%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	17	199	88	304
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	65.50%	28.90%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	94.40%	93.90%	95.70%	94.40%
		% of Total	5.30%	61.80%	27.30%	94.40%
Total	Count	18	212	92	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	65.80%	28.60%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	5.60%	65.80%	28.60%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.15, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 1 (5.60%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate “employers to look for

reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”; on the other hand 72.20% of these respondents comprising, 13 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 22.20% of these respondents comprising 4 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 17 of them comprising 5.60% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want to assure the important stakeholders – Industry/employers – about the quality of education offered. On the other hand 199 HEIs comprising 65.50% ‘Expect’ and 88 HEIs comprising 28.90% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 18 (5.60%) institutions do not expect NAAC accreditation to facilitate “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”, 212 (65.80%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 92 (28.60%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 212 (65.80%) HEIs ‘Expect’ NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”

Table 4.1.16: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 8, i.e. *“Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.387 ^a	2	.824
Likelihood Ratio	.405	2	.817
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.01.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.387) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation benefit institution to facilitate employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value ($p = 0.824$). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”.

Table 4.1.17: Cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 9, i.e. *“Intra and inter-institutional interactions”*

Benefit 9: Intra and inter-institutional interactions.			NAAC Expectation 9			Total
			Not Expected	Expected	Most Expected	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	1	13	4	18
		% within NAAC accredited	5.60%	72.20%	22.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 9	5.30%	5.60%	5.60%	5.60%
		% of Total	0.30%	4.00%	1.20%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	18	219	67	304
		% within NAAC accredited	5.90%	72.00%	22.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Expectation 9	94.70%	94.40%	94.40%	94.40%
		% of Total	5.60%	68.00%	20.80%	94.40%
Total	Count	19	232	71	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	5.90%	72.00%	22.00%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Expectation 9	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	5.90%	72.00%	22.00%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.1.17, the range of expectations that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, 1 (5.60%) of them say it is ‘Not Expected’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”; on the other hand 72.20% of these respondents comprising, 13 HEIs ‘Expect’ and 22.20% of these respondents comprising 4 HEIs ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”, respectively.

Among 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 18 of them comprising 5.90% of HEIs ‘Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”. This is surprising considering the normal expectation that all HEIs would want a good system of internal and external communication for smooth functioning. On the other hand 219 HEIs comprising 72.00% ‘Expect’

and 67 HEIs comprising 22.00% ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation helps “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”, respectively.

Overall among total 322 respondents 19 (5.90%) institutions ‘Do Not Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”, 232 (72%) institutions ‘Expect’ and 71 (22%) ‘Most Expect’ NAAC accreditation process to facilitate “Intra and inter-institutional interactions” respectively.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 232 (72.00%) HEIs ‘Expect’ NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”

Table 4.1.18: Chi-square test for accredited and non-accredited HEIs by extent of expectation from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 9, i.e. *“Intra and inter-institutional interactions”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.004 ^a	2	.998
Likelihood Ratio	.004	2	.998
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.06.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 0.004) to measure association between HEIs expectation on NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions” and accreditation status in the above table shows a non-significant p value (p =0.998). This level of significance indicates that there is no association between the status of accreditation of HEIs and their expectation that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

4.2 Data analysis to address research objective #2 - “Evaluate the benefits that NAAC accredited HEIs have accrued by going through NAAC accreditation process.”

In the following tables it is attempted to analyze the extent of realization of benefits of accreditation, among NAAC accredited HEIs surveyed for the study. To measure the extent of realization that HEIs have with respect to each of the benefits claimed by NAAC, the tables below list - cross tabulation of accredited and non-accredited HEIs and the extent of realization of benefits on each of the benefit claimed by NAAC.

Table 4.2.1: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 1 i.e.” *NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”*

Benefit 1: Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process.		NAAC Benefit 1			Total	
		Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized		
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	72.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	7	104	193	304
		% within NAAC accredited	2.30%	34.20%	63.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	28.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	2.20%	32.30%	59.90%	94.40%
Total	Count	25	104	193	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	7.80%	32.30%	59.90%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 1	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	7.80%	32.30%	59.90%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.1, the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have 'Realized' this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 7 (2.30%) of them indicate that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation "helps institutions to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process". Considering the importance of this benefit i.e. HEIs to understand their SWOT as part of the strategic intent; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have not realized this benefit. On the other hand 104 (34.20%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs 'Realized' and 193 (63.50%) of them have 'Most Realized' that NAAC accreditation to facilitate "institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process", respectively. The fact that 297 HEIs comprising 97.70% have either 'Realized' or 'Most Realized' this benefit confirms NAAC's claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 25 (8%) institutions did 'Not Realize' this benefit, 104 (32.30%) institutions 'Realized' and 193 (59.90%) institutions have 'Most Realized' that NAAC accreditation facilitates "institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process".

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 193 (59.90%) HEIs have 'Most Realized' that NAAC accreditation to facilitate "institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process".

Table 4.2.2: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 1 i.e. “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	226.502 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	109.157	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.40.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 226.502) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – “NAAC accreditation facilitates institutions to know their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”.

Table 4.2.3: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 2 i.e. *“Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation”*

Benefit 2: Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation			NAAC Benefit 2			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	64.30%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	10	138	156	304
		% within NAAC accredited	3.30%	45.40%	51.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	35.70%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	3.10%	42.90%	48.40%	94.40%
Total	Count	28	138	156	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	8.70%	42.90%	48.40%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 2	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	8.70%	42.90%	48.40%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.3; the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates institutions to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 10 (3.30%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates institutions to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. Considering the importance of this benefit i.e. HEIs to “Identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” as part of the strategic intent; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 138 (45.40%) respondents in the

category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 156 (51.30%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate institutions to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, respectively. The fact that 294 HEIs comprising 96.70% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 28 (8.70%) institutions did ‘not realize’ this benefit, 138 (42.90%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 156 (48.40%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitate to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 156 (48.40%) HEIs have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate institutions to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Table 4.2.4: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 2 i.e. *“Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	200.191 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	102.307	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.57.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 200.191) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Table 4.2.5: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 3 i.e. “*Collegiality on the campus*”

Benefit 3: Collegiality on the campus.			NAAC Benefit 3			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 3	64.30%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	10	132	162	304
		% within NAAC accredited	3.30%	43.40%	53.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 3	35.70%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	3.10%	41.00%	50.30%	94.40%
Total	Count	28	132	162	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	8.70%	41.00%	50.30%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	8.70%	41.00%	50.30%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.5, the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “collegiality on the campus”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 10 (3.30%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”. Considering the importance of this benefit i.e. HEIs to facilitates “collegiality on the campus; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 132 (43.40%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 162 (53.30%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC

accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”, respectively. The fact that 294 HEIs comprising 96.70% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 28 (8.70%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 132 (41.00%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 162 (50.30%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 162 (50.30%) HEIs have ‘most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”.

Table 4.2.6: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 3 i.e. “*Collegiality on the campus*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	200.191 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	102.307	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.57.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 200.191) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – “NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus”.

Table 4.2.7: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 4 i.e. *“Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”*

<u>Benefit 4:</u> Funding agencies look for objective data for performance funding.		NAAC Benefit 4			Total	
		Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized		
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	34.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	35	159	110	304
		% within NAAC accredited	11.50%	52.30%	36.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	66.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	10.90%	49.40%	34.20%	94.40%
Total	Count	53	159	110	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	16.50%	49.40%	34.20%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	16.50%	49.40%	34.20%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.7, the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 35 (11.50%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”. Considering the importance of this benefit i.e. HEIs want funding agencies to look at their data objectively so that they get more funding; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized this benefit.

On the other hand 159 (52.30%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 110 (36.20%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, respectively. The fact that 269 HEIs comprising 88.50% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 53 (16.50%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 159 (49.40%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 110 (34.20%) institutions have ‘most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 159 (49.40%) HEIs have ‘Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

Table 4.2.8: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 4 i.e. *“Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	96.768 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	70.882	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.96.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 96.768) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation helps in making “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC

accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

Table 4.2.9: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 5 i.e. *“Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

<u>Benefit 5:</u> Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy			NAAC Benefit 5			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	69.20%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	8	123	173	304
		% within NAAC accredited	2.60%	40.50%	56.90%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	30.80%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	2.50%	38.20%	53.70%	94.40%
Total	Count	26	123	173	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	8.10%	38.20%	53.70%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 5	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	8.10%	38.20%	53.70%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.9; the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 8 (2.60%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. Considering the importance of this benefit of HEIs to initiate innovative and modern pedagogy to enhance learning experience; NAAC should probably probe further as to

why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 123 (40.50%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 173 (56.90%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, respectively. The fact that 296 HEIs comprising 97.40% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 26 (8.10%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 123 (38.20%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 173 (53.70%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 173 (53.70%) HEIs have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation to facilitate “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Table 4.2.10: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 5 i.e. *“Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	217.057 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	106.708	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.45

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 217.057) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association

between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC accreditation facilitates “Institution to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Table 4.2.11: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 6 i.e. “*New sense of direction and identity for institutions*”.

Benefit 6: New sense of direction and identity for institutions			NAAC Benefit 6			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	66.70%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	9	127	168	304
		% within NAAC accredited	3.00%	41.80%	55.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	33.30%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	2.80%	39.40%	52.20%	94.40%
Total	Count	27	127	168	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	8.40%	39.40%	52.20%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 6	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	8.40%	39.40%	52.20%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.6; the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it helps in providing “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 9 (3.00%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. Considering the importance of this benefit of HEIs want a sense of direction and identity at all times; NAAC

should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 127 (41.80%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 168 (55.30%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”, respectively. The fact that 295 HEIs comprising 97.10% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

The table further says that among total 322 respondents 27 (8.40%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 127 (39.40%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 168 (52.20%) institutions have ‘Most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 168 (52.20%) HEIs have ‘most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Table 4.2.12: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 6 i.e. “*New sense of direction and identity for institutions*”.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	208.311 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	104.433	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.51.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 208.311) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of

accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Table 4.2.13: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 7 i.e. “Society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”

Benefit 7: The society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered			NAAC Benefit 7			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 7	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	18	138	148	304
		% within NAAC accredited	5.90%	45.40%	48.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 7	50.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	5.60%	42.90%	46.00%	94.40%
Total	Count	36	138	148	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	11.20%	42.90%	46.00%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 7	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	11.20%	42.90%	46.00%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.13, the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 18 (5.90%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. Considering the importance of this benefit that HEIs to keep the important stakeholders – society informed on the quality of education offered; NAAC should probably

probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 138 (45.40%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 148 (48.70%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, respectively. The fact that 286 HEIs comprising 94.10% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 36 (11.20%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 138 (42.90%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 148 (46.00%) institutions have ‘most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 148 (46.00%) HEIs have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Table 4.2.14: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 7 i.e. *“Society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	151.467 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	88.898	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.01.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 151.467) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association

between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC accreditation facilitates “society look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Table 4.2.15: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 8 i.e. “Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”

Cross tabulation						
		*Benefit 8: Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits.	NAAC Benefit 8			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	45.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	22	174	108	304
		% within NAAC accredited	7.20%	57.20%	35.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	55.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	6.80%	54.00%	33.50%	94.40%
Total	Count	40	174	108	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	12.40%	54.00%	33.50%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	12.40%	54.00%	33.50%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.15, the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 22 (7.20%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”. Considering the importance of this benefit that HEIs to assure the important stakeholders – Industry/employers – about the quality of education offered; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 174 (57.20%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 108 (35.50%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”, respectively. The fact that 282 HEIs comprising 92.70% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

Overall, the table says that among total 322 respondents 40 (12.40%) institutions did ‘Not Realize’ this benefit, 174 (54.00%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 108 (33.50%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation enables to “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 174 (54.00%) HEIs have ‘Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”.

Table 4.2.16: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 8 i.e. *“Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	134.414 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	83.754	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.24.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 134.414) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”, shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality offered to the prospective recruits”.

Table 4.2.17: Cross tabulation of status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 9 i.e. *“Intra and inter-institutional interactions”*

Benefit 9: Intra and inter-institutional interactions.			NAAC Benefit 9			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC accredited	No	Count	18	0	0	18
		% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 9	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
		% of Total	5.60%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%
	Yes	Count	12	149	143	304
		% within NAAC accredited	3.90%	49.00%	47.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 9	40.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.40%
		% of Total	3.70%	46.30%	44.40%	94.40%
Total	Count	30	149	143	322	
	% within NAAC accredited	9.30%	46.30%	44.40%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 9	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	9.30%	46.30%	44.40%	100.00%	

It could be seen from the table 4.2.17; the range of realization of benefit that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit claimed by NAAC that it facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

Among 18 non NAAC accredited HEIs, none of the institution says that they have ‘Realized’ this benefit as they have not undergone the NAAC accreditation process. This response is in line with how this group should have responded.

Among, 304 NAAC accredited HEIs 12 (3.90%) of them indicate that they have ‘Not Realized’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”. Considering the importance of this benefit that all HEIs want a good system of internal and external communication for smooth functioning; NAAC should probably probe further as to why these HEIs have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. On the other hand 149 (49.00%) respondents in the category of NAAC accredited HEIs ‘Realized’ and 143

(47.00%) of them have ‘Most Realized’ that NAAC accreditation helps the “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”, respectively. The fact that 292 HEIs comprising 96.00% have either ‘Realized’ or ‘Most Realized’ this benefit confirms NAAC’s claim of this benefit.

The table further says that among total 322 respondents 30 (9.30%) institutions did ‘Not realize’ this benefit, 149 (46.30%) institutions ‘Realized’ and 143 (44.40%) institutions have ‘most realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

From the forgoing analysis, it could be concluded that most 149 (46.30%) HEIs have ‘Realized’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

Table 4.2.18: Chi-square test for status of accreditation by the extent of realization of benefit from NAAC accreditation process on the benefit 9 i.e. “*Intra and inter-institutional interactions*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	185.574 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	98.424	2	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.68.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 185.574) to measure association between status of NAAC accreditation and the extent of realization of benefit, that NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”, shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates that there is an association between status of accreditation and realization of benefit – NAAC accreditation facilitates “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”.

4.3.1 Data Analysis to address research objective #3 – “Evaluate the extent and nature of association between expectations and benefits that HEIs have and realized, respectively through NAAC accreditation process”.

In the following tables it is attempted to analyse the extent of expectation by the extent of realization with respect to all the 9 benefits claimed by NAAC. The following section are organised by the expectation – realization matrix as below:

Table: 4.3.0 Expectation V/s Realization Matrix²

	Not Realized	Realized	Most realized
Not Expected	In-line with the expectation	Surprise	Customer delight
Expected	Disappointing	In-line with the expectation	Surprise
Most Expected	Very Disappointing	Disappointing	In-line with the expectation

As described in the table above, the matrix provides the elements of analysis that could be obtained through a cross tabulation of extent of expectations by extent of realization of benefits.

² This matrix was developed by Dr. V J Byra Reddy and the Scholar of this study during the course of the study.

Table 4.3.1: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 1 i.e. “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”

<u>Benefit1:</u> Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process.			NAAC Benefit 1			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 1	Not Expected	Count	3	3	2	8
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	37.50%	37.50%	25.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	12.00%	2.90%	1.00%	2.50%
		% of Total	0.90%	0.90%	0.60%	2.50%
	Expected	Count	14	92	106	212
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	6.60%	43.40%	50.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	56.00%	88.50%	54.90%	65.80%
		% of Total	4.30%	28.60%	32.90%	65.80%
	Most Expected	Count	8	9	85	102
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	7.80%	8.80%	83.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	32.00%	8.70%	44.00%	31.70%
		% of Total	2.50%	2.80%	26.40%	31.70%
Total		Count	25	104	193	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 1	7.80%	32.30%	59.90%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 1	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	7.80%	32.30%	59.90%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 8 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, 3 HEIs comprising 37.50% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 3 HEIs comprising 37.50% have ‘Not expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 3 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 2 (25.00%) institutions have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Considering that these 2 HEIs had 'Not Expected' this benefit but have 'Most Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 2 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 212 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation to facilitate institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process", 14 (6.60%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 14 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 92 (43.40%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process helps institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process, say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 92 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 106 (50.00%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 106 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just expecting.

From the first row's total of 102 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 8 (7.80%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process". From this it is possible to say that these 8 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 9 (8.80%) HEIs ‘Most Expected’ the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates ‘institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process’, say that they have just ‘Realized’ this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 9 HEIs would be ‘disappointed’ as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 85 (83.30%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.2: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 1 i.e. “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.471 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	51.057	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.011	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .62

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 49.471) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that ‘Institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process’ and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.3: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 2 i.e. “*Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

Benefit 2: Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation			NAAC Benefit 2			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 2	Not Expected	Count	7	22	4	33
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	21.20%	66.70%	12.10%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	25.00%	15.90%	2.60%	10.20%
		% of Total	2.20%	6.80%	1.20%	10.20%
	Expected	Count	15	96	77	188
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	8.00%	51.10%	41.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	53.60%	69.60%	49.40%	58.40%
		% of Total	4.70%	29.80%	23.90%	58.40%
	Most Expected	Count	6	20	75	101
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	5.90%	19.80%	74.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	21.40%	14.50%	48.10%	31.40%
		% of Total	1.90%	6.20%	23.30%	31.40%
Total		Count	28	138	156	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 2	8.70%	42.90%	48.40%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 2	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	8.70%	42.90%	48.40%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 33 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, 7 HEIs comprising 21.20% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 22 HEIs comprising 66.70% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 22 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 4 (12.10%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 4 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 4 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 188 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation", 15 (8.00%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 15 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 96 (51.10%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate HEIs to "identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 96 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 77 (41.00%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates HEIs to "identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 77 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'Expecting'.

From the first row's total of 101 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 6 (5.90%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to "identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation". From this it is possible to say that these 6 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 20 (19.80%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to "identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 20 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 75 (74.30%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “identify their internal areas of planning and resource allocation”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.4: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 2 i.e. “*Identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	51.837 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	54.640	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	40.758	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.87.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 51.837) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that institutions to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.5: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 3 i.e. *“Collegiality on the campus”*

<u>Benefit 3:</u> Collegiality on the campus.			NAAC Benefit 3			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 3	Not Expected	Count	7	21	2	30
		% within NAAC Expectation 3	23.30%	70.00%	6.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 3	25.00%	15.90%	1.20%	9.30%
		% of Total	2.20%	6.50%	0.60%	9.30%
	Expected	Count	18	94	90	202
		% within NAAC Expectation 3	8.90%	46.50%	44.60%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 3	64.30%	71.20%	55.60%	62.70%
		% of Total	5.60%	29.20%	28.00%	62.70%
	Most Expected	Count	3	17	70	90
		% within NAAC Expectation 3	3.30%	18.90%	77.80%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 3	10.70%	12.90%	43.20%	28.00%
		% of Total	0.90%	5.30%	21.70%	28.00%
Total	Count	28	132	162	322	
	% within NAAC Expectation 3	8.70%	41.00%	50.30%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	8.70%	41.00%	50.30%	100.00%	

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 30 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus”, 7 HEIs comprising 23.30% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 21 HEIs comprising 70.00% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 22 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 2 (6.70%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 2 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most Realized’ the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as ‘customer delight’ for these 2 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 202 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus", 18 (8.90%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 18 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 94 (46.50%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates collegiality on the campus, say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 94 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 90 (44.60%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "collegiality on the campus" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 90 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'Expecting'.

From the first row's total of 90 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 3 (3.30%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that "NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus". From this it is possible to say that these 3 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 17 (18.90%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that "NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 17 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 70 (77.80%) of HEIs that were 'Most Expecting' that NAAC accreditation facilitates "collegiality on the campus", say that they have 'Most

Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.6: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 3 i.e. "*Collegiality on the campus*"

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.961 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	59.943	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	48.607	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.61.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 54.961) to measure association between HEIs' expectation that facilitates "collegiality on the campus" and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.7: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 4 i.e. *“Funding agencies look for objective data for performance funding”*

Benefit 4: Funding agencies look for objective data for performance funding.			NAAC Benefit 4		NAAC Benefit 4	Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 4	Not Expected	Count	10	8	4	22
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	45.50%	36.40%	18.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	18.90%	5.00%	3.60%	6.80%
		% of Total	3.10%	2.50%	1.20%	6.80%
	Expected	Count	24	118	30	172
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	14.00%	68.60%	17.40%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	45.30%	74.20%	27.30%	53.40%
		% of Total	7.50%	36.60%	9.30%	53.40%
	Most Expected	Count	19	33	76	128
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	14.80%	25.80%	59.40%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	35.80%	20.80%	69.10%	39.80%
		% of Total	5.90%	10.20%	23.60%	39.80%
Total		Count	53	159	110	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 4	16.50%	49.40%	34.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	16.50%	49.40%	34.20%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 22 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, 10 HEIs comprising 45.50% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 8 HEIs comprising 36.40% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 8 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 4 (18.20%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 4 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 4 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 172 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively", 24 (14.00%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 24 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 118 (68.60%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 118 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 30 (17.40%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 30 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 128 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 19 (14.80%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that "NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively". From this it is possible to say that these 19 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 33 (25.80%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 33 HEIs would be

‘disappointed’ as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 76 (59.40%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.8: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 4 i.e. *“Funding agencies look for objective data for performance funding”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	79.700 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	76.922	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.688	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.62

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 79.700) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively” and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.9: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 5 i.e. *“Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

Benefit 5: Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy			NAAC Benefit 5			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 5	Not Expected	Count	6	6	1	13
		% within NAAC Expectation 5	46.20%	46.20%	7.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	23.10%	4.90%	0.60%	4.00%
		% of Total	1.90%	1.90%	0.30%	4.00%
	Expected	Count	14	99	73	186
		% within NAAC Expectation 5	7.50%	53.20%	39.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	53.80%	80.50%	42.20%	57.80%
		% of Total	4.30%	30.70%	22.70%	57.80%
	Most Expected	Count	6	18	99	123
		% within NAAC Expectation 5	4.90%	14.60%	80.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	23.10%	14.60%	57.20%	38.20%
		% of Total	1.90%	5.60%	30.70%	38.20%
Total		Count	26	123	173	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 5	8.10%	38.20%	53.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 5	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	8.10%	38.20%	53.70%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 13 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, 6 HEIs comprising 46.20% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 6 HEIs comprising 46.20% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 22 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 1 (7.70%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 1 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 1 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 186 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy", 14 (7.50%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 14 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 99 (53.20%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate institutions to "initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 99 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 73 (39.20%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates institutions to "initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 73 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 123 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 6 (4.90%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitate institutions to "initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy". From this it is possible to say that these 6 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 18 (14.60%) HEIs that 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitate institutions to "initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 18 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 99 (80.50%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting’ that “NAAC accreditation facilitate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.10: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 5 i.e. *“Institutions to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	82.843 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	76.615	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	56.459	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.05.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 82.843) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation the institutions to ‘initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy’ and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.11: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 6 i.e. *“New sense of direction and identity for institutions”*

Benefit 6: New sense of direction and identity for institutions			NAAC Benefit 6			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 6	Not Expected	Count	4	8	4	16
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	14.80%	6.30%	2.40%	5.00%
		% of Total	1.20%	2.50%	1.20%	5.00%
	Expected	Count	15	91	54	160
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	9.40%	56.90%	33.80%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	55.60%	71.70%	32.10%	49.70%
		% of Total	4.70%	28.30%	16.80%	49.70%
	Most Expected	Count	8	28	110	146
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	5.50%	19.20%	75.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	29.60%	22.00%	65.50%	45.30%
		% of Total	2.50%	8.70%	34.20%	45.30%
Total		Count	27	127	168	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 6	8.40%	39.40%	52.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 6	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	8.40%	39.40%	52.20%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 16 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identity for institutions”, 4 HEIs comprising 25.00% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 8 HEIs comprising 50.00% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 8 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 4 (25.00%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 4 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 4 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 160 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identity for institutions", 15 (9.40%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 15 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 91 (56.90%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that "NAAC accreditation process facilitates a new sense of direction and identity for institutions", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 91 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 54 (33.80%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate "a new sense of direction and identity for institutions" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 54 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 146 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 8 (5.50%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "new sense of direction and identity for institutions". From this it is possible to say that these 8 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 28 (19.20%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "a new sense of direction and identity for institutions", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 28 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 110 (75.30%) of HEIs that were most expecting that NAAC accreditation facilitates “new sense of direction and identity for institutions”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.12: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 6 i.e. “*New sense of direction and identify for institutions*”

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	62.601 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	63.229	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	44.689	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.34

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 62.601) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation facilitate “a new sense of direction and identity for institutions” and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.13: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 7 i.e. *“Society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”*

Benefit 7: The society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered			NAAC Benefit 7			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 7	Not Expected	Count	6	7	4	17
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	35.30%	41.20%	23.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 7	16.70%	5.10%	2.70%	5.30%
		% of Total	1.90%	2.20%	1.20%	5.30%
	Expected	Count	22	116	76	214
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	10.30%	54.20%	35.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 7	61.10%	84.10%	51.40%	66.50%
		% of Total	6.80%	36.00%	23.60%	66.50%
	Most Expected	Count	8	15	68	91
		% within NAAC Expectation 7	8.80%	16.50%	74.70%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 7	22.20%	10.90%	45.90%	28.30%
		% of Total	2.50%	4.70%	21.10%	28.30%
Total	Count	36	138	148	322	
	% within NAAC Expectation 7	11.20%	42.90%	46.00%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 7	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	11.20%	42.90%	46.00%	100.00%	

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 17 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, 6 HEIs comprising 35.30% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 7 HEIs comprising 41.20% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 7 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 4 (23.50%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 4 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 4 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 214 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered", 22 (10.30%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 22 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 116 (54.20%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 116 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 76 (35.50%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 76 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 91 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 8 (8.80%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered". From this it is possible to say that these 8 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 15 (16.50%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 15 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 68 (74.70%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting’ that NAAC accreditation facilitates “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.14: Chi-square test extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 7 i.e. “*Society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered*”

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	53.996 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.068	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.979	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.90

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 53.996) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that it facilitates ‘society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered’ and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.15: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 8 i.e. *“Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”*.

Benefit 8: Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits.			NAAC Benefit 8			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 8	Not Expected	Count	7	9	2	18
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	38.90%	50.00%	11.10%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	17.50%	5.20%	1.90%	5.60%
		% of Total	2.20%	2.80%	0.60%	5.60%
	Expected	Count	26	141	45	212
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	12.30%	66.50%	21.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	65.00%	81.00%	41.70%	65.80%
		% of Total	8.10%	43.80%	14.00%	65.80%
	Most Expected	Count	7	24	61	92
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	7.60%	26.10%	66.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	17.50%	13.80%	56.50%	28.60%
		% of Total	2.20%	7.50%	18.90%	28.60%
Total		Count	40	174	108	322
		% within NAAC Expectation 8	12.40%	54.00%	33.50%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		% of Total	12.40%	54.00%	33.50%	100.00%

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 18 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”, 7 HEIs comprising 38.90% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 9 HEIs comprising 50.00% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 9 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 2 (11.10%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 2 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most

Realized' the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as 'customer delight' for these 2 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 212 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits", 26 (12.30%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 26 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 141 (66.50%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate "employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits", say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 141 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 45 (21.20%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate "employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 45 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'Most Realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 92 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 7 (7.60%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits". From this it is possible to say that these 7 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 24 (26.10%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitate "employers to look for reliable information on the

quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”, say that they have just ‘Realized’ this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 24 HEIs would be ‘disappointed’ as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 61 (66.30%) of HEIs that were ‘Most Expecting that NAAC accreditation facilitate “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”, say that they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.16: Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 8 i.e. “Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits”.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	73.057 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	68.206	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	48.590	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.24.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 73.057) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the prospective recruits” and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

Table 4.3.17: Cross tabulation of extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 9 i.e. *“Intra and inter-institutional interactions”*

Benefit 9: Intra and inter-institutional interactions.			NAAC Benefit 9			Total
			Not Realized	Realized	Most Realized	
NAAC Expectation 9	Not Expected	Count	7	7	5	19
		% within NAAC Expectation 9	36.80%	36.80%	26.30%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 9	23.30%	4.70%	3.50%	5.90%
		% of Total	2.20%	2.20%	1.60%	5.90%
	Expected	Count	18	130	84	232
		% within NAAC Expectation 9	7.80%	56.00%	36.20%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 9	60.00%	87.20%	58.70%	72.00%
		% of Total	5.60%	40.40%	26.10%	72.00%
	Most Expected	Count	5	12	54	71
		% within NAAC Expectation 9	7.00%	16.90%	76.10%	100.00%
		% within NAAC Benefit 9	16.70%	8.10%	37.80%	22.00%
		% of Total	1.60%	3.70%	16.80%	22.00%
Total	Count	30	149	143	322	
	% within NAAC Expectation 9	9.30%	46.30%	44.40%	100.00%	
	% within NAAC Benefit 9	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	9.30%	46.30%	44.40%	100.00%	

From the first row total of the table it is evident that out of 19 institutions who did ‘Not Expect’ “NAAC accreditation facilitates intra and inter-institutional interactions”, 7 HEIs comprising 36.80% have ‘Not Realized’ this benefit. This is in-line with what these institutions had expected as they had not expected this benefit and they have also not realized the same.

The other 7 HEIs comprising 36.80% have ‘Not Expected’ this benefit, however, after going through the accreditation, have ‘Realized’ it. Hence, it is possible to say that for these 7 HEIs realizing this benefit is a surprise.

Remaining 5 (26.30%) institutions have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Considering that these 5 HEIs had ‘Not Expected’ this benefit but have ‘Most Realized’ the same, it is possible to say that this phenomenon could be termed as ‘customer delight’ for these 5 HEIs.

From the first row's total of 'Expected' in the extent of expectation, out of 232 HEIs who expected "NAAC accreditation facilitates intra and inter-institutional interactions", 18 (8.80%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that these 18 HEIs would be 'disappointed' that they have not been able to realize an expectation that they were expecting from NAAC accreditation process.

While 130 (56.00%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' a benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitate intra and inter-institutional interactions, say that they have also 'Realized' this benefit. From this it is possible to say that for these 130 HEIs whatever they were expecting has been realized. Hence it is 'in line' with their expectation.

Another, 84 (36.20%) HEIs that were 'Expecting' the benefit that NAAC accreditation process facilitates "intra and inter-institutional interactions" say that they have 'Most Realized' this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that these 84 HEIs must be 'surprised' that they have 'most realized' a benefit that they were just 'expecting'.

From the first row's total of 71 HEIs in 'Most Expected', in the extent of expectation. 5 (7.00%) HEIs say that they have 'Not Realized' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "intra and inter-institutional interactions". From this it is possible to say that these 5 HEIs would 'very disappointed' that they have not realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

While 12 (16.90%) HEIs 'Most Expected' the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "intra and inter-institutional interactions", say that they have just 'Realized' this benefit. Form this it is possible to say that these 12 HEIs would be 'disappointed' as they have just realized an expectation that they were most expecting.

Another 54 (76.10%) of HEIs that were 'Most Expecting' that NAAC accreditation facilitates "intra and inter-institutional interactions", say that

they have ‘Most Realized’ this benefit. Hence, it is possible to say that this result is in line with their expectation.

Table 4.3.18: *Chi-square test for extent of expectation by the extent realization of benefit with respect to benefit 9 i.e. “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	55.756 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	50.826	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.644	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.77.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 55.756) to measure association between HEIs’ expectation that ‘intra and inter-institutional interactions’ and its realization as a benefit shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates there is a strong association between the extent of expectation and the extent of the realization of this benefit.

4.4 Data Analysis to address research objective #4 “Assess and evaluate if there are gaps in expectations and benefits among HEIs in India while going through NAAC accreditation process”

Framework for analyzing the data for this objective is provided in the table below.

Table 4.4.0 Range of gap between perceived benefit - perceived expectation

Gap	HEIs response	
-4.00 to – 2.01	Most Expected	Very negative gap
-2.00 to – 0.01	Expected	Negative gap
0	No difference between Benefit & Expectation.	No gap
+ 0.01 – 2.00	Benefit Realized	Positive gap
+ 2.01 – 4.00	Benefit Most Realized	Very Positive gap

To measure the gap between Expectations and the Benefits derived by the HEIs with respect to each of the benefits NAAC claims, the difference between the ‘Perceived Benefit’ and the ‘Expectation’ is calculated. Each Expectation and Benefit is captured on a scale of 1 to 4 and therefore the gap varies from -4 to +4. Negative gap (-4 to -0.01) indicate expectation to be higher than the benefit whereas positive gap (0.01 to 4) indicate higher perceived benefit than expectation. Zero gap indicates that there is no more perceived benefits than expectation.

Table 4.4.1: Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 1 i.e. “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	12	2	14
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 1	85.70%	14.30%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	66.70%	0.70%	4.30%
	% of Total	3.70%	0.60%	4.30%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	6	49	55
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 1	10.90%	89.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	33.30%	16.10%	17.10%
	% of Total	1.90%	15.20%	17.10%
0	Count	0	28	28
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 1	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	9.20%	8.70%
	% of Total	0.00%	8.70%	8.70%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	225	225
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 1	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	74.00%	69.90%
	% of Total	0.00%	69.90%	69.90%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 1	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.1 above, there are 14 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. Among these 14 respondents, 12 HEIs

comprising 85.70% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 2 HEIs comprising 14.30% of the respondents are NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 2 (14.30%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 55 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. Among these 55 respondents 6 HEIs comprising 10.90% are non-NAAC accredited while 49 respondents comprising 89.10% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 49 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 16.10% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 28 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. Among these 28 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 28 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 28 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 9.20% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 225 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “institution to know its strength, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”. Among these 225 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 225 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 225 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 225 institutions comprise 74.00% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It is very surprising to see that none among the NAAC accredited institutions show a very positive gap of 2.01 to 4.00. NAAC should view this seriously as it implies that NAAC accreditation has not evoked such a positive gap.

Table 4.4.2 *Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 1 i.e. “institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”*

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	188.231 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	89.415	3	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .78.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 188.231) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to know its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process and status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very

strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates institutions to know their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities through an informed review process”.

Table 4.4.3 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 2 i.e. “*identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	11	0	11
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 2	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	61.10%	0.00%	3.40%
	% of Total	3.40%	0.00%	3.40%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	7	57	64
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 2	10.90%	89.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	38.90%	18.80%	19.90%
	% of Total	2.20%	17.70%	19.90%
0	Count	0	37	37
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 2	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	12.20%	11.50%
	% of Total	0.00%	11.50%	11.50%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	210	210
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 2	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	69.10%	65.20%
	% of Total	0.00%	65.20%	65.20%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 2	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitate institution to identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.2 above, there are 11 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation

facilitates institution to identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. Among these 11 respondents, all 11 HEIs are non-NAAC accredited HEIs and none of the HEI is NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 55 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. Among these 64 respondents 7 HEIs comprising 10.90% are non-NAAC accredited while 57 respondents comprising 89.10% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 57 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 18.80% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 37 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. Among these 37 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 37 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 37 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 12.20% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 210 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to

“identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”. Among these 210 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 210 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 210 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 210 institutions comprise 69.10% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It is very surprising to see that none among the NAAC accredited institutions show a very positive gap of 2.01 to 4.00. NAAC should view this seriously as it implies that NAAC accreditation has not evoked such a positive gap.

Table 4.4.4 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 2 i.e. “*identification of internal areas of planning and resource allocation*”

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	203.870 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	94.619	3	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .61.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 203.870) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation benefit facilitates institution to “identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation” and status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates institution to identify the internal areas of planning and resource allocation”.

Table 4.4.5 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 3 i.e. “Collegiality on the campus”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	9	0	9
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 3	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	50.00%	0.00%	2.80%
	% of Total	2.80%	0.00%	2.80%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	9	50	59
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 3	15.30%	84.70%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	50.00%	16.40%	18.30%
	% of Total	2.80%	15.50%	18.30%
0	Count	0	30	30
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 3	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	9.90%	9.30%
	% of Total	0.00%	9.30%	9.30%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	224	224
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 3	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	73.70%	69.60%
	% of Total	0.00%	69.60%	69.60%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 3	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.3 above, there are 14 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus”. Among these 9 respondents, all 9 HEIs are non-NAAC accredited HEIs and none of the HEI is NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 59 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”. Among these 59 respondents 9 HEIs comprising 15.30% are non-NAAC accredited while 50 respondents comprising 84.70% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 50 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 16.40% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 30 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”. Among these 30 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 30 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 30 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 9.90% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 224 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “collegiality on the campus”. Among these 224 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 224 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 225 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 224 institutions comprise 73.70% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It is very surprising to see that none among the NAAC accredited institutions show a very positive gap of 2.01 to 4.00. NAAC should view this seriously as it implies that NAAC accreditation has not evoked such a positive gap.

Table 4.4.6 *Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 3 i.e. “Collegiality on the campus”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	177.481 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	88.408	3	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .50.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 177.481) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus” and status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates collegiality on the campus”.

Table 4.4.7 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 4 i.e. “Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	9	8	17
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	52.90%	47.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	50.00%	2.60%	5.30%
	% of Total	2.80%	2.50%	5.30%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	9	72	81
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	11.10%	88.90%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	50.00%	23.70%	25.20%
	% of Total	2.80%	22.40%	25.20%
0	Count	0	67	67
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	22.00%	20.80%
	% of Total	0.00%	20.80%	20.80%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	155	155
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	51.00%	48.10%
	% of Total	0.00%	48.10%	48.10%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	2	2
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.70%	0.60%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.60%	0.60%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 4	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.4 above, there are 17 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation

facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively". Among these 17 respondents, 9 HEIs comprising 52.90% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 8 HEIs comprising 47.10% of the respondents are NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 8 (47.10%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 81 HEIs show a negative gap of -2.00 to -0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively". Among these 81 respondents 9 HEIs comprising 11.10% are non-NAAC accredited while 72 respondents comprising 88.90% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 72 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 23.70% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a 'negative gap' on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively". For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 67 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "funding agencies to look at the institution's (data) funding requirement objectively". Among these 67 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 67 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a 'zero gap'.

However, it is good to see 67 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 22.20% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 155 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”. Among these 155 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 155 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 155 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 155 institutions comprise 51.00% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that a total of just 2 institutions show a ‘very positive gap’ of 2.01 to 4.00. Among these 2 institutions both are NAAC accredited HEIs while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEIs. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions showing this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 2 NAAC accredited institutions show the ‘positive gap’ or ‘Most Realized’ status with respect to the benefit that “NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”. In other words only 0.70% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.8 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 4 i.e. *“Funding agencies to look for objective data for performance funding”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	90.164 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	58.786	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 90.164) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively and status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations by the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates funding agencies to look at the institution’s (data) funding requirement objectively”.

Table 4.4.9 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 5 i.e. “Institutions to initiate and modern methods of pedagogy”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	8	1	9
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	88.90%	11.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	44.40%	0.30%	2.80%
	% of Total	2.50%	0.30%	2.80%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	10	62	72
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	13.90%	86.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	55.60%	20.40%	22.40%
	% of Total	3.10%	19.30%	22.40%
0	Count	0	68	68
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	22.40%	21.10%
	% of Total	0.00%	21.10%	21.10%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	172	172
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	56.60%	53.40%
	% of Total	0.00%	53.40%	53.40%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	1	1
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 5	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.5 above, there are 9 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. Among these 9 respondents, 8 HEIs comprising 88.90% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 1 HEI comprising 11.10% of the respondents is NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 1 (11.10%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 72 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. Among these 72 respondents 10 HEIs comprising 13.90% are non-NAAC accredited while 62 respondents comprising 86.10% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 62 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 20.40% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 68 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. Among these 68 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 68 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 68 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 22.40% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 172 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. Among these 172 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 172 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 172 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 172 institutions comprise 56.60% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that just 1 institution shows a ‘very positive gap’ of 2.01 to 4.00 and this 1 institution is NAAC accredited HEIs while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEIs. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to show this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 1 NAAC accredited institution shows the ‘positive gap’ or ‘Most Realized’ status with respect to the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”. In other words only 0.30% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.10 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 5 i.e. *“Institutions to initiate and modern methods of pedagogy”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	141.993 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	74.502	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 141.993) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to “initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy” by status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit – “NAAC accreditation facilitates HEIs to initiate innovative and modern methods of pedagogy”.

Table 4.4.11 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 6 i.e. “New sense of direction and identify for institutions”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	10	1	11
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	90.90%	9.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	55.60%	0.30%	3.40%
	% of Total	3.10%	0.30%	3.40%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	8	59	67
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	11.90%	88.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	44.40%	19.40%	20.80%
	% of Total	2.50%	18.30%	20.80%
0	Count	0	44	44
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	14.50%	13.70%
	% of Total	0.00%	13.70%	13.70%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	198	198
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	65.10%	61.50%
	% of Total	0.00%	61.50%	61.50%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	2	2
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.70%	0.60%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.60%	0.60%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 6	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identify for institutions” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.6 above, there are 11 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. Among these

11 respondents, 10 HEIs comprising 90.90% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 1 HEIs comprising 9.10% of the respondents are NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 1 (9.10%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 67 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that “NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. Among these 67 respondents 8 HEIs comprising 11.90% are non-NAAC accredited while 59 respondents comprising 88.10% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 59 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 19.40% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “a new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 44 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. Among these 44 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 44 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 44 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 14.50% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 198 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense

of direction and identify for institutions”. Among these 198 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 198 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 198 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 198 institutions comprise 65.10% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that a total of just 2 institutions show a ‘very positive gap’ of 2.01 to 4.00. Among these 2 institutions both are NAAC accredited HEIs while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEIs. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions showing this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 2 NAAC accredited institutions show the ‘positive gap’ or ‘Most Realized’ status with respect to the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”. In other words only 0.70% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.12 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 6 i.e. *“New sense of direction and identify for institutions”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	171.289 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	83.095	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 171.289) to measure association between HEIs opinion on “NAAC accreditation facilitates a new sense of direction and identify for institutions” by status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates a “new sense of direction and identify for institutions”.

Table 4.4.13 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 7 i.e. “Society to look for reliable information on quality education offered”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	7	2	9
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	77.80%	22.20%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	38.90%	0.70%	2.80%
	% of Total	2.20%	0.60%	2.80%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	11	54	65
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	16.90%	83.10%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	61.10%	17.80%	20.20%
	% of Total	3.40%	16.80%	20.20%
0	Count	0	50	50
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	16.40%	15.50%
	% of Total	0.00%	15.50%	15.50%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	196	196
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	64.50%	60.90%
	% of Total	0.00%	60.90%	60.90%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	2	2
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.70%	0.60%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.60%	0.60%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 7	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates the society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.7 above, there are 9 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. Among these 9 respondents, 7 HEIs comprising 77.80% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 2 HEIs comprising 22.20% of the respondents are NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 2 (22.20%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 65 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. Among these 65 respondents 11 HEIs comprising 16.90% are non-NAAC accredited while 54 respondents comprising 83.10% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 54 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 17.80% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 50 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. Among these 50 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 50 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 50 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 16.40% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 196 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. Among these 196 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 196 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 196 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 196 institutions comprise 64.50% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that a total of just 2 institutions show a ‘very positive gap’ of 2.01 to 4.00. Among these 2 institutions both are NAAC accredited HEIs while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEIs. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions showing this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 2 NAAC accredited institutions show the ‘positive gap’ or ‘Most Realized’ status with respect to the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”. In other words only 0.70% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.14 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 7 i.e. “Society to look for reliable information on quality education offered”

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	119.369 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	70.164	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 119.369) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation benefit to facilitates the “society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered” and status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value ($p=0.000$). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations by the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation benefits to facilitate the society to look for reliable information on quality of education offered”.

Table 4.4.15 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 8 i.e. “Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered on the perspective recruits”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	6	3	9
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	33.30%	1.00%	2.80%
	% of Total	1.90%	0.90%	2.80%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	12	52	64
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	18.80%	81.30%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	66.70%	17.10%	19.90%
	% of Total	3.70%	16.10%	19.90%
0	Count	0	100	100
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	32.90%	31.10%
	% of Total	0.00%	31.10%	31.10%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	148	148
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	48.70%	46.00%
	% of Total	0.00%	46.00%	46.00%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	1	1
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 8	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.8 above, there are 9 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. Among these 9 respondents, 6 HEIs comprising 66.70% are not NAAC accredited HEIs while 3 HEIs comprising 33.30% of the respondents are NAAC accredited HEIs. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap. However, it is very surprising to see the 3 (33.30%) NAAC accredited institutions to show a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 64 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. Among these 64 respondents 12 HEIs comprising 18.80% are non-NAAC accredited while 52 respondents comprising 81.30% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 52 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 17.10% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 100 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. Among these 100 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 100 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the

non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 100 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 32.90% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 148 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. Among these 148 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 148 institutions are NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a ‘positive gap’ as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 148 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 148 institutions comprise 48.70% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that just 1 institution shows a ‘very positive gap’ of 2.01 to 4.00. This 1 institution is NAAC accredited HEI while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEI. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to show this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 1 NAAC accredited institution shows the ‘positive gap’ or ‘Most Realized’ status with respect to the benefit that NAAC accreditation enables to “employers look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”. In other words only 0.30% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.16 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 8 i.e. *“Employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered on the perspective recruits”*

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	99.360 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	65.578	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 99.360) to measure association between HEIs opinion on “NAAC accreditation benefit facilitates employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits” by status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value (p =0.000). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates employers to look for reliable information on the quality of education offered to the perspective recruits”.

Table 4.4.17 Cross tabulation of range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 9 i.e. “*Intra and inter-institutional interactions*”

Gap	Respondents / Institutions	NAAC accreditation status		Total
		Not Accredited	Accredited	
- 4.00 to - 2.01	Count	6	0	6
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	33.30%	0.00%	1.90%
	% of Total	1.90%	0.00%	1.90%
- 2.00 to - 0.01	Count	12	44	56
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	21.40%	78.60%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	66.70%	14.50%	17.40%
	% of Total	3.70%	13.70%	17.40%
0	Count	0	47	47
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	15.50%	14.60%
	% of Total	0.00%	14.60%	14.60%
0.01 to 2.00	Count	0	212	212
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	69.70%	65.80%
	% of Total	0.00%	65.80%	65.80%
2.01 to 4.00	Count	0	1	1
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%
Total	Count	18	304	322
	% within Benefit - Expectation GAP 9	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%
	% within NAAC accredited	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.60%	94.40%	100.00%

The above table shows gap between benefit and expectation that the surveyed HEIs have on the benefit - “NAAC accreditation facilitates intra and inter-institutional interactions” by the status of accreditation.

As could be seen from the table 4.4.9 above, there are 6 HEIs that show a very negative gap of – 4.00 to – 2.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “intra and inter-institutional interactions”. Among these 6

respondents, all are from non NAAC accredited HEIs while none HEI of the respondents are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is somewhat normal to expect them to have a very negative gap.

It could be seen that a total of 56 HEIs show a negative gap of – 2.00 to – 0.01 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “intra and inter-institutional interactions”. Among these 56 respondents 12 HEIs comprising 21.40% are non-NAAC accredited while 44 respondents comprising 78.60% are NAAC accredited institutions. As the non-NAAC accredited HEIs have not gone through the NAAC accreditation process it is natural to expect them to have a negative gap.

However, it is rather very surprising to see that 44 NAAC accredited institutions to show a negative gap. It implies that 14.50% of all the NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a ‘negative gap’ on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “intra and inter-institutional interactions”. For NAAC this should be a cause of concern.

It could be seen from the table that 47 institutions show a gap of zero (0) on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “intra and inter-institutional interactions”. Among these 47 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited while all the other 47 institutions are NAAC accredited. As the non-NAAC accredited institutions have not gone through NAAC accreditation process it is natural to have them show a ‘zero gap’.

However, it is good to see 47 institutions among the NAAC accredited Institutions showing a ‘zero gap’ as they comprise only 15.50% of total NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table a total of 212 institutions show a ‘positive gap’ of 0.01 to 2.00 on the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates “intra and inter-institutional interactions”. Among these 212 institutions none of the institutions are non-NAAC accredited. While all the other 212 institutions are

NAAC accredited. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to have a 'positive gap' as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process; it is good that 212 NAAC accredited institutions exhibit a positive gap. These 212 institutions comprise 69.70% among NAAC accredited institutions.

It could be seen from the table that just 1 institution shows a 'very positive gap' of 2.01 to 4.00. This 1 institution is NAAC accredited HEI while none belong to non-NAAC accredited institution HEI. It is natural to expect none of the non-NAAC accredited institutions to show this gap as they have not gone through NAAC accreditation process.

It is concerning that only 1 NAAC accredited institution shows the 'positive gap' or 'Most Realized' status with respect to the benefit that NAAC accreditation facilitates "intra and inter-institutional interactions". In other words only 0.30% of the NAAC accredited institutions have most realized this benefit.

Table 4.4.18 Chi-square test for range of gap (between perceived benefit and perceived expectation) and accreditation status of HEIs with respect to benefit 9 i.e. “Intra and inter-institutional interactions”

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	143.346 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	80.612	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	322		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

Pearson Chi-square measure of association (Chi square = 143.346) to measure association between HEIs opinion on NAAC accreditation facilitates intra and inter-institutional interactions by the status of accreditation in the above table shows a significant p value ($p = 0.000$). This level of significance indicates a very strong association between the gap of benefits and expectations and the status of accreditation on the benefit –“NAAC accreditation facilitates intra and inter-institutional interactions”.