

ANALYSIS REPORT ON THE IDIA DIVERSITY SURVEY, 2014-15



INCREASING DIVERSITY BY INCREASING ACCESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	3
COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PART 1: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND	4
1. College Representation.	4
2. General v. Reserved	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. Choosing law as a career	6
4. Family's Association with Law	7
5. Schooling Background	8
PART 2: SOCIO CULTURAL BACKGROUND.....	11
6. Gender	11
7. Disability or Impairment Suffered	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8. Religion and Caste.....	12
9. Geographical Representation.....	13
PART 3: ECONOMIC BACKGROUND.....	16
10. Family Background.....	16
PART 4: PRE-CLAT/AILET EXPERIENCE	18
11. Funding of the legal education.....	18
12. Coaching institutes as the most opted option for CLAT/AILET preparation	20
13. Attempts at Clearing the Examination, Difficulty Levels, et cetera.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PART 5: POST-CLAT/AILET EXPERIENCE	24
14. Disparaging remarks by fellow students	24
15. Disparaging remarks by members of staff and faculty.....	26
16. Awareness campaigns/workshops/discussions/talks organised by the law schools to address these prejudices	30
PART 6: OTHER POST-ADMISSION CAMPUS EXPERIENCES	31
17. Students facing 'cultural shock'	31

18.	Comprehension issues vis-à-vis classroom teachings and discussions	31
19.	Academic support programs in colleges	32
20.	Participation in co-curricular activities such as mooting, debating, MUNs, Client-Counselling and Negotiations	33
PART 7: OVERALL EXPERIENCE OF LAW SCHOOLS		34
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.....		34

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The analysis of the diversity survey reveals in clear terms a stark diversity deficit which is reflected in the following findings:

1. Majority of the students belong to General category, while the minority communities are barely represented.
2. Only 3% of the surveyed students are from Muslim families. To keep this in perspective, 14.2% of India's population comprises of Muslims.¹
3. More than 90% of the students have completed their schooling in English medium schools set up in cities.
4. Differently abled students comprise only 1.41% of the student population. This is despite the fact that all NLUs reserve 3% of the seats for students from the PWD category.
5. Most of the students hail from economically well-off families. This is indicated by various factors such as high income (about 36% of the surveyed students' parents' annual income is over 10 lakh rupees) and English-speaking proficiency of their parents (80% of the surveyed students reported that at least one of their parents is fluent in English). Also, most of the students hail from families involved in either business or government services (fathers of more than half the surveyed students are either civil servants or engaged in business or government service).
6. As far as the funding of legal education is concerned, there seems to be poor availability of scholarships to students. Very few students manage to find funding for the exorbitant fees charged by NLUs. This is indicated by the fact that while nearly 22% of the surveyed students come from families whose annual income is below 3 lakh rupees, only about 4.5% of the surveyed students are availing of scholarships, either provided by their universities or by external agencies, to fund their education.
7. The survey also reveals that unfortunate disparaging remarks have been made against the LGBT community, women, people who do not speak English well, etc. This indicates the level of prejudice prevailing among both students and staff/faculty members.
8. In some cases, these disparaging remarks have also transformed themselves into unfortunate incidents of bullying, ragging, harassments and ridiculing.
9. The survey records an unwillingness of students to take part in extra-curricular activities like debating, MUNs, moot court competitions, client-counseling competitions etc. on account of the fear of conversing fluently in English, and issues pertaining to low self-esteem.

¹ Infra 8. Religion and Caste, page 14 of this report.

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT

IDIA continued with its annual exercise of National Law University (NLU) Diversity Surveys by conducting, earlier this year, a nation-wide survey of first year students admitted in the academic year 2014-15 across multiple NLUs in India. The survey aims to analyse multiple aspects relating to diversity of students in National Law Universities. This year's Diversity Survey proved to be IDIA's largest one yet, as the total number of participant students is 1359 across 12 National Law Universities.

This report analyses the survey results and highlights areas of potential reform at various NLUs that will hopefully facilitate the evolution of a better and more inclusive legal education ecosystem.

PART 1: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. College Representation.

Answer Choices	Responses
Chanakya National Law University, Patna (CNLU)	10.89%
Gujarat National Law University, Gandhinagar (GNLU)	11.48%
Hidayatullah National Law University, Raipur (HNLU)	10.96%
NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad (NALSAR)	6.18%
National Law School of India University, Bangalore (NLSIU)	5.67%
National Law University, Jodhpur (NLU)	7.36%
National Law University Odisha, Cuttack (NLUO)	7.28%
National University of Advanced Legal Studies, Kochi (NUALS)	5.52%
National University of Study and Research in Law, Ranchi (NUSRL)	8.31%
Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala (RGNUL)	9.35%
Ram Manohar Lohia National Law University, Lucknow (RMLNLU)	11.48%

National Law University, Delhi (NLUD)	5.52%
---------------------------------------	-------

Table 1: Participating NLUs and percentage of surveyed students

As compared to the 2013-14 diversity survey report,² which covered only five NLUs – NLSIU, NALSAR, NUJS, NLU Delhi and NLU Jodhpur – this survey was conducted at a far larger scale covering twelve universities across India.

Except for NUJS, all the NLUs which were included in the 2013-14 diversity survey report were also a part of 2014-15 IDIA survey. The participation from the said NLUs has been the same in both years, with an average of almost 90% of the total batch strength responding. Maximum responses were received from RMLNLU, Lucknow and GNLU, Gandhinagar, with 156 students responding from each university.

2. Category of Seats

Answer Choices	Responses
All India General	60.01%
SC	10.46%
ST	4.82%
OBC	7.05%
State Domicile	7.64%
NRI	4.53%
Foreign national	1.41%
Physically Handicapped / Differently Abled	1.41%
Others (such as EBC, BC, Kashmiri Migrant, or Son/Daughter of Defence Personnel etc)	2.67%

Table 2: Category of Seats

The survey reveals that the majority of the students in National Law Universities in India belong to the General category. This is a direct result of the way in which seats are allocated

² See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 4, available at <http://idialaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Top-5-Analysis.pdf>.

by the NLUs. More than 60% of the students hail from the general category while only 22.3% represent backward classes. The results, on being compared to 2013-14³ diversity survey report, reveal a 10% drop in the students from the general category and an increase of 6% in those from the backward classes.

Some NLUs have reserved seats under state domicile quota. Others like NLUO, RGNUL, HNLU and NLU Delhi do not have such reservation. Seats are also reserved for differently abled students and foreign nationals, but each of these represents only 1.41% of the total students. There is also observed a fall of 4%, as compared to the 2013-14 diversity survey report in the students under the Foreign Nationals Category.⁴ Other categories revealed by the survey are Economically Backward Classes, NRI sponsored seats, Son/Daughter of Defence personnel, and Kashmiri Migrants. These categories cumulatively account for 2.67% of the students.

3. Choosing law as a career

(i) Reasons for choosing law

Answer Choices	Responses
Parental compulsion	6.79%
By choice	65.03%
Accidental/just got into it	17.60%
Law was a fallback option (could not make it to other courses such as engineering or medicine)	9.02%
Other	16.70%

Table 3: Reasons for pursuing law

A clear majority of the student population i.e. 65.03% of the students surveyed, reported to having taken up law as a career out of their own volition. This is a clear indication of increasing interest in law. A statistical comparison drawn with the 2013-14 diversity survey report would show how the appeal towards law as a career has increased since the last year. Whereas almost one-fourth of the students that participated in the survey last year claimed to have “accidently gotten into” law as their career choice, this year only 17% of the total

³ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 5, available at <http://idialaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Top-5-Analysis.pdf>.

⁴ *Ibid.*

students made this claim.⁵ Some of the participant students have also mentioned that legal education could serve as a base to enter politics or civil services, and to serve society at large.

The survey also revealed that the students opting for law out of parental compulsion have doubled to 6.79% from 3% since the 2013-14 survey.⁶ This is another indicator of law’s surging popularity as a career option, particularly among parents in families.

(ii) Parental Support

Answer Choices	Responses
Parents supported	83.77%
Parents did not support	2.30%
Parents did not support initially, but they supported the choice later on.	13.94%

Table 4: Parental Support in pursuing legal education

As depicted by the tabulated data above, a huge majority of the students receive their parents’ support for pursuing law as a career. The data is almost identical to what the 2013-14 diversity survey report revealed. Of 1359 students surveyed, only 26 i.e. 2.3% were not supported at all. Last year, 13 out of 402 students, or 3.2%, did not receive any support.⁷

4. Family’s Association with Law

Answer Choices	Responses
Student has a family link with law.	43.53%
Student does not have a family link with law.	56.47%

Table 5: Family’s link with Law

Family association with the legal profession is an important reason behind many students’ decision to join law colleges. Of the total students surveyed, 43.5% of the students stated that their family is linked with the legal profession in one way or the other. This is far greater

⁵ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 10, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 10, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>

than what was revealed by the 2013-14 diversity survey report, where only 29% of the students had such a link.⁸

5. Schooling Background

(i) Medium of Instruction at Schools of surveyed students

Answer Choices	Responses
English	96.71%
Hindi	2.76%
Other vernacular language	0.52%

Table 6: Medium of Instruction

A combined study of 2013-14 and 2014-15 data reveals that an enormous body of students - 98.73 and 96.71% respectively of the total students surveyed - hail from English medium schools.⁹ A possible cause for this uniformity is that the question papers for the entrance exams are set in English and there is a major section that tests aspirants only on the basis of their English language skills. This makes it extremely difficult for the students instructed in vernacular languages.

(ii) Affiliation of School Board.

Answer Choices	Responses
CBSE	68.79%
ICSE	16.27%
IB	0.52%
Open Board	0.37%
State Board	12.20%
Other	1.85%

⁸ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 9, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>

⁹Anahita Mukherji, 2 Crore Indian Children study in English-medium schools, THE TIMES OF INDIA (March 2012) available at <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/2-crore-Indian-children-study-in-English-medium-schools/articleshow/12105621.cms>. (A rise of 274% has been seen in the number of students enrolled in the English medium schools in 2003-04.)

Table 7: School Board Affiliation

The data depicts that more than two-thirds of the total surveyed students come from CBSE-affiliated schools. This can be attributed to the fact that the number of schools affiliated to CBSE is far more than those affiliated to ICSE.¹⁰ No comparison of the data can be made with 2013-14 diversity survey report, as it did not cater to this aspect of schooling background.

(iii) Location of the Schools

Answer Choices	Responses
City	90.18%
Town	10.59%
Village	1.92%

Table 8: Location of School from which First Year Students Hail

The latest census declares that more than 80% of the Indian population resides in rural areas¹¹ but the table above depicts that 90% of the total students surveyed had their schooling in cities. This severe lack of diversity shows the lack of mobilization of students from villages and towns towards studying in the NLU's, possibly due to lack of awareness regarding legal education and opportunities in rural areas as compared to cities. This consequently leads to a dearth of proper training resources and facilities for preparing for the law entrance examinations.

(iv) Percentage Scored by the Students in their XII Board Examinations

Answer Choices	Responses
Above 90 %	29.96%
Between 80 and 90 %	35.06%
Between 70 and 80 %	25.15%

¹⁰Deepshikha Punj, *The great Indian education debate*, THE INDIAN EXPRESS, (July 7, 2013) available at <http://www.newindianexpress.com/magazine/The-great-Indian-education-debate/2013/07/07/article1666702.ece>. (More than 12,504 schools are affiliated to CBSE while only 1900 schools in India have ICSE board.)

¹¹Census 2011, *Rural Urban Distribution Of Population* available at http://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/paper2/data_files/india/Rural_Urban_2011.pdf.

Below 70%	9.84%
-----------	-------

Table 9: Percentage scored by students

About 65% of the students have secured more than 80% in their 12th standard examination, and the next 25% have secured in the range of 70% to 80%. This reveals that most of the students entering the NLUs are academically proficient. But if a comparison is made with the results of the 2013-14 diversity survey report, then the data suggests that there has been a fall in the number of high-scorers (students in 80-100 percentile) by a full 14%.¹² This could be most likely due to the fact that the previous survey looked at students only from Top 5 NLUs, and these Top 5 NLUs are more likely to have students who performed relatively better in Class 12.

(v) Academic Stream Opted

Answer Choices	Responses
Science	54.91%
Humanities	11.07%
Commerce	33.43%
Other	0.59%

Table 10: Academic background of First Year Students

Analysing data of the surveys from 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15, it has been seen that there is a consistent upward trend of students with a science background taking up law as their career. 50% of the first year-students surveyed in 2013¹³ and 51% of the first year-students surveyed in 2014¹⁴ were from science stream.

¹² See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 12, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>

¹³ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 12, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

PART 2: SOCIO-CULTURAL BACKGROUND

6. Gender Diversity

Answer Choices	Responses
Male	52.66%
Female	47.05%
Other	0.30%

Table 11: Participating NLUs and Surveyed Students [Gender Representation- Responses]

Law universities have commendable gender equality in terms of their student population, with 52.66% male and 47.05% female students. NALSAR Hyderabad, NLIU Bhopal, HNLU Raipur and GNLU Gandhinagar are some of the NLUs that have horizontally reserved 30% of the seats for female candidates, to encourage female aspirants to pursue legal education.

However, it must be noted that the female population exceeded male population by 4% in the 2013-14 diversity survey report.¹⁵ This year there has been a fall as shown in the table above. 4 students out of the total students surveyed have also ticked the “Others” column which must be seen in context of the Supreme Court judgment recognizing transgender community as a third gender.¹⁶

7. Persons with Disabilities

Answer Choices	Responses
No	95.78%
Yes, hearing impairment	0.38%
Yes, speech impairment	0.23
Yes, visual impairment	1.21%
Yes, mobility impairment (Physically handicapped)	0.90%

¹⁵See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 4, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>.

¹⁶ *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India*, (2014) 5 SCC 438.

Yes, learning disability	0.38%
Yes, other disability	1.21%

Table 12: Participating NLUs and Surveyed Students [Persons with Disabilities]

The table depicts that 5% of the total students surveyed are differently abled and suffer some form of impairment. All NLUs have a 3% reservation for persons with disability (PWD), in compliance with the Persons with Disability Act. Also, various NLUs grant differently abled students with certain benefits like extra time in examinations etc. so as to facilitate fair competition.

But as mentioned in Table 2 of the report, only 1.41% of students are admitted under the PWD category. This can be due to multiple factors. The admissions under this category depend on the threshold of disability criteria that the colleges set. Due to high standards that are set as the criteria, many disabilities such as that of learning or speech¹⁷ are not considered serious enough and not recognized under PWD reservation.

8. Religion

Answer Choices	Responses
Buddhism	1.14%
Christianity	4.55%
Hinduism	82.70%
Islam	3.11%
Jainism	3.57%
Sikhism	1.59%
Zoroastrianism	0.30%
Other	3.03%

Table 13: Religious representation of first year students

Out of the surveyed students, 82.70% follow Hinduism while only 3% represent the Muslim community. All other religions are also meagrely represented. One of the reasons that can be attributed to such huge representation of Hindu community is that Hindus form almost

¹⁷ Section 2(i), Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.

three-fourths of the Indian population and therefore it is natural that they will have greater representation.¹⁸ The 2013-14 Diversity Survey Analysis also depicts the same pattern. The representation of Hindus has increased by 6%, and that of Muslims has increased by 2.35%.¹⁹ However, it has to be noted that even though the Muslim community is the largest minority in India and forms 14.2% of the total Indian population²⁰, it is extremely underrepresented as compared to other religions. For instance, around 4.55% of the students are Christians, which is greater than the Muslim representation despite the fact that Christians form only 2.3% of the Indian population and Muslims form 14.09%.²¹ This alarmingly low representation from a minority community calls for urgent attention.

9. Geographical Representation

Answer Choices	Responses
Uttar Pradesh	19.20%
Rajasthan	12.00%
Madhya Pradesh	9.37%
Bihar	9.37%
Kerala	5.73%
Delhi (NCT)	5.26%
Jharkhand	5.19%
Maharashtra	4.26%
Chhattisgarh	3.95%
West Bengal	3.41%
Karnataka	3.25%

¹⁸ Rukmini S. Vijaita Singh, *Muslim population growth slows*, THE HINDU, (August 27, 2015) available at <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/census-2011-data-on-population-by-religious-communities/article7579161.ece>.

¹⁹ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 7, available at <http://idialaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Top-5-Analysis.pdf>.

²⁰ Alope Tikku, *Muslim population grows marginally faster: Census 2011 data*, HINDUSTAN TIMES (August 26, 2015) available at <http://www.hindustantimes.com/india/muslim-population-grows-marginally-faster-census-2011-data/story-yAhd2F6z57ezaFWiwwYU7H.html>.

²¹ *Population by Religion in India*, INDIAN ONLINE PAGES available at <http://www.indiaonlinepages.com/population/religious-population-in-india.html>

Gujarat	3.25%
Andhra Pradesh	2.32%
Haryana	2.09%
Punjab	2.01%
Uttarakhand	1.78%
Tamil Nadu	1.55%
Telangana	1.47%
Odisha	1.47%
Jammu and Kashmir	1.01%
Chandigarh (UT)	0.77%
Assam	0.46%
Himachal Pradesh	0.23%
Tripura	0.08%
Mizoram	0.08%
Meghalaya	0.08%
Manipur	0.08%
Goa	0.08%
Daman and Diu (UT)	0.08%
Arunachal Pradesh	0.08%
Andaman and Nicobar Islands (UT)	0.08%
Sikkim	0.00%
Puducherry (UT)	0.00%
Nagaland	0.00%

Lakshadweep (UT)	0.00%
Dadra and Nagar Haveli (UT)	0.00%

Table 14: Geographical representation of First Year Students

The table above depicts the geographical distribution of students across the various Indian states and Union Territories. The highest representation is from Uttar Pradesh followed by Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar.

Union Territories and North Eastern states have again found themselves scantily represented just as depicted by 2013-14 diversity survey report. The 2014-15 survey revealed that Union Territories like Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, and Puducherry were not at all represented this year. Sikkim and Nagaland have not been represented in two consecutive years. Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Daman and Diu, Goa, Manipur, Meghalaya and Mizoram are represented by 1 student. There are no students from the previously represented states of Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura.²²

It is to be noted that all the union territories and north eastern states that have been scantily represented or were not represented at all do not have an NLU. Thus, lack of awareness regarding legal education can be the main cause. Setting up of national universities in these unrepresented states can be one of the solutions to encourage diversity. Representation from Jammu and Kashmir is comparatively more. This can be the result of the seats reserved for Kashmiri Migrants in various NLUs such as NLU Delhi, RGNLU Patiala and HNLU Raipur.

Extremely high representation from Uttar Pradesh (2.6 million), Bihar (1.7 million) and Madhya Pradesh can be explained by their dense population. Also, Bhopal in Madhya Pradesh with more than 14 coaching centers²³ and Jaipur in Rajasthan with 23 coaching centers²⁴ have become CLAT-AILET coaching hubs after 75 in Mumbai²⁵ and 216 in Delhi.²⁶

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Law Entrance Exam Coaching Centers in Bhopal*, available at <https://targetstudy.com/coaching/law-entrance-exams-coaching-in-bhopal.htm>.

²⁴ *Law Entrance Exam Coaching Centers in Jaipur*, available at <https://targetstudy.com/coaching/clat-coaching-in-jaipur.htm>.

²⁵ *Law Entrance Exam Coaching Centers in Mumbai*, <https://targetstudy.com/coaching/law-entrance-exams-coaching-in-mumbai.htm>.

²⁶ *Law Entrance Exam Coaching Centers in Delhi*, <https://targetstudy.com/coaching/law-entrance-exams-coaching-in-delhi.htm>.

PART 3: ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

10. Family Background

(i) Proficiency in English language.

Answer Choices	Responses
Both of them do	53.71%
Only my mother does	2.42%
Only my father does	24.28%
Neither of them do	19.59%

Table 15: Family's Proficiency in English

More than half of the students surveyed come from families where both parents speak English proficiently. This suggests that these students come from highly educated family backgrounds. Also, since English as a language plays such significant role in legal education, such students clearly tend to benefit more than the others. Out of 1322 responses received, only 259, that is, almost 20% of the students responded that neither of their parents can speak English. It must be noted that this figure has almost doubled from the 2013-14 diversity survey analysis where only 10% of the total students made this claim. One possible explanation for this could be that since the survey from 2013-14 captured data from only the top 5 NLUs, this indicates that more students admitted to these NLUs come from families where at least one parent speaks English, in relation to the other NLUs. Another possible explanation could be that CLAT 2014 must have been more diversity-friendly and inclusive as compared to CLAT 2013.

(ii) Occupation of the Parents

Answer Choices	Responses (Mother)	Responses (Father)
Lawyer	3.17%	7.37%
Doctor	3.48%	5.32%
Engineer	1.89%	11.25%
Civil Servant (IAS, IPS, etc.)	0.68%	6.38%

Other Government Service	6.65%	23.02%
Businessman	3.33%	21.35%
Teacher / Professor	14.97%	6.91%
Media Professional	0.91%	0.53%
Agriculturist	0.30%	1.82%
Scientist	0.38%	0.53%
Defence Personnel	0.23%	2.66%
Homemaker	57.75%	0.68%
Other (please specify)	6.27%	12.16%

Table 16: Parents' Occupation

The results of the above table are consistent with the realities of the Indian society at present as more than half of the students responded with Homemaker as their mother's occupation. The 2013-14 diversity survey report depicted 43% of the mothers as Homemakers.²⁷ Interesting responses received apart from the categories mentioned in the survey, as part of the 'Other' category, are Librarian, Politician, Editor, Writer, Accountant, Food Technologist, Sales Accountant, Art Therapist, Historian, Social Worker, Fashion Designer, Event Organizer, Journalist, Psychologist, Pharmacist, Singer, Architect etc..

The responses to 'Father's profession' paint a completely different picture. Majority of the students responded with two major occupations: Businessman and Government services. 9 students responded with the option of Homemaker as their father's occupation, as compared to the 2013-14 diversity survey report in which no student's father was a homemaker. Other responses received under the head of father's profession are Chartered Accountant, Bank Manager, Politician and Stock Broker.

Only 7.37% and 3.17% of the fathers and mothers respectively belong to the legal profession. This goes on to show that contrary to the popular notion that only those from a family of lawyers seek a legal education, most of the students in NLUs will be first generation lawyers.

²⁷ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 8, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>.

(iii) Annual Income of the Family

Answer Choices	Responses
Below 50,000	1.71%
From 50,000 to 1 lakh	5.13%
From 1 lakh to 3 lakhs	15.71%
From 3 lakhs to 10 lakhs	41.21%
From 10 lakhs to 15 lakhs	19.91%
Above 15 lakhs	16.33%

Table 17: Family's Annual Income

A majority of the students surveyed hail from families that have incomes ranging from 3 lakh to 10 lakhs. Further, 36% of the students belong to the categories with incomes ranging from 10 lakh to 15 lakhs, and above that. This clearly indicates that a disproportionate lot of students from well off and elite families join NLUs. This is likely due to the expensive fees that many cannot afford.²⁸

However, in comparison with the 2013-14 diversity survey report data, in which 87% of the students hailed from the families with income above three lakhs,²⁹ we see a decrease of almost 10% in this category this year. This shows that slowly more students from less well-off family back grounds are being included in NLUs.

PART 4: PRE-CLAT/AILET EXPERIENCE

The surveyed students were asked about who was funding their legal education and their responses have been tabulated below:

11. Funding of the legal education

Answer Choices	Responses
----------------	-----------

²⁸ Prachi Shrivastava, *Cost of legal education shoots up as younger colleges struggle*, LIVE MINT (Jul 28 2015) available at <http://www.livemint.com/Politics/F18PoH4CjdAbBATLNrhecN/Cost-of-legal-education-shoots-up-as-younger-colleges-strugg.html>.

²⁹ See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 11, available at <http://idialaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Top-5-Analysis.pdf>.

Parents	90.87%
Relatives	1.96%
Family friends	0.15%
Bank loan	7.55%
Scholarship	2.57%
Others	0.45%

Table 18: Source of funding for legal education

It appears from the responses that parents' income remains the primary source of funding for NLU students' legal education. However, a good number of students are funding their legal education through bank loans and various scholarships. The specific responses under the category 'other' also reflect funding from various scholarships such as:

- Aditya Birla Scholarship,
- SBI Education Loan,
- IDIA scholarship,
- National Talent Search Examination Scholarship,
- M.K. Nambyar Endowment Fund,
- SAIL-Sarvottam Scholarship,
- Various college sponsored scholarships, and
- State government/Central government scholarship schemes.

It may be brought to light here that an analysis of the responses under the head 'Others' reveals a considerable overlap (in terms of the responses) between the categories of 'relatives', 'loan' and 'scholarships'. Therefore, a combined reading of the surveyed responses under the category 'bank loans' and some of the responses in the category 'others' reveal that an approximate of 8.45% of the students surveyed are funding their legal education by availing bank loans against which their properties, lands, houses, cars etc. have been mortgaged. This a reflection of hardships that a significant proportion of prospective students' families are put through. Given this, easing the burden inherent in the process of obtaining of student loans is the need of the hour. It goes without saying that a major part of this problem owes its origin to the exorbitant fees charged by NLUs today.

Further, a combined reading of the responses under the head 'Scholarships' and 'Others' reveals that 4.67% of the students surveyed are funding their legal education through

various scholarships. This figure is exclusive of cases where scholarships had been applied for but results were awaited at the time of filling in the survey.

Comparison with data from the diversity survey 2013-14³⁰ reveals an increase in the percentage share of loans from 7% to the above mentioned 8.45%. There has also been a marked increase in the percentage share of scholarships, from 1% to 4.67%. However, the fact that less than 5% of students avail of scholarships reveals the poor availability of both internal and external scholarships to students in NLUs. More of such scholarships definitely need to be offered by all the NLUs.

12. Coaching institutes as the most opted option for CLAT/AILET preparation

The responses from the diversity survey indicate that an overwhelming majority of the respondents undertook coaching to prepare for the CLAT/AILET examinations. It has perhaps become a *de facto* route to prepare for CLAT/AILET examinations by enrolling in coaching centers which, in turn, charge heavy fees.³¹ The below table provides the estimate for the number of students who undertook coaching to prepare for CLAT/AILET, out of those surveyed.

Answer choices	Responses
Yes	83.90%
Wanted to, but could not afford it	0.48%
No, opted to prepare on my own	15.62%

Table 19: Students enrolling in Coaching Institutes for CLAT/AILET preparation

Out of those who undertook coaching for CLAT/AILET preparation, majority of the students (34.20%)³² dropped a year after finishing school to prepare for the exams. This is followed by those taking a one-month crash course after completion of school (26.64%). This data has been tabulated below:

³⁰See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 11, available at <http://idialaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Top-5-Analysis.pdf>.

³¹ See <http://www.careerlauncher.com/center/ProductCLDesc.jsp> (career launcher's LST Express program, Rupees 26,100 for 4-6 weeks), http://www.lawentrancecoaching.com/c_sriram_rapid_course.html (IMS' similar 'RAPID' program, Rupees 29,500 for 25 days); last accessed on November 16, 2015.

³² The option of dropping a year after completion of school received the maximum number of responses, hence the percentage of 34.20%, being the highest percentage amongst the other options, has been described as 'majority'.

Answer choices	Responses
One-month crash course after 12 th standard (or equivalent) exams	26.64%
Six months	9.00%
One-year course while studying in 12 th standard (or equivalent)	16.20%
Two-year course while studying in Class 11 th or 12 th (or equivalent)	10.17%
Dropped a year after Board exams to prepare for CLAT/AILET	34.20%
Others	3.78%

Table 20: Duration of Coaching

There might be various factors leading to a majority of students dropping a year after the Class XII board exam and enrolling themselves in CLAT. These may include failure to clear the exam in the first attempt, or the student wishing to take their chances with a better law school in the subsequent attempt, or the student(s) shifting subsequently to the field of law as a career option.

Out of the students who took coaching, an absolute majority of 52.66% attended a single programme: Career Launcher's LST program, followed by other options, which has been tabulated as below:

Answer choices	Responses
Career Launcher	52.66%
IMS	4.57%
Sriram	7.92%
Paradigm	1.30%
Bhatara/AB Tutorials	1.58%
CLAT Possible	12.02%
Heritage	2.98%

Others	23.77%
--------	--------

Table 21: Students' choice of Coaching programmes

It is noteworthy that Career Launcher's LST program remains one of the most popular choices for CLAT/AILET coaching in the country. However a comparative analysis with the diversity survey of 2013-14 reveals a drop in its popularity, from an earlier percentage of 62% to the above recorded percentage of 52.66%.³³ IMS, another leading national level coaching centre has however risen as one of the preferred centers, with an increase of 2.39% in surveyed responses in comparison with the 2013-14 diversity survey.³⁴ 'Sriram', a popular Chennai based coaching centre, has seen a decline in its popularity from 12.46% to 7.92% when compared with the 2013-14 survey³⁵. Popularity of few regional coaching centers such 'Heritage' seem to have increased (from 1.56% to 2.98%).³⁶

13. Attempts at Clearing the CLAT/AILET examination

Of the total number of students surveyed, a clear majority of 68.68% were able to clear the CLAT examination in their first attempt, while an additional 7.41% of the students secured a seat but chose not to take admission. This leaves us with the remaining 23.91% who failed to clear the examination in the first attempt. This is tabulated as below:

Answer choices	Responses
Yes	68.68%
No, I did not secure a seat at a national law university when I first wrote CLAT/AILET	23.91%
No, I secured a seat but chose not to take admission	7.41%
Attended the examination thrice or more	0.75%

Table 22: Attempts at clearing CLAT/AILET of students

Further the surveyed data illustrates that 0.75% of the students attempted the examinations thrice or more before securing a seat.

³³See IDIA Diversity Survey 2013-14, p. 14, available at <https://www.idialaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/top-5-analysis.pdf>.

³⁴Ibid

³⁵Id.

³⁶Id.

In terms of rating the CLAT examination on a difficulty level, the majority (68.67%) have rated the exam at a ‘moderate’ difficulty level, followed by 21.96% of the students who found it ‘easy’, and 9.38% who found the examination ‘tough’. This has been tabulated below:

Answer choices	Responses
Easy	21.96%
Moderate	68.67%
Tough	9.38%

Table 23: Difficulty Level of CLAT/AILET according to students

The above information may be analysed in the context of a more specific, section-wise enquiry that depicts relative difficulty faced by the students in various sections. This has been tabulated in the table below which records the responses of the surveyed students, who were asked which subject in CLAT they faced the most difficulty in;

Answer choices	Responses
English	12.20%
Current Affairs	17.26%
Static GK	34.91%
Mathematics	24.24%
Logical Reasoning	8.83%
Legal Reasoning	6.98%
None	11.72%

Table 24: Category-wise difficulty level of CLAT/AILET according to the students.

The above data clearly reveals that ‘static GK’ continues to be one of the most difficult areas in the CLAT/AILET examination. The section on ‘static GK’ in the examination tests the ability of the candidate to memorise facts. It may be suggested that the weightage to be accorded to static GK questions be therefore kept to a minimum in an examination that seeks to evaluate the mental aptitude and intellectual potential of the candidates for the study of law

PART 5: POST-CLAT/AIET EXPERIENCE

14. Disparaging remarks by fellow students

Students were asked to respond to whether they have faced disparaging remarks being made by fellow students in relation to nine different categories, viz.,

1. Women
2. Ability to speak English
3. Gay, Lesbians, Bisexual persons
4. People from different ethnic backgrounds
5. People from different religious backgrounds
6. People from different caste
7. People from different economic backgrounds
8. People with a particular skin colour
9. Persons with disability

The surveyed students were asked to rate the frequency of the disparaging remarks (if any) on a reference scale with following parameters: N (Never), R (Rarely – once or twice in a year, on an average), O (Occasionally – three of five times in a year, on an average), V (Very Often – six to nine times in a year, on an average), and F (Frequent – ten or more times in a year, on an average). The responses have been recorded in the table below;

Categories	N	R	O	V	F
Women	25.40%	27.28%	23.44%	11.08%	12.79%
Gay, Lesbian or Bisexual persons	29.99%	28.19%	21.34%	10.71%	9.77%
Persons of particular economic backgrounds	42.40%	29.53%	15.62%	7.64%	4.81%
Persons of particular	36.54%	28.37%	19.95%	7.74%	7.39%

caste					
Persons with particular skin colour	42.93%	23.53%	16.38%	8.45%	8.71%
Persons with a disability	63.09%	23.95%	7.38%	3.69%	1.89%
Persons of particular ethnic backgrounds	52.25%	25.61%	13.32%	6.23%	2.60%
Persons who do not speak English well	23.49%	24.27%	23.49%	15.49%	13.25%
Persons with particular religious backgrounds	37.14%	30.19%	19.55%	9.18%	3.95%

Table 25: Disparaging remarks made by fellow students

An analysis of the above data brings to light that unfortunately, societal prejudices seem to find their ways into esteemed institutions of legal learning. An attempt has been made in the following table to arrange these biases within the top three parameters (i.e. Frequently, Very Often, and Occasionally) in the descending order to establish what biases are the most prevalent amongst the students in NLUs.

Frequent	Very Often	Occasionally
1. language bias (towards those who do not speak English well)	1. language bias (towards those who do not speak English well)	1. language bias (towards those who do not speak English well)
2. Disparaging remarks against women	2. Disparaging remarks against women	2. Disparaging remarks against women
3. Disparaging remarks against Gay, Lesbians and Bisexual persons	3. Disparaging remarks against Gay, Lesbians and Bisexual persons	3. Disparaging remarks against Gay, Lesbians and Bisexual persons
4. Disparaging remarks towards a particular skin colour	4. Disparaging remarks against a particular religion	4. Disparaging remarks against a particular caste

5. Disparaging remarks against a particular caste	5. Disparaging remarks towards a particular skin colour	5. Disparaging remarks against a particular religion
6. Disparaging remarks towards a particular economic background	6. Disparaging remarks against a particular caste	6. Disparaging remarks towards a particular skin colour
7. Disparaging remarks against a particular religion	7. Economic background	7. Disparaging remarks towards a particular economic background
8. Disparaging remarks against an ethnic group	8. Disparaging remarks against an ethnic group	8. Disparaging remarks against an ethnic group
9. Disparaging remarks against a person with disability	9. Disparaging remarks against a person with disability	9. Disparaging remarks against a person with disability

Table 26: Arrangement of Bias according to the top 3 parameters.

From the above table it emerges that amongst the categories of ‘Frequently’, ‘Very Often’ and ‘Occasionally’, the most number of disparaging remarks seem to have been made against people who do not speak English well (52.23 %), followed by women (47.31% of participants), and Gays, Lesbians and Bisexual persons. (41.82% of participants). This reveals a disturbingly entrenched prejudice and bias amongst students in the leading law universities of the country towards the above three categories, and highlights a possibly dominant elitist sexist male culture in the NLUs.

15. Disparaging remarks by members of staff and faculty

Apart from attempting to get indications as to existing biases amongst students in various NLUs, the surveyed students were also asked to indicate the frequency with which they have heard the members of the staff and faculty in their respective law schools making disparaging remark with respect to the nine categories mentioned in the preceding section. The surveyed students submitted their responses in line with the earlier described parameters (i.e. N, R, O, V, F). Their responses have been tabulated below:

Categories	N	R	O	V	F
------------	---	---	---	---	---

Women	63.94%	20.57%	9.64%	3.10%	2.75%
Gay, Lesbian or Bisexual persons	73.86%	17.11%	5.93%	1.55%	1.55%
Persons of particular economic backgrounds	76.74%	16.45%	4.82%	1.12%	0.86%
Persons of particular caste	74.87%	17.01%	6.04%	1.12%	0.95%
Persons with particular skin colour	81.79%	12.60%	3.80%	1.04%	0.69%
Persons with a disability	83.77%	12.00%	2.50%	1.04%	0.69%
Persons of particular ethnic backgrounds	79.88%	13.99%	3.89%	0.95%	1.30%
Persons who do not speak English well	64.28%	20.79%	9.66%	2.85%	2.42%
Persons with particular religious backgrounds	73.04%	18.86%	5.43%	1.72%	0.95%

Table 27: Disparaging remarks by staff or faculty.

In line with the approach in the previous section, the above data has been analysed and re-arranged in a descending order of biases amongst the top three parameters of ‘Frequently’, ‘Very Often’ and ‘Occasionally’ to get a glimpse at the most prevalent biases prevailing amongst the members of staff and faculty in the national law schools, in the table below:

Frequently	Very Often	Occasionally
1. Disparaging remarks against women	1. Disparaging remarks against women	1. Language bias (towards people who do not speak English well)
2. Language bias (towards people who do not speak English well)	2. Language bias (towards people who do not speak English well)	2. Disparaging remarks against women
3. Disparaging remarks	3. Disparaging remarks	3. Disparaging remarks

against Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual persons	against a particular religion	against a particular caste
4. Disparaging remarks against a particular ethnic group	4. Disparaging remarks against Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual persons	4. Disparaging remarks against Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual persons
5. Disparaging remarks against a particular religion	5. Disparaging remarks against a particular economic background.	5. Disparaging remarks against a particular religion
6. Disparaging remarks against a particular caste	6. Disparaging remarks against a particular caste	6. Disparaging remarks against a particular economic background
7. Disparaging remarks against a particular economic background	7. Disparaging remarks against a particular skin colour	7. Disparaging remarks against a particular ethnic group.
8. Disparaging remarks against a particular skin colour	8. Disparaging remarks against persons with disability	8. Disparaging remarks against a particular skin colour
9. Disparaging remarks against persons with disability	Disparaging remarks against a particular ethnic group.	9. Disparaging remarks against persons with disability

Table 28: Arrangement of Bias according to the top 3 parameters.

The above tabulation reveals that a prejudice towards women, and towards people who cannot speak English well (reflected in the form of disparaging remarks being made against them), are present amongst the faculty/staff members of the NLUs. Although the figures do not rise as high for faculty/staff members as they do for the students, their very factum of existence cannot be denied.

It therefore appears, if we were to narrow down upon two specific categories, the law school campuses of the reputed NLUs in the country, suffer with some amount of express prejudice towards at least two specific categories –

1. **Women**

2. Persons who cannot speak English well.

It is indeed unfortunate that the data reveals this, given that NLUs are often considered as platforms where perspectives of egalitarianism and feminism are sought to be encouraged among students.

Explanatory Note: Tables 26 and 28 are ‘re-arranged’ tables The original tables recording responses against five categories of frequency (‘Frequent’, ‘Very Frequent’, ‘Occasionally’, ‘Rarely’ and ‘Never’) have been re-tabulated to narrow down the focus on the top-three categories of frequency (‘Frequent’, ‘Very Frequent’ and ‘Occasionally’), within which the disparagements have been placed in a descending order depending upon the percentages recorded in their favour. This has been done in order to deduce which of the nine biases are the most pervasive across law school campuses.

Prejudices frequently lead into incidents of bullying, ragging and ridicule, which further lead to ‘fitting-in’ issues for the students. The following table records responses to the question whether they have been bullied, ragged, harassed, ridiculed or faced fitting in issues in reference to the previously listed nine criteria:

Answer choices	Responses
No	86.29%
Yes, because of my gender/sexual orientation	1.89%
Yes, because of my disability	0.47%
Yes, because of my religious beliefs	0.87%
Yes. Because of my caste	1.34%
Yes, because of the colour of my skin	1.65%
Yes, because of my economic status	1.26%
Yes, because of where I come from	5.99%
Yes, because of my family background	0.95%
Yes, because I do not speak English well	4.65%

Table 29: Students experience with bullying/ragging/harassment

The above results seem to be consistent with the previous responses and it again emerges that prejudices towards gender/sexual orientation and inability to communicate fluently in English language led to 6.54% of the participants suffering incidents of ragging and harassment. This continues to cause tremendous fitting-in issues for the affected students. Furthermore, it also appears from the above data that regional biases have been an important factor behind these incidents, since 5.99% (the highest percentage in the category of people answering the question in affirmative) have attributed the cause of such ragging/harassment to the place they come from.

16. Awareness campaigns/workshops/discussions/talks organized by the law schools to address these prejudices

The surveyed students were asked whether their institution had conducted any awareness campaigns, workshops, discussions, talks etc. to address discrimination against/insensitive treatment of the nine categories discussed before. The affirmative responses (with percentages against the relevant category) have been tabulated below:

Answer choices	Responses
Women	88.49%
Gay, Lesbian or bisexual persons	43.35%
Persons of particular economic backgrounds	26.47%
Persons of particular religious backgrounds	19.44%
Persons of particular caste	20.97%
Persons with a particular skin colour	13.17%
Persons with a disability	28.52%
Persons of particular ethnic backgrounds	17.14%
Persons who do not speak English well	27.11%

Table 30: Awareness workshops organised by law schools to address prejudices

The above responses indicate that most NLUs have organized many awareness campaigns and sessions; to address prejudicial and discriminatory conduct against women. It may be pointed out that though this is in line with the gravity of prejudices as revealed in previous

sections, there could be more awareness and sensitization programs as far as integration issue faced by students who cannot speak English well are concerned. In light of the fact that the diversity survey has revealed that these students end up at the receiving end of the highest number of disparaging remarks and other forms of harassment, it may be suggested that more effort must be put to address this issue by NLUs. Such sessions could perhaps de-stress the importance of English language in social interactions, apart from providing a platform where students could be provided language lessons, wherever required. These sessions could also involve senior students who didn't have a good command over the English language when they joined the university, but who managed to develop that through their stay in law school.

PART 6: OTHER POST-ADMISSION CAMPUS EXPERIENCES

17. Students facing 'cultural shock'

The surveyed students were asked whether they faced any 'cultural shocks' after joining their respective NLUs. Their responses have been tabulated below:

Answer choices	Responses
No	81.96%
Yes (please specify)	18.04%

Table 31: Students facing cultural shock

It may be relevant to point out that such 'cultural shocks', when seen in light of the already prevalent prejudices analysed before, can make it all the more difficult for the non-mainstream students to find their feet in an elitist law school environment.

18. Comprehension issues vis-à-vis classroom teachings and discussions

Approximately 40% of students surveyed, (which is more than one-third of all participants) when asked whether they faced any difficulties in understanding class room lectures, answered in the affirmative. The reasons for such responses have been tabulated below:

Answer choices	Responses
No	63.96%
Yes, I do not understand English very well	4.02%

Yes, the teachers do not teach very well	19.64%
Yes, I am scared to ask the teachers questions and clarify	8.91%
Yes, the reading materials are not easily comprehensible	5.44%
Yes, for other reasons	5.36%

Table 32: Difficulty in comprehending class room lectures

It is deducible from the above table that one of the major reasons given by students for inability in understanding classroom lectures is that the students have not found the teaching levels to be satisfactory (almost one-fifth of all participants). This is followed by their apprehensions in asking their doubts and getting them clarified, and from issues faced in comprehending the reading materials. Some of the other reasons recorded by the students include: difficulty in understanding BA subjects, communication problems on part of the teachers, the non-interactive nature of the lectures, the fast pace of teaching in law schools, the need to cram the contents for some of the subjects etc.

The responses to the above question suggest that the academic models of various NLUs need a re-look. The method of teaching must be made more engaging, and should encourage classroom participation amongst students. They should also place lesser emphasis on testing the memorizing ability of the students.

19. Academic support programs in colleges

It may be noted that many NLUs have a peer or fellow students run academic support program(s) for the junior batches, and the surveyed students were asked about the utility of such programs. The following table records their responses:

Answer choices	Responses
Helpful	61.71%
Not Helpful	5.70%
Not applicable to me, since I have never sought support from such a program	17.41%
Have not heard of such a program in my college	15.19%

Table 33: Academic support programmes in NLUs.

It can be inferred that a majority of the surveyed students have found these ‘peer or buddy support programs’ to be helpful. There however also remain a sizeable number of students who responded indicating their unawareness of existence of such programs in their colleges. Either their NLUs don’t have such a system in place, or the system is in place but has not been publicized well. Both situations ought to be remedied by the concerned NLUs.

20. Participation in co-curricular activities.

Students in their time at law schools take part in various co-curricular activities, as described above. They were asked: “Do you participate in co-curricular activities such as mooting, debating, client counselling, Model United Nations (MUNs), and negotiations?” The following table tabulates the responses:

Answer choices	Responses
Yes	65.33%
No, studies take most of my time	13.52%
No, I am not interested	10.38%
No, my English is not good enough	7.08%
No, for other reasons	5.58%

Table 34: Participation in co-curricular activities

While the majority of students have responded that they do take part in such activities, a sizeable minority finds it difficult to balance these activities with academics. A major part of the reasons recorded in the ‘other’ category include a lack of self-esteem and confidence amongst students to take part in these activities. There are also several cases of students not participating due to ‘fitting-in’ issues. 7.08% of students reported that they do not take part in such activities on account of lack of command over the English language. This again highlights, in light of the previous analysis of disparagement faced, the exclusions faced by students not able to converse fluently in the English language. There are also students who wish to take up these activities after the end of their first year in their respective institutions.

Peer-support programs can be put in place for co-curricular activities too, such as mooting, debates, MUNs etc., on lines of similar programs already existing for providing academic support (as discussed under Table 19) . This suggestion comes in light of helping those

students with low self-esteem issues as far as participation in such activities is concerned. These programs may also help the students cope with the ‘fitting-in’ issues discussed before.

PART 7: OVERALL EXPERIENCE OF LAW SCHOOLS

The surveyed students were asked to rate their overall experience of law schools and their responses have been tabulated below:

Answer choices	Responses
Excellent	12.66%
Good	54.53%
Average	24.45%
Disappointing	6.56%
Pathetic	1.80%

Table 35: Overall Experience in law schools

A majority of students have rated their overall experience in law schools as ‘Good’, followed by ‘Average’, ‘Excellent’, and ‘Disappointing’. It may further be noted that a fifth category of ‘pathetic’ has also managed to receive the support of 1.80% of students.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The analysis of the diversity survey reveals in clear terms, that there is a stark diversity deficit. A majority of the students belong to General category, while the minorities are barely represented. More than four-fifth of them follow Hinduism. More than 90% of the students had their schooling in English medium schools set up in cities. Differently abled students have minuscule representation. Most of the students hail from economically well-off families which is indicated by various factors such as high income and English-speaking proficiency of their parents. Also, most of the students hail from families which are either involved in business or government services.

With regard to the funding of students’ legal education, there seems to be a shortage of availability of scholarships to students with limited financial means, who in turn have to resort to bank loans and borrowing money from relatives to finance their course fees. In

terms of examination pattern, CLAT continues to place heavy reliance upon questions from static GK that remains to be the section in which students face the most difficulty.

The survey has also shown that unfortunate disparaging remarks have been recorded to be made against categories like the LGBT community, women, people who do not speak English well, etc. Students as well as staff/faculty members entertain prejudices, primarily against people who cannot converse fluently in the English language, and women. These disparaging remarks have also sometimes transformed themselves into unfortunate incidents of bullying, ragging, harassments and ridiculing. To alleviate this menace, workshops and awareness campaigns could be organized to sensitize both the students and the staff members. These steps will help in ensuring that students don't experience fitting-in issues and 'cultural shocks' in their campus experience.

Further, for a sizeable portion of students, class-room lecture based teaching has proven to be largely ineffective, with these students being disappointed by the quality of the lectures; however the student run academic or 'peer/buddy-support' programs have proven to be useful in this regard. It has therefore been suggested that similar peer/buddy-support programs be implemented by all NLUs to encourage participation of students in extra-curricular activities like mooting, debating, client counselling, Model United Nations etc., since the survey reveals student apprehension about participating in these activities due to the fear of conversing fluently in English and issues pertaining to low self-esteem. A peer group supported program (just as one is available for academic purposes in some NLUs) may prove to be much useful in this regard.