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INSPIRATION AND GRATITUDE

Rohit Sharma
(NUJS Batch of 2020)

The Journey

In my first four years at NUJS, I had a growing realization that a pattern was observable in students’ achievements and excellence at NUJS. In many instances, these were largely exclusive to individuals from similar socio-economic backgrounds. I was curious to know why students that I knew from non-English speaking, non-metro cities were not performing as well in academics and extra-curricular as others. I had a discussion with the then President of Student Juridical Association (SJA) Arindum Nayak about conducting a Survey on the lines of the NLS Diversity Report, with a more comprehensive questionnaire. Soon thereafter, the team of Nikhil Iyer and Mihika Poddar (then in the fifth year), my classmate Siddharth Sonkar (then in the fourth year) and I started work on the questionnaire for the Survey.

Through our discussions, we felt the necessity of a privilege check at NUJS, which would increase privilege-consciousness among its students and start a discourse on such issues. The discussion posed a confounding dilemma on how to understand privilege and diversity: Whether we should look at entry level or through the years at NUJS, especially since privilege is invisible. This report is an effort to map the various factors we believe determine the life of a student at NUJS, in academics and beyond. We sincerely believe that this data will prove valuable in conversations with the NUJS Administration, State Government, our Alumni, and with any other party who has a stake in the functioning of the University.

Before collecting the responses, NUJS Diversity Team collaborated with the SJA, which is the official Student Body of the University. In pursuance of sensitizing the general body, we conducted a talk on the importance of Diversity and Inclusivity in Law Schools. Prof. Ruchira Goswami and Prof. Saurabh Bhattacharjee from our faculty, and Mr. Arnab Roy from the Increasing Diversity by Increasing Access to Legal Education (IDIA) joined us for the talk and expressed their support for the Survey.

After we received the responses, a few highly spirited members from the General Body and my classmates Shrikrishna Upadhyaya, Mahima Cholera, Roma Bhojani, and Gatha G Namboothiri joined us for analyzing the data and drafting the NUJS Diversity Report. We divided ourselves into teams to draft and review the final report, which is now public.

The People

This survey report would not have been possible without the confidence of the student body, encouragement by the SJA, support of our college professors, assistance by external experts, and hard work of our team.
I would like to extend my warmest gratitude to Prof. Kalpana Kannabiran (Director, Council for Social Development, Hyderabad) for most graciously agreeing to pen the Foreword for the report, that too at a short notice. Her words are compelling and capture the essence behind the report in the best way possible.

Prof. Saurabh Bhattacharjee, Prof. Ruchira Goswami and Prof. Ankita Chakraborty from our faculty stood behind us from the beginning and helped shape the survey and this report. This task would not have been possible without their guidance.

Mr. Arnab Roy from IDIA has always been a beacon of support and has actively motivated me in pursuing this cause. Mr. Surya Prakash B.S. from Daksh agreed to review the report and his comments proved valuable in shaping the final draft. I am grateful for their assistance and constant words of encouragement.


I would also extend special mention and thanks to Aditya Rajagopal, Akshat Kaushik, Arindum Nayak, Chirayu Jain, Prashant Shukla and Tejas Popat for their help and contributions in preparation of the report. A shout out to Paul Thottan for the artwork on the cover page

I would like to thank Nikhil Iyer, Siddharth Sonkar and Mihika Poddar for their role in preparing a lengthy but comprehensive questionnaire which ensured we collected data on a wide variety of variables.

In drafting the report, I had the assistance of Nikhil Iyer, Siddharth Sonkar, Mahima Cholera, Gatha G Namboothiri, Shrikrishna Upadhya and Roma Bhojani, and this dedicated team ensured that the report is drafted to the best of our collective abilities.

None of this would have been possible without my family, who supported and encouraged me in innumerable tangible and intangible ways. Finally, I would like to once again thank my senior and friend Nikhil Iyer who has been an untiring force and constant supporter since the day I set out on this venture.

This report would not have been possible without the motivation, contribution and support of all these people.

February 13, 2020
The question of discrimination and exclusion on university campuses was catapulted into visibility by Rohith Vemula as never before. His unforgettable letter written just before his death raised searing questions of human worth, value, aspirations and their hollowing out by pervasive divisions and oppressions based on caste within social contexts including on campuses. We can scarcely forget that for a fortnight before he ended his life he had camped in a velivada – a dalit ghetto – in the heart of the university campus in full public view and evoked no serious reaction from the larger university community. What Rohith’s death laid bare was the complicity of institutions of higher education in the perpetuation of social divisions and discrimination through curricular, extra-curricular and environmental routes. We can scarcely forget that campuses reflect the fraught politics in mainstream society. We witnessed in Rohith’s case too, the interlocking forces of the outside and the inside of campuses. And yet, university campuses have never been free of politics – they have in fact been the learning ground of politics. Events between Rohith’s protest in 2015 and the movement following his death in 2016 through the death of Payal Tadvi in 2019 till the continuing present in 2020, point to the urgency of addressing questions of pluralism and equality on campuses as the only way of building sustainable cultures of deliberative democracy in our contexts. It is against this backdrop that this study is extremely valuable and deeply instructive.

The diversity indicators in this study point to a pattern that merits close attention and reflection: 26.7 percent of respondents identify as Brahmin – not just general category but this caste in the general category which is the largest chunk, because “Other Upper Castes” together constitute close to 32 percent. Dalits and Adivasis together account for about 15.6 percent. However, the fact that within this, Adivasis are only around 5 percent is also a matter of concern especially when one correlates that with their low presence in extra-curricular work, the inaccessibility of effective peer support and ineffective mentorship to this cohort. Respondents identifying themselves as Atheists add up to 10.6 percent, not a small number, but it would be interesting to see how this cuts through caste identification: Is this number drawn from the 15.2 percent who have not reported caste membership, or are they distributed across caste categories? Clearly from the data on parental income, those reporting lack of knowledge of caste (as distinct from unwillingness to identify self in caste terms) belong to the most affluent families. We have therefore an overwhelming majority of respondents identifying as Hindu-Brahmin/Upper Caste-Heterosexual-Male-Urban, predominantly from the Hindi speaking North (with the exception of Bengal – the home state – and Maharashtra). The South, Jammu and Kashmir and North-East India fall through the cracks. It is possible that aspirants from the South prefer the law schools there since there are at least 4, but what remains a significant absence – especially in the present national context – is that of students from Kashmir and the North-East.

The discussion on the “creamy layer” was invented in the legal profession and sustained through teaching the constitution and reservations in partisan ways in most law schools. Successive
generations of students have been schooled into pitting reservations against arguments on “merit.” Given this context, the folding together of English fluency with dominant caste status, high parental education, mothers-not-in-paid-work, spending patterns that are double those from marginalized backgrounds read with the distribution patterns of students by caste location and CGPA is an important finding of this study. Not surprisingly this is also reflected in participation in extracurricular and academic activities, in effect setting up barriers to equal access on an everyday level. This would certainly be reflected in interpersonal interactions and peer dynamics that might sharpen the lines and entrench them further.

The lines that are most evident are caste lines and gender lines. Students identifying as male far outnumber those identifying as female and transgender/non-cis. Parental income correlates in telling ways with gender: Women outnumber men where parental income is in the highest brackets and are far lower than men in the lowest parental income brackets. We know in other educational contexts that family income and livelihood security determine whether or not girls go to school and for how many years. We also know that the option for mothers to be “homemakers” is a privilege tied to class (and caste) location. It is also telling that no fathers are reported as being home-makers even where mothers are in privileged employment. The assumption that the unpaid work of mothers is merely a “labour of love” is part of dominant commonsense that feminist economists especially have struggled hard to displace for decades, with little success. The ripple effects of this in the internalization of gender hierarchies and gender regimes, the withdrawal of women from paid work, the non-recognition of women’s unpaid labour, the bleeding of the sexual division of labour into courses and logistic responsibilities in learning environments (law schools no exception) entrench gender discrimination in the most pervasive ways.

Gender lines reveal themselves in other ways as well. Why, for instance is ragging reportedly much higher among men than women? Why do more women than men report sexual harassment? The figures of victim-survivors seeking professional help points to the gravity of the situation with respect to campus violence. How might we think through suffering, disclosure, due process, redress and impunity in the times of #MeToo? These are questions we must seek answers for.

Hopefully after Navtej Johar, law schools like NUJS will be more welcoming of non-cisgender students and teachers. How might we make our law schools hospitable to students from rural areas? Students from minority communities? And gender non-conforming students? We would need to look at other indices of discrimination as well – disability for instance. According to the NSSO 76th round focusing on persons with disabilities in India (2018), “the percentage of persons with disability of age 3 to 35 years who were ever enrolled in ordinary school was 62.9 percent.” The Diversity Study points to a distribution of persons with disabilities across social location and economic status.

The data presented in this study demonstrates the inter-generational, and continuing material effects of structural discrimination and barriers to educational attainment and performance. The responsibility rests with law schools to create a level playing field that is nuanced, multi-layered and anticipates every aspect of the equality of opportunity mandated by the Constitution.
All of this underscores the urgency of thinking through questions of barrier-free access, hostile environments and robust processes of inclusion that are intersectional and systemic. Most important of all is the recognition that intersecting normativities bolster and reproduce privilege in NUJS and other law schools similarly placed – how does one re-think legal education, institutional arrangements and structural design in a way that displaces hegemonic forms that are exclusionary? The challenge is in thinking deeply about the non-negotiability of conviviality, self-respect, sororal fraternities/fraternal sororities and dignity in peer relations alongside curricular reform, structural arrangements, institutional mechanisms and protocols that signal a university community that is not gated; in other words, the operationalization of the Preamble in spirit and conviction and Article 15(2) in institutional design and implementation.

I commend the students of NUJS for undertaking this extremely difficult and very important task of mapping the fields of diversity-pluralism-exclusions. This is a necessary first step to comprehensive institutional reform, which I hope will follow soon.

February 11, 2020
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National University of Juridical Sciences (NUJS) is one of the oldest and most prestigious national law schools in the country. It is turning twenty years old in 2020. Each year thousands of aspirants from major cities, small towns and remote villages appear for the common entrance test in a bid to enter the exalted gates of the university. But only a select few, a handful of 125 students, qualify each year for the undergraduate programme at NUJS.

Section 4(2) of the WBNUJS Act, 1999, the statute under which NUJS is established, proudly proclaims “the University shall be open to all persons of all religions of either sex irrespective of race, creed, caste or class.” This is a mandate flowing directly from the principles of equality under the Constitution of India, and NUJS, a public university, strictly adheres to it. But the question we seek to ask is how equal is the equality measured at the gates of NUJS when one enters but not on a day-to-day basis?

In other words, despite the formal equality of opportunity that NUJS promise to its students, has the promise translated into substantive equality for all and equality of outcome for every deserving student?

Equality is constrained by barriers, both structural and institutional. Structural barriers in the nature of gender, caste, religion, region, language, physical ability, and status, often reproduce and reinforce institutional barriers. This is true for NUJS as well.

However, the challenge before us prior to addressing the same through systemic changes and reforms, was one of numbers. Data is valuable in addressing social and institutional issues. Moreover, data has a shock value – it exposes commonly-held prejudices and shines light upon unexpected realities. It holds a mirror to our faces and makes us ponder.

The NUJS Diversity Report, 2019 is an attempt at presenting the census data collected from the students of NUJS in a proper perspective which enables both institutional changes in the future and individual introspection in the immediate.

OBJECTIVES:

The idea behind conducting the diversity census was to conduct a serious evaluation of both demographics of students at NUJS and their performance in academic and extra-curricular activities. In addition, information on peer behaviour and support systems would also enable better evaluation.

The questionnaire for the survey was designed with a wide scope that will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the student body at NUJS. The objectives behind the survey and this report can be summarised as below:

1. To appreciate the demographics of the undergraduate student body at NUJS in relation to gender, religion, caste, language, region, economic status, education, family background, and other diverse socio-economic indicators.

2. To better identify the functional role played by social, economic, linguistic, and regional identities (including persons with different abilities) by studying their correlations with:
b. Participation and representation in student activities on campus including academic and non-academic societies.

c. Internships and career decisions made by students, including that of pursuing higher studies abroad.

3. To reflect upon the social dynamics that govern a student’s life at NUJS through an analysis of students’ perceptions on peer-to-peer support systems, peer pressure, and peer behaviour in matters such as ragging and those which enable socio-economic discrimination.

**METHODOLOGY:**

The survey methodology was used to collect primary empirical data from the subjects, i.e. the undergraduate student body of NUJS. The preparation was carried out by the survey team which consulted with a volunteer team of 33 students in drafting the questionnaire. In order to enable similar studies in the future, more first-year volunteers were consciously involved in its preparation.

The final questionnaire consisted of 154 questions in total. It was uploaded online and a link could be shared with each survey respondent, which was accessible only from the NUJS domain email ID. The respondents were allowed to submit the questionnaire only once per email ID. Since only one email ID is issued per student, this ensured the integrity of the dataset.

Each one from the team of volunteers was allotted a list of respondents that they were responsible for in ensuring enumeration of the survey. Needless to say, respondents were asked to submit information on a purely voluntary basis with informed consent. They were also advised that the raw primary data will be accessed by only four named persons from the survey team and shall never be shared with anyone, whatsoever.

A total of 544 responses were received from the general body of the students which consisted of the batches of 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018. The batch of 2014 graduated last year. The coverage rate is 87.04% (544 out of 625) and the sample is sizeably strong and diverse. The report has been prepared from the data collected from these 544 respondents.

Readers must note that in the report cross-comparison has been made across different variables. However, in relation to gender, the response of one transgender person has been consciously omitted for the risk of revealing the identity, and hence, all gender comparisons are out of 541 respondents. Similarly, across batch-wise comparisons, 3 responses have been omitted owing to the respondents joining NUJS before 2014 as well as one invalid response, and hence, all batch comparisons are out of 541 respondents.

**THE REPORT**

This report is divided into 3 chapters, i.e. Demographics, Performance at NUJS and Life at NUJS.

Under Demographics, focus is placed on diversity in the student body in terms of gender, caste, religion, region, economic status, education, language and familial background. It also contains data on diversity among the admission categories at NUJS, i.e. General, Domicile, SC, ST,
NRI/NRI Sponsored, Persons with Disability (PWD) and Domicile. The sub-chapter on family background contains information on educational qualification of parents of students, generations of schooling and graduation in each family, occupation of parents and dependent siblings of the respondents. The sub-chapter of financial background discusses parental income, education loans and expenditure of students. The following sub-chapters on educational and linguistic background of students enlist information related to nature of schools attended, fees paid, pre-university streams and performance, as well as fluency of students in written and spoken English assessed at the time of joining the university and at the time of the survey.

The Demographics chapter invites our attention to the deep inequalities that had already shaped the lives of the students at the time when they entered the university. The disparities in socio-economic indicators of the students at large have consequences on their performance as the next chapter demonstrates.

Performance at NUJS presents data on academic, co-curricular and extra-curricular performance of students. This entails serious discussion in the sub-chapter of academics on Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA), the marker of academic ‘merit’ and how it is shaped as we traverse social identities. The data on moots, debates, ADR competitions, and research publications which are exalted activities frequented by law students follow in the subsequent sub-chapters. The sub-chapter on committee memberships and office bearers of various social sororities of NUJS is revealing. The final sub-chapter of Performance at NUJS is devoted to understanding the career choices, internship decisions and eventual placements of students and how they mediate through compelling social factors. A section on scholarships which contrasts two different kinds of scholarships offered to NUJS students follows.

The last chapter, Life at NUJS promises to unravel many new lessons for the student body and the institution. While the first sub-chapter on peer-to-peer support takes a critical look at many support structures created by students for their benefit, the second sub-chapter maps the peer pressure in activities faced by the students which perhaps motivate as well as snuffs them out. The final sub-chapter takes a look at peer behaviour – ragging, discrimination and sexual harassment – and places before all of us conflicting realities that make up our small campus.

In addition, the rear of the report is made up of a small chapter on diversity within the diversity team – a self-reflection of those who bring to you this report.

**It is our sincere hope and belief that this report will guide our future actions, not just in broad institutional capacities but also in our everyday lives. We encourage students, especially aspiring office bearers, to flesh out from the report concrete recommendations backed by data which can go a long way in making our collective lives freer and equitable. We also hope that this effort is replicated in institutions across our country, especially by other law schools, so that the student community is truly the flagbearer of the change to come.**
**SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS:**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**BASIC DEMOGRAPHICS**

- **Gender** – Out of 544 respondents, 214 (39.3%) identified as Female and 329 (60.5%) identified as Male. One Respondent (0.2%) identified as Transgender.

- **Caste** – The table shows the Caste-wise distribution at NUJS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **State** – The States of West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar and NCT of Delhi have a greater share of representation in demographics. States in North East India, J&K, Andhra Pradesh and Telangana are scarcely represented in NUJS.

- **Region (i.e. Village, Town, City)** – 458 respondents (84.1%) are from Cities, while 79 (14.5%) are from Towns. Only 7 respondents (1.4%) are from Villages.

- **Religion** – Around three quarters, or 76% respondents belong to the Hindu religion. The second highest group, at 10.6%, identify as Atheists. The proportion of respondents belonging to the Jain religion is 3.3%, while those who identify with Islam, Sikhism, Buddhism or Christianity are less than 3% each.

- **Sexual Orientation** - A majority of 486 Respondents (89.3%) identified themselves as Heterosexuals. Among the other respondents, 37 (6.8%) identified as Bisexuals, 13 (2.4%) identified as Asexual, 3 (0.5%) identified as Gay, and 1 (0.2%) identified as Pansexual. No person identified as Lesbian.
FAMILY BACKGROUND

- **Parental Education** – About 85% respondents have parents both of whom are graduates or have received a higher degree. It is noteworthy that in cases where the Mother is a ‘12th Pass’ or below, 48 respondents (9%) said their Father was a graduate or above. On the other hand, where the father is a ‘12th Pass’ or below, only 10 Mothers (1.8%) are graduates or above.

- **Caste-wise Parental Education Distribution** - The highest proportion of students with parents who are graduates or above are found amongst those who ‘Don’t Know’ their Caste, Other Upper Castes and Brahmins. This is in contrast with those from the Scheduled Castes, Other Backward Castes, and Scheduled Tribes groups, which have the lowest such proportions.

- **Occupation of Parents** - Mothers of more than half the respondents are homemakers. They are also Teachers (14.7%), in Government Service (8.8%) and in Business (5.5%). On the other hand, Fathers who pursue Business or Government Service make up half of all respondents. 6 respondents have Mothers (1.1%) in the Civil Services, while 43 respondents have Fathers (7.9%) in that occupation.

- **Family in Legal Profession** – Of the 178 respondents (32.7% of all respondents) who answered that they have a family relation in the legal profession, nearly 62% respondents belong to the Brahmins and Other Upper Castes groups.

- **Parents’ Fluency in English** – 56.4% respondents, and 39.5% respondents said that their Fathers and Mothers respectively have ‘High’/‘Extremely High’ fluency in English. On the other hand, 40.4% said their Mothers had ‘Low’ fluency, while the figure for Fathers was lower at 27.2%.

- **Monthly Expenditure** – Nearly 19% spend below Rs. 3000 per month, while another 41% spend below Rs. 6,000. Only about 14% spend more than Rs. 10000 per month.
FINANCIAL BACKGROUND

- **Annual Parental Income** – The table shows the income-wise distribution at NUJS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range (in Rupees)</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 LPA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12 LPA</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 20 LPA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 36 LPA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 36 LPA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware/Don't Want to Disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Gender-wise Income Distribution** - Generally, a higher proportion of females are in the higher annual parental income brackets, compared to males. While 10.3% males fall in the income bracket below Rs. 3 Lakh Per Annum (LPA), the corresponding figure for females is 5.1%. In line with this trend, we find that 21% of the females in the income bracket above Rs. 36 LPA, as against 13% males.

- **Caste-wise Income Distribution** – More than a quarter of the respondents in the OBC, SC, and ST groups are in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket. The proportions of the Brahmin, Other Upper Caste, and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups in this bracket are lower. On the other hand, 24.1% respondents who Don’t Know their Caste have parental income more than Rs. 36 LPA. This is followed by the figures for those in the OBC, Brahmins, and Other Upper Castes groups in the income bracket.

- **Educational Loan for NUJS** - The majority of students (83.5%) do not depend on loans for financing their education. There are 90 students (16.5%) who are studying on loans. Across income brackets, there is a consistent decrease in the proportion of students who took loan with increase in their parental income. The highest percentage (40%) is therefore visible for students with parental income Below Rs 3 LPA.

- **School Fees** – About 30% respondents paid school fees below Rs. 20k, while 42% paid more than Rs. 50k annually.
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

- **Schooling** – 259 respondents (48%) attended Top Private Schools, while 225 (41%) went to other Private Schools. Only about 8% respondents studied at Government Schools, followed by 3% who went to ‘Other’ types of schools.

- **Board of Education** – Every nine out of ten Respondents have a Class 10th Pass Certificate either from an CBSE or an ICSE affiliated school. Only about 7% have studied in State Board schools.

- **Performance in Class 12** - Only 0.4% of the Respondents secured less than 60% in the twelfth standard. The majority of the Respondents (64.9%) have secured between 80-95% in the twelfth standard.

- **Stream in Class 12** – 42% respondents opted for the Science stream, while 37% chose Commerce. One-fifth of all respondents chose Humanities/Arts as their stream. A higher proportion of Males (45.9%) opted for the Science stream, compared to females (37.4%). However, at about 28%, nearly double the proportion of females chose the Humanities/Arts stream in comparison to males.

- **CLAT Coaching** - 84.9% respondents attended CLAT coaching while 15.1% did not. About 15% respondents from the Brahmin, Other Upper Castes, OBC, and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups attended coaching. On the other hand, nearly 30% respondents from the SC, and ST, and those from Other Religions/Caste Not Applicable groups did so.

- **Students Who Took a Drop Year** - Nearly 52% of all respondents have taken a drop before joining NUJS. The highest proportion of respondents who took a Drop are found in the 2017 batch (58.7%) and the 2016 batch (56.4%). A student from a town or a village is more likely to take a Drop than a student from a city. We also see that the proportion of Drop-takers falls with rise in income levels. While those with income levels below Rs. 3 LPA have taken the most Drops, the likelihood of Drop-takers is lowest at the income level of above Rs. 36 LPA.

- **Fluency in Written English (Then and Now)** – The proportion of respondents who rate their fluency in Written English as ‘Extremely High’ now is 57.3%, as compared to 51.3% at the time of joining NUJS. There has been a simultaneous decrease in the proportion of respondents who said their fluency is ‘Low’ or ‘Medium’, and an increase in proportion with ‘High’ fluency.

- **Fluency in Spoken English (Then and Now)** – A higher proportion of students rate their fluency in Spoken English as ‘High’/’Extremely High’ now, as compared to at the time of joining NUJS.
DIVERSITY ACROSS ADMISSION CATEGORIES

- In the general category, males comprise 65.7% of the respondents. All admission categories other than ‘General’ are reserved categories. Nearly half of the respondents under reserved categories are females (47.2%). Females are in the majority (around 55-60%) in three categories, namely, NRI/NRI Sponsored, State Domicile (General), and State Domicile (SC) categories.

- Respondents who identified as Brahmins, Other Upper Castes or Don’t Know their caste comprise about 90% of all those admitted under the General and NRI/NRI Sponsored categories. All 12 respondents enrolled in the Foreign National category are from these three Caste Groups.

- While 2 seats are reserved under ‘OBC-A’ and ‘OBC-B’ categories, a total of 15 respondents said they belong to the OBC group, out of which 11 were admitted in the General category. 24 Respondents admitted under General category stated that caste was inapplicable or that they belonged to Other Religions.

- In 15 respondents in the PWD category, 4 each identified themselves as Brahmin and Other Upper Castes. There are two OBCs, one ST, and no SC under the PWD category. A higher proportion of students in the PWD category are in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket, as compared to any other category.

- This is followed by those who enrolled in the SC and ST category.

- A majority of respondents enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category fall in income brackets more than Rs. 20 LPA. Nearly one-third of the respondents in the Foreign National category fall in Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket. This is the second highest proportion of respondents in this income bracket across all groups.

- Respondents from cities are in the majority across all admission categories. The highest disparity in distribution between city and town is seen in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category (95%-5%), and in the Foreign Nationals category (92%-8%). Respondents from towns outnumber those from cities only for State Domicile (OBC) category. Out of the 7 respondents from villages, 4 were admitted in the General category, while one each under PWD, State Domicile (SC) and State Domicile (ST) categories.

- Among 90 students who have taken loans, 53 enrolled in the General category, while 13 were admitted in the SC category. By proportion, the highest incidence of loans (35.7%) is seen amongst those enrolled under the two ST categories (Plains and Hills). One quarter of the total respondents admitted under State Domicile (General), PWD and SC categories have also taken loans to study at NUJS. The proportion is 10% for those enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored and the Foreign National categories.
PERFORMANCE IN LAW SCHOOL

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

- **Importance of Academics** – Nearly 67% respondents feel that Academics are Highly/Very Highly important. 11% said it had Low/Very Low Importance.

- **CGPA Distribution** – The table shows CGPA distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGPA Range</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 2.99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 3.99</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 4.99</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 5.99</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CGPA across Years** – A higher proportion of respondents in the 2016 batch had CGPA above 5 than any other batch. The 2014 batch has a higher proportion of respondents in the CGPA 4 – 4.99 range than any other batch. On the other hand, a higher proportion of respondents in the 2017 batch had CGPA below 3 as compared to any other batch.

- **CGPA and Region** – Among those with Above 6 CGPA, 93.1% of the students are from Cities. None of the Respondents from villages have CGPA above 4.

- **CGPA and Gender** – Females perform better than males in academics. While 78.9% of the females have CGPA above 4, the corresponding figure for males is just above 50.7%. Similarly, only 4.2% of the female students have a CGPA less than 3, 20.9% of male students have a CGPA of less than 3.

- **CGPA and Caste** – Only 1 student each from 15 OBCs, and 56 SCs, has a CGPA above 6. Nobody from the ST group has a CGPA above 5. A higher proportion of respondents have CGPA above 4 in all Caste Groups except these three, with Brahmans having the highest such proportion. Similarly, a higher proportion of STs (51.7%) and SCs (33.9%) have CGPA below 3 than any other caste group. This figure is lowest among Brahmans (7.5%).

- **CGPA and Spoken English fluency** – Only 1 respondent ‘Low’ fluency in Spoken English has CGPA above 5. This academic performance is seen to be improving with better fluency in Spoken English. Thus, 42% respondents with ‘Extremely High’ have CGPA above 5, as compared to 18.5% respondent with ‘High’ fluency.

- **CGPA and Language of Instruction in School** - All the 29 respondents who have CGPA above 6 had English as the Medium of Instruction in their school. Among 57 respondents who said their Medium of Instruction was English and Hindi, all except 10 have CGPA below 5. Similarly, among 20 students who went to Hindi-medium schools, all except 2 have CGPA below 5. None of the respondents who went to schools with other languages as the Medium of Instruction have CGPA above 5.

- **CGPA and Drop Year** – Among 282 respondents who took a Drop Year before
joining NUJS, 23% have CGPA above 5, while 44% have CGPA below 4.

- **Repeat Examinations** – One in every four respondents has given at least one repeat exam owing to failure in a subject.

- **Opinion on Repeat and Improvement Exam Fees** – 287 (52.8%) respondents feel that repeat fees should be abolished and 317 (58.2%) respondents believe that the improvement fees should be reduced.

### Extra-Curricular Activities

- **Moots** – 68% respondents have participated in mooting at some level. This includes 56% who have attended competitions at the national and international level.

- **Debates** – Just about half the total respondents have debated at some level, while only 24% have participated in a competition at the national and international level.

- **ADR Activities** – 37% respondents have done an ADR Competition at some level, including 16% who have done at the national and international level.

- There is higher female participation than males in Moots and ADR activities. While the participation level is similar for debates among both male and female students.

- A higher proportion of students from the Other Upper Castes group and those who Don't Know their Castes groups have participated in moots, debates and ADR competitions among all Caste Groups in NUJS.

- More than 86% of all respondents who have participated in either a Moot, Debate, or ADR Activity hail from Cities. Of the 7 respondents from Villages, 3 have done a National Moot, 2 have participated in the University Rounds for Debates, while 1 each have done a National and an International ADR Activity.

- Nearly 40% respondents in the below 6 LPA brackets have never mooted. Similarly, the least proportion of students who have participated in a debate
competition are in the below 6 lakh income brackets. Nearly 71% respondents in the Below 6 LPA bracket have never done an ADR activity.

- The proportion of respondents who have Mooted increases as we move higher on the CGPA range. This is also true for participation in Debates and in ADR Activities.

- Amongst all respondents who have Debated, 61.7% have ‘Extremely High’ fluency in Spoken English. The corresponding figure for respondents with ‘Extremely High’ fluency among those who have Mooted is 55.4%, and for those who have done ADR Activities is 60.7%.

**RESEARCH PAPERS AND PAPER PRESENTATION CONFERENCES**

- Out of the total 544 respondents, 101 (18.6%) have published research papers. 62 amongst these (61.4%) did so without being a part of any academic journal.

- 42 respondents (7.7%) have presented at Paper Conferences.

- A higher proportion of females (22.9%) as compared to males (15.8%) have published Research Papers. However, a similar proportion of respondents from both genders have presented in Paper Conferences.

- A similar proportion of respondents across all Caste Groups have published a Research Paper (around 10%) and presented at a Paper Conference (8%) respectively. The exception is the ST group, where only 1 respondent each out of 29 has published a Research Paper and presented at a Conference. No OBC respondent has presented at a Paper Conference.

- None of the students from villages have published a Research Paper while nearly 20% students from Cities have published at least one. The corresponding figure for Towns is 13.9%. Even for Paper Conferences, the highest proportion of respondents who have attended these conferences are from cities.

- The lowest proportion of Respondents who have published Research Papers are in the income bracket of Rs. 3 to 6 LPA, while the lowest proportion of respondents who have presented papers in Conferences have family income below 3 LPA.
• An increasing proportion of respondents have published research papers as we move higher along the CGPA ranges. The only exception is among respondents with CGPA 2 – 2.99, where no respondent has been published. Those with CGPA above 6 have the maximum proportion (37.9%) of respondents who have published research paper across all CGPA groups.

• Only 1 student who has low written fluency in English had published a research paper. This is true for participation in paper conferences as well.

ACADEMIC JOURNALS

• 87 respondents have been part of an academic journal. 54 respondents (9.7% of the total) have been members or editors of the NUJS Law Review. 39 respondents (7.1%) have been members or editors of the Journal on Indian Law and Society (JILS), which includes 10 who have been members of both. 4 respondents have been a part of journals apart from these two.

• There is greater female representation in both the NUJS Law Review and JILS as compared to males.

• Among 87 respondents who are part of academic journals, a mere 7 (8%) are from the OBC, SC, and ST Caste Groups. 86% respondents are from the Other Upper Castes, Brahmins and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups.

• Respondents in income bracket above Rs. 12 LPA are better represented among those who are members of academic journals than those in the below Rs. 12 LPA bracket.

• While nobody with CGPA below 3 is a member of an academic journal, the majority of respondents have CGPA above 5.

• Only 1 student with ‘Low’ fluency in Written English has been a member of a journal.
MEMBERSHIP IN AND OFFICE BEARERS OF SOCIETIES AND COMMITTEES

➢ Membership in Societies – 66.1% respondents have been members of at least one SJA society at some point in NUJS, while 63.4% respondents have done so for non-SJA Societies.

➢ A similar proportion of male and female respondents are members of SJA Societies, at around 61%. For non-SJA Societies, we see a higher proportion of males (71.5%) are members compared to females (58.3%).

➢ 75.8% STs and 46.4% SCs have never been in an SJA Society. The lowest corresponding figure for SJA Societies is seen amongst those who Don’t Know their Caste, and Brahmins (around 26.7%).

➢ 3 out of 7 respondents from Villages have never been in a SJA or a non-SJA Society respectively. Similarly, about 45% of those from Towns have too never been in an SJA Society. This figure is lower for Cities (31.6%). The figures for non-SJA Societies are similar.

➢ The proportion of respondents who are members of both SJA and non-SJA Societies increases as we move higher along the CGPA ranges. Thus, the highest proportions within a CGPA range are seen in the CGPA above 6 range.

• Office Bearers of the SJA, and SJA and non-SJA Societies – 171 respondents (31%) have been Office Bearers of different Societies.

➢ Overall, a similar proportion of males and females have been Office Bearers. Across Caste Groups, the lowest proportion of Office Bearers are seen in the ST group (10.3%), compared to the highest seen amongst Other Upper Castes (38.7%), and Brahmins (33.8%) who have been Office Bearers.

➢ Across income brackets, a higher proportion of respondents in the Rs. 12 to 20 LPA bracket (37.1%) have been Office Bearers, as against any other income bracket. Further, the proportion of respondents who have been Office Bearers seems to increase as we move higher in the CGPA ranges.

➢ Among 20 respondents who were Office Bearers for only the SJA, there are 14 males, and 6 females.
CAREERS AND INTERNSHIPS

1. Career Choices

- Financial Status as Factor for Career Decisions:
  - About 61% respondents said that their financial status is a Highly/Very Highly influential factor on career-related decisions. A lower proportion of respondents from higher income brackets rated this influence as High/Very High, as compared to respondents belonging to lower income brackets.
  - 73.33% (66 out of 90) respondents who have taken loans to study at NUJS feel that their financial status affects their decisions pertaining to their careers Highly/Very Highly.

- Annual Fees and Decision to Opt for Law Firm:
  - When asked to mark the influence of the annual fees at NUJS with their decision to opt for a law firm job, 48.9% of the respondents answered that the correlation was High/Very High.
  - There is a direct relation between income levels and the perceived influence of the annual college fees. Thus, the proportion of those who answered High/Very High is highest, at 77.8%, in the lowest income bracket of below Rs. 3 LPA. And it is the lowest, at 28.7%, in the highest income bracket of more than Rs. 36 LPA.
  - Nearly three quarters of respondents studying on loans marked a High/Very High correlation between college fees and decision to opt for a law firm job.

- Foreign LLM:
  - About one third of all respondents were actively considering doing an LLM program from an international college after graduation.
  - A higher proportion of females (41.1%) than males (30%) wish to pursue a foreign LLM.
  - Among all Caste Groups, the lowest proportions of respondents who said they were actively considering a Foreign LLM are seen in the ST (10.3%) and SC (19.6%) groups. It is highest amongst OBCs (53.3%) and those who Don’t Know their Caste (44.5%).
  - A higher proportion of respondents are seen to be actively considering a foreign LLM in the higher income brackets than in the lower brackets. In the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, only about 15.5% respondents answered the question in the affirmative while more than 50% of the respondents in the more than Rs. 36 LPA bracket marked it affirmatively.
  - There also is a direct correlation between the CGPA of a respondent and their decision to pursue a Foreign LLM. Thus, only 15.3% respondents with CGPA below 2 currently wish to pursue a foreign LLM, while more than half of all respondents with CGPA above 6 desire to do so.

2. Internships through the RPC

- The mandate of the RPC is to facilitate internships from the 3rd Year onwards. Thus, 306 responses were considered to analyse who benefitted from an RPC internship. Overall, 45.1% respondents out of 306 said they received an internship through the RPC, while the others did not. A higher proportion of females (52.6%)
than males (37.4%) secured such an internship.

- More than 40% respondents from all Caste Groups secured an internship through the RPC, except those from the SC (28.1%), ST and OBC (12.5% each) groups.

- None of the 7 respondents with CGPA less than 2 got an internship through the RPC, while the corresponding figure for respondents with CGPA above 6 is 80.9%. A higher proportion of respondents in the higher CGPA ranges have secured an internship through the RPC.
LIFE AT NUJS

PEER TO PEER SUPPORT

• The Buddy Initiative

➢ Nearly one third respondents said the effectiveness of the Buddy Initiative was either High/Very High, Moderate, or Low/Very Low.

➢ The proportion of respondents who said it was Highly/Very Highly effective has increased across successive batches.

➢ Across Caste Groups, the highest proportion of respondents who rated it as Low/Very Low effectiveness are in the OBC group (53.3%), and the ST group (37.9%). The most satisfied students i.e. those who rated it as Highly/Very Highly effectiveness is in the SC group (42.9%) and among those who Don’t Know their Caste (39.6%).

➢ A higher proportion of respondents in the income bracket below Rs. 6 LPA rated the Buddy Initiative as being of Low/Very Low effectiveness, compared to those in higher income brackets.

➢ Over 61% of the Respondents said the frequency of them meeting their mentors in the Buddy Initiative was Low/Very Low.

• Debate Mentorship Programme

➢ Among 250 responses from the batches of 2016, 2017, and 2018, 27.6% respondents rated the Debate Mentorship Programme as Highly/Very Highly effective, while nearly 40% chose the Low/Very Low options.

➢ The proportion of students who rated the effectiveness as High/ Very High has increased with each successive year.

➢ All respondents in the OBC group, and 51% of those in the SC group rated it as of Low/Very Low effectiveness. This figure is lowest amongst Brahmins (13.8%).

➢ Respondents from families in the higher income brackets seem to be more satisfied with the Debate Mentorship programme i.e. a higher proportion have rated it as Highly/Very Highly effective.

• Moot Mentorship Programme

➢ Among 186 responses from the 2017 and 2018 batches, about 36% respondents said the Programme was Highly/Very Highly effective, while about 38% marked the effectiveness as Low/Very Low.

➢ A higher proportion of respondents from 2018 batch rated the programme’s effectiveness as moderate or better than the 2017 batch.

➢ A higher proportion of females (46.9%) rated it as Low/Very Low, compared to males (33.1%).

➢ All OBCs rated the Programme as of Low/Very Low effectiveness, followed by 50% each of respondents from the ST group and Other Religion group.

➢ 61% respondents said they received High/Very High assistance from their seniors in Moots. 20% said it was Low/Very Low.
• **ADR Mentorship Programme**

➢ 153 responses from the 2017 and 2018 batches will be considered here.

➢ Overall, while about 43% of total respondents said the programme had Low/Very Low effectiveness, about 30% said it was High/Very High.

➢ A greater proportion of students from the 2018 batch found the ADR mentorship programme to be Highly/Very Highly effective, in comparison to the 2017 batch.

➢ Across all Caste Groups, the highest proportion of respondents who said the Mentorship Programme had Low/Very Low effectiveness are in the ST group (65%), followed by Other Upper Castes and Other Religions groups. (53% each).

• **Peer Pressure**

In this part, we observe the extent to which NUJS students faced Peer Pressure to participate in the following activities.

• **Moots**

➢ Nearly 47% of the total respondents said that peer influence to moot was Low/Very Low, as against 34% who said it was High/Very High.

➢ Over the years, a higher proportion of respondents said that peer influence to moot was High/Very High.

➢ A higher proportion of females (40%) feel High/Very High peer influence to moot compared to males (27%).

• **Debates**

➢ About 65% of the total respondents felt Low/Very Low peer influence to debate.

• **ADR Competitions**

➢ About three quarters said peer pressure to participate in ADR Competitions was Low/Very Low.

➢ The proportion of respondents who answered peer influence to participate in ADR Competitions was High/Very High is highest for the 2018 batch, at about 16%. For all other batches, the figure is below 10%.

➢ 15% more females said they felt the peer pressure to participate in ADR Activities as High/Very High than males.
• **Academic Journals**

- While 66% of the total respondents said the pressure to attain membership of a journal was Low/Very Low, about 16% said it was High/Very High.
- A higher proportion of females (21%) felt High/Very High peer influence to attain membership in a journal than males (11%).
- The highest proportion of those who chose the High/Very High options are seen in the SC group, followed by the ST group, and the Other Religions group.

• **Membership in Committees**

- While about 53% of the total respondents said they felt Low/Very Low peer influence to join a Committee, 28% said it was High/Very High.
- The proportion of respondents who said the pressure to join a Committee was High/Very High has increased gradually over the years.

---

**PEER BEHAVIOUR**

• **Ragging**

- Nearly 60% respondents said they had been ragged by their Seniors.
- Except for a slight increase in ragging from the 2015 to 2016 batch, there seems to be a continuous decline in ragging in campus.
- A considerably higher proportion of Males (75.2%) said they experienced ragging as compared to females (37.1%).
- A higher proportion of respondents in the Brahmins (66.90%) and Other Upper Castes (65.32%) groups said they were ragged, in comparison to the OBC (53.33%), SC (53.57%) and ST (27.59%) groups.

• **Sexual Harassment**

- 80 respondents (15%) said they have faced sexual harassment by someone who is an individual associated with the college. While 4% did not want to answer the question, about 81% marked no.
- Nearly 1 out of every 5 Females, and 1 out of every 10 Males has experienced sexual harassment while at NUJS.

• **Whether discrimination exists on these grounds at NUJS?**

- **Gender** – About 58% said gender-based discrimination was Low/Very Low, while about 22% chose the High/Very High options. A higher proportion of females (30%) chose these options than males (17%).
➢ **Sexual Orientation** – About 56% respondents felt there exists High/Very High discrimination based on Sexual Orientation.

➢ **Caste** – Overall, 70% respondents said there was Low/Very Low caste-based discrimination at NUJS, while 13% said it was High/Very. The highest proportions of those who said there is Low/Very Low caste-based discrimination are amongst the Brahmins (72.4%), those from Other Religions (72.1%), Other Upper Castes (70.5%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (67.4%) groups. These figures are in the range of 60% - 62% for the OBC, SC, and ST groups.

➢ **Religion** – The majority of respondents across all religions said religion-based discrimination was Low/Very Low. The exceptions are the Atheists and ‘Others’ groups, where 44.8%, and 50% respondents respectively chose the Moderate or Higher options.

➢ **Class** – 40% respondents each said that class-based discrimination was High/Very High, and Low/Very Low. It is amongst those income brackets which are below Rs. 12 LPA parental income that we find the highest proportion of respondents who said class-based discrimination was High/Very High, in comparison to other income brackets.

➢ **CLAT Rank** – Not more than 30% respondents across all admission categories said that CLAT Rank based discrimination was High/Very High. The exceptions to this are respondents enrolled in the State Domicile (OBC, SC, and ST) categories (horizontal reservation in the SC, ST, and OBC categories) where an average of about 60% respondents feel such discrimination is High/Very High.

➢ **CGPA** - It is amongst respondents in the Below 2 CGPA bracket (63%), and the 3-3.99 bracket (57%) that we find the highest proportions of respondents who said there was High/Very High discrimination based on CGPA. This is followed by respondents in the 5-5.99 bracket, at nearly 50%.

- **Religious bias in Celebration of Festivals on Campus**

  A majority of both Muslims (53%), and Atheists (55%) feel there is a religious bias in the celebration of festivals at NUJS. It is amongst Buddhists (0), Christians (18%) and Hindus (25%) that we see the lowest proportion of respondents who said that religious bias exists.

- **Close Relation with a Senior in First Year**

  70% Males, as compared to 59% females were close to a Senior in their first year at NUJS.

  A higher proportion of students from Top Private Schools (71%) were close to seniors in their first year, as against students from other Private Schools (66%) and Government schools (47.62%).

- **Interactions with Other Genders in First Year**

  About 14% Males did not speak/remember speaking with somebody from other genders in their first year; the figure for females is less than half at 6%
• **IS NUJS DIFFERENTLY ABLED FRIENDLY?**

The respondents were asked if they were differently abled, and if so, their opinion was sought on a further set of five questions regarding infrastructure support, faculty, academics and extra-curricular activities.

➢ 15 (2.75%) of the total respondents (544) stated that they are differently abled.

*Whether there could be improvements in the infrastructural support at NUJS?*

➢ 9 respondents (60%) said yes, 5 said no, and 1 respondent said the infrastructural support was adequate.

*Is the faculty accommodative of your disability?*

➢ While 3 students said no, 5 said yes. Another 5 said some faculty were accommodating while 2 said most were accommodative.

*Whether your disability has affected your CGPA?*

➢ 10 students thought that their disability has affected their CGPA while 5 have not.

• **PROFESSIONAL HELP FOR MENTAL HEALTH**

➢ When asked if the respondents had consulted professional help such as therapy for their mental health during law school, about one-fifth answered positively.

➢ A higher proportion of Female respondents (25%) have taken professional help during law school than Males (15%).

➢ Out of the 80 sexual harassment survivors in NUJS, 38 respondents have said they have taken professional help.

➢ One fifth of all respondents who have experienced ragging said they have sought professional help.

➢ The highest proportions of those who have taken professional help are seen amongst respondents in the SC group (23%), followed by Other Upper Castes (21%).

➢ While nearly 25% respondents in the Above 36 LPA bracket have taken professional help, the next highest such figure is in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket (20%).
DEMOGRAPHICS
I. **Basic Demographics**

Under this section, we will analyse four basic demographic indicators – gender, caste, religion and region. We believe these are primary markers of identity in our society which play a determinative role in access to opportunities and outcomes in life. These four basic indicators have been subsequently used as comparative markers to map the diversity with respect to other demographic information such as family, financial and educational backgrounds as well as performance at law school. Readers may peruse this section for a general understanding of basic demographics and subsequent parts of the report will help fully appreciate how various identities have impacted the lives of students.

1. **Gender**

Out of the 544 respondents, 214 (39.3%) identified as Female and 329 (60.5%) identified as Male. One respondent (0.2%) identified as Transgender. **It is evident that the ratio of female to male is 2:3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

1.1 **Batch-wise Gender Distribution**

![Figure 1](image)

Figure 1 above depicts the batch wise trend of female and male students. The number of female students has never been greater than or equal to the male students in the 5 batches covered by the survey (2014-2018). **The poorest female to male ratio amongst these batches is witnessed in the 2017 batch.**
1.2 Sexual Orientation

In response to the question on sexual orientation, an overwhelming majority of 486 respondents (89.3%) identified themselves as Heterosexuals. Out of the remaining, 37 (6.8%) identified as Bisexuals, 13 (2.4%) identified as Asexual, 3 (0.5%) identified as Gay, and 1 (0.2%) identified as Pansexual. No person identified as Lesbian.

![Pie chart showing sexual orientation distribution]

Figure 2

2. Caste

In response to the question of ‘Caste’, respondents could choose one of ‘Brahmin’, ‘Baniya’, ‘Kshatriya’, ‘OBC’, ‘SC’, ‘ST’, ‘Don’t Know’, ‘Other Religion/ Not Applicable’, and ‘Other’. Additionally, those who responded that they do not know their caste have been grouped separately as ‘Don’t Know’. Respondents belonging to other religions who marked that caste was inapplicable to them have been retained under the category ‘Other Religion’. In instances where the respondent has mentioned a specific caste (e.g. Yadav), we have referenced the respective Government lists of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes as notified by law. For further information on this categorization, readers may refer to Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

1 Responses marked as ‘bicurious’, ‘male’ and ‘N/A’ have not been considered.
Respondents from Other Upper Castes group form the biggest caste group at NUJS, followed by Brahmins. Together, they comprise nearly 57% of all Respondents.

Nearly 15.2% of the respondents do not know their caste. Scheduled Tribes form the smallest group, while Scheduled Castes comprise about one-tenth of the total respondents.

2.1 Gender-wise Caste Distribution

![Gender-wise Caste Distribution](image)

Except for the group who ‘Don’t Know’ their caste, the gender-wise proportion across caste-groups is skewed in favour of males. This is in line with the gender ratio amongst all Respondents i.e. 3:2 in favour of males.
3. Religion

Figure 4 depicts the responses received to the question of religion.

The majority of the respondents (76%) belong to the Hindu religion. The second highest group (10.6%) identify as Atheists. The number of Respondents belonging to the Jain faith exceeds the number of students from Islam, Sikh, Buddhist and Christian religions. The small sample size for Buddhism, Christianity, and ‘Others’ must be kept in mind for the upcoming analyses.

3.1 Gender-wise Religious Distribution

The gender wise distribution of religion for Hindus, Muslims, and Christians is similar to the overall gender distribution. Amongst Atheists and Buddhists, the proportion of males is above 70%, while it is 50% among Jains.
4. Region

4.1 State-wise Representation
The map of India\(^2\) depicts the number of students per State in which they have been a resident of. It includes the responses of those students who have resided in more than one State before joining NUJS.

Figure 6 above represents the national character of NUJS. At the time of the survey, all States of India barring Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Nagaland, and Mizoram were represented. The States of West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar and NCT of Delhi have a greater share of representation. Ten students belonged to countries other than India including Nepal.

### 4.2 City/Town/Village (Region)

The response to the question on whether the respondents completed their high school education from City, Town or Village has been taken as indicative of the type of region the students come from. Out of the total responses received, 458 (84.3\%) respondents come from cities while 79 (14.4\%) come from towns. Only 7 (1.3\%) studied in villages.

**Figure 6**

#### 4.2.1 Batch-wise Region Distribution

Figure 7 below shows the batch-wise distribution of the region to which students belong.

\(^2\) Since at the time of survey the State of Jammu & Kashmir had not been split into two Union Territories of Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh respectively, an older version of the Indian map has been used here.
As seen, no students in the batches of 2014 and 2018 said they’re from a village. On the other hand, those who come from towns make up 20.3% of the batch of 2018, the highest such figure across all batches.

4.2.2 Gender-wise Region Distribution

Figure 8 below shows the gender-wise distribution of the region to which the students belong.

The distribution of males to females is 59%-41% for cities, while it is 69%-31% for towns. Only 1 amongst 7 respondents from villages is a female.

4.2.3 Caste-wise Region Distribution

Figure 9 below shows the caste-wise distribution of the region to which the students belong.
In comparison to other caste-groups, it is in the SC and ST caste-groups that we see the highest proportion of respondents from towns and villages, who make up about 30% of both groups. This proportion is lowest amongst those who Don’t Know their Caste, at about 10%, and marginally higher in the Brahmin, Other Upper Caste, and OBC groups.

II. FAMILY BACKGROUND

Any student’s access to educational and professional opportunities are presumably shaped by their family profile. This includes the parents’ education and occupation, which often influence the financial status of the family (discussed in ‘Financial Background’). We also discuss their educational history through an analysis of the generations of graduates in the family. Another factor which we believe plays a vital role in light of our educational curriculum is the parents’ fluency in English, which is mapped against caste in this section.

1. Educational Qualification of Mother and Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s Educational Qualifications</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Below 10th</th>
<th>10th Pass</th>
<th>12th Pass</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Pass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Pass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Figure 9
Of the 544 respondents, about 85% students have parents both of who are graduates and above. This is highlighted in blue in Table 3. Around 24 respondents (4.5%), have parents neither of whom are graduates, highlighted in orange in the Table.

It is noteworthy that in cases where the mother is a ‘12th Pass’ or below, 48 respondents (9%) said their father was a graduate and above. The corresponding number for mothers who are graduates and above where the father is a ‘12th Pass’ or below is a mere 10 (1.8%).

1.1 Gender-wise Parental Education Distribution

More than 88% female students have parents both of whom are graduates and above, while the corresponding number is 82% for male students. The former is also higher than the overall proportion of students with parents who are graduates, which is about 85%.

1.2 Caste-wise Parental Education Distribution

As can be observed in the Figure 12 below, the highest proportion of students with parents who are graduates are found amongst those who ‘Don’t Know’ their caste, Other Upper Castes and Brahmins. This is in contrast with those from the Scheduled Castes, Other Backward Castes, and Scheduled Tribes groups, which have the lowest such proportions. The presence of parents neither of whom are graduates in these latter caste groups is also noticeable. Their proportions are about ten times higher than that in the former caste groups.

Amongst Brahmins, roughly one-fifth of all students (20.6%) have at least one parent with a Doctoral qualification. This number is followed by those from Other Backward Castes (13.3%), but it halves for Other Upper Castes (11.5%) and for those who Don’t Know their caste (10.8%). It falls further for Scheduled Castes (5.3%) and is the lowest for Scheduled Tribes (3.4%).
1.3 Religion-wise Parental Education Distribution

A religion-based analysis of the survey responses shows that barring those who answered ‘Others’ as their religion, all other groups have at least 80% students with both parents who are graduates and above. Both parents of all respondents who are Sikhs or Buddhists are graduates.

2. Parents’ Occupation

The proportion of different occupations of the respondents’ parents is shown in the tables below. The category ‘Others’ represents a range of responses from architect to consultants to social workers.

We received 36 distinct responses to the question on mother’s occupation. Mothers of more than half the respondents are home makers. Table 4 below shows the break-up of mother’s occupations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's Occupation</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Table 5 shows the break-up of father’s occupations. We received 44 distinct responses to the question on father’s occupation. Government service was the most pursued occupation, followed by business.

43 fathers are in the legal profession, in contrast to 17 mothers. Similarly, 43 are also civil servants, in comparison to 6 mothers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

2.1 Generations of Graduates on both Parent’s Side and Parental Occupation

The number of generations that have achieved graduation is presumably a factor in the occupations that the parent may have chosen. In Tables 6 and 7, the first row shows the proportion of total respondents as per generations of graduates on that parent’s side. Wherever the proportion of parents pursuing a particular occupation exceeds the proportion of students in that bracket as per generations of graduates, it may be inferred that there exists a tendency to prefer one occupation over another.

Thus, in Table 6, it is seen that mothers have tended to pursue business, or being a teacher, where they may either be the first graduate in their family or have not yet attained graduation. On the contrary, occupations like those of a civil servant, doctor, or government service are preferred by those mothers who had at least 1 generation of graduates above them.
The legal profession likely to be taken up by mothers who have had at least one graduate above them in their family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Occupation</th>
<th>0 to 1 Generation</th>
<th>2 to 3 Generations</th>
<th>More than 3 Generations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>199 (36.5%)</td>
<td>285 (52.3%)</td>
<td>60 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>121 (42.9%)</td>
<td>139 (49.2%)</td>
<td>22 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>26 (32.5%)</td>
<td>42 (52.5%)</td>
<td>12 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>10 (29.4%)</td>
<td>19 (55.8%)</td>
<td>5 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>13 (43.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>6 (21.4%)</td>
<td>19 (67.9%)</td>
<td>3 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (35.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17 (30.4%)</td>
<td>36 (58.7%)</td>
<td>7 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

In Table 7, similar observations can be made. The fathers of such respondents who have had a maximum of 1 generation of graduates above them tend to pursue teaching and business as their occupations. This is followed closely by jobs in Management. Occupations such as that of a civil servant, an engineer, or in government service are preferred by fathers of such respondents who have 2 to 3 generations of graduates above them. Nearly 75% of fathers in the legal profession have at least 1 generation of graduates above them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>0 to 1 Generation</th>
<th>2 to 3 Generations</th>
<th>More than 3 Generations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>197 (36.2%)</td>
<td>286 (52.5%)</td>
<td>61 (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>51 (41.5%)</td>
<td>60 (48.7%)</td>
<td>12 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>15 (34.8%)</td>
<td>25 (58.1%)</td>
<td>3 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>7 (30.4%)</td>
<td>11 (47.8%)</td>
<td>5 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>25 (62.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>55 (35.2%)</td>
<td>88 (56.4%)</td>
<td>13 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>10 (23.2%)</td>
<td>24 (55.8%)</td>
<td>9 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7 (41.1%)</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>2 (11.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>15 (57.7%)</td>
<td>9 (34.6%)</td>
<td>2 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27 (37%)</td>
<td>36 (49.3%)</td>
<td>10 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

2.2 Caste-wise Parental Occupations Distribution

In Table 8 we see the proportion of mothers pursuing specific occupations in relation to the total number of respondents who identify with a particular caste. A majority of mothers across all caste...
groups are home makers, except of those respondents who said they Don’t Know their caste, or that the question on caste was inapplicable to them.

Of 6 mothers who are civil servants, 4 are Brahmins, while the other two belong to Other Upper Caste and ST group respectively. A look at the admission category of these 6 respondents shows that while 4 were admitted under NRI/NRI Sponsored category, the other two enrolled under the General, and the ST (Plains) category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Occupation/Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Other Upper Caste</th>
<th>OBC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Other Religion</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home maker</td>
<td>74 (51%)</td>
<td>98 (56.6%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37 (44.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>21 (14.5%)</td>
<td>27 (15.6%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>17 (11.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
<td>14 (8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
<td>9 (5.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td>9 (5.2%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8*

Table 9 below shows caste-wise distribution of fathers’ occupations. Amongst those fathers who are in government service, the proportion is the highest in SC, followed by ST and Brahmins. The proportion of businessmen amongst Other Upper Castes, those who Don’t Know their caste, and to whom the question on caste is inapplicable is higher than all others. While there are no businessmen in the ST group, there is 1 such father amongst respondents in the SC group.

The proportion of civil servants in relation to other occupations within a caste group is highest for STs. This figure is followed by that for SCs and Brahmins. Of 43 respondents whose fathers are Civil Servants, about 47% were admitted in the General category, while 21% were under the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category. Of the remaining 14 respondents, 7 enrolled in the ST (Plains) category, 4 in the SC category, and one each in the PWD and State Domicile (ST) category.
### Table 9

#### Father's Occupation/Caste Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation/Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Other Upper Caste</th>
<th>OBC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Other Religion</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>25 (17.2%)</td>
<td>54 (31.2%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 (34.8%)</td>
<td>26 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>12 (8.2%)</td>
<td>10 (5.7%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>6 (10.7%)</td>
<td>8 (27.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>6 (4.1%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>11 (7.5%)</td>
<td>10 (5.7%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>9 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>50 (34.4%)</td>
<td>38 (22%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>26 (46.4%)</td>
<td>11 (37.9%)</td>
<td>9 (20.9%)</td>
<td>18 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>8 (5.5%)</td>
<td>22 (12.7%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>3 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6 (4.1%)</td>
<td>4 (2.3%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7 (4.8%)</td>
<td>13 (7.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20 (13.8%)</td>
<td>15 (8.7%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>11 (19.6%)</td>
<td>6 (20.6%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>10 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Family in Legal Profession

As observed in Table 10 below, only about one-third or about 32.7% of the respondents have someone in their immediate families in the legal profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent or Guardian</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Close Relative</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

2.4 Caste-wise distribution of Family in Legal Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% Among Respondents with Family Members in the Legal Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Caste</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Of the 178 respondents who answered they do have a relative in the legal profession, a caste-wise breakup follows. Nearly 62% respondents here fall in two groups, namely Brahmins and Other Upper Castes.

3. Generations of Graduates on Mother’s and Father’s Side

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations of Graduates on Mother’s Side</th>
<th>Generations of Graduates on Father’s Side</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

The majority of the respondents of the survey have had 2 or more generations of graduates on each side of their family. 53.4% of all respondents fall under such classification. This is highlighted in blue. On the other hand, 143 students, or 26.2% of the respondents belong to families where either parent is the first person on that side of the family to attain graduation, or where neither parent is a graduate. This is highlighted in orange. These respondents would become first or second time University graduates in the family.

3.1 Gender-wise Generations of Graduates on Mother’s and Father’s Side Distribution

As seen in Figure 14, females have a marginally higher proportion of respondents who have 2 or more generations of graduates on both sides of the family. As a corollary, the proportion of male respondents who would become graduates for the first or second time ever on either side of their families is slightly higher than that of female respondents.
In a trend similar to that observed in the caste-wise analysis of parents’ educational qualification, the generations of undergraduates on either parent’s side are found to be more in the case of Brahmins, Other Upper Castes, and for respondents who Don’t Know their Caste, or answered No Caste. This means that in a majority of cases for these caste groups, the student is a third time-or-higher University goer. On the contrary, the proportion of students who are would become first or second-time graduates in the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes groups is considerably higher than compared to other caste groups. This proportion is highest at about 51% for students from Scheduled Tribes group.

Figure 16 below shows the proportion of students from each caste group who would become the first-or-second time graduates on at least one side of their families. It reflects the proportion of students where at least one side of the family has never received an undergraduate degree. This includes cases where one parent may have attained graduation and the other has not. Similarly, it also includes cases where neither parent has attained graduation. The proportion of students in the Other Backward Classes is the highest in this regard. Almost one quarter of the students from Scheduled Castes, and Scheduled Tribes groups have at least one parent who has never attended University. The lowest such proportions are seen amongst Other Upper Castes.
Figure 16

3.3 Religion-Wise Generations of Graduates on Mother’s and Father’s Side Distribution

![Pie chart showing distribution of generations of undergraduates across religions.](image)

Figure 17

Figure 17 shows that across all religions, only Muslims and Buddhists have a proportion of less than 50% of those with at least 2 generations of undergraduates on both sides of the family. While Sikhs have the highest such proportion, Buddhists have the lowest. Amongst those with maximum 1 generation of graduates on either side of the family, the highest proportion is seen amongst Buddhists, followed by those who chose ‘Others’ as their religion.

4. Parents’ Fluency in English

Respondents were asked to rate the fluency of their parents in English and the responses are given in the table below. As Table 13 shows, nearly 53% fathers are reported to be Highly/Extremely Highly fluent in spoken English, as compared to about 40% mothers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency Level</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>220 (40.4%)</td>
<td>148 (27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>109 (20%)</td>
<td>110 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>97 (17.8%)</td>
<td>138 (25.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely High</td>
<td>118 (21.7%)</td>
<td>148 (27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

4.1 Caste-Wise Parents’ Fluency in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents with both parents having Medium or Higher fluency</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents with both parents having Low fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>52.05%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Classes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Those who Don’t Know their caste has the highest proportion of respondents where both parents have High or Extremely High fluency. The groups of ‘Other Religions/ Not Applicable’ and Brahmins are second and third respectively. Those who Don’t Know also have the lowest proportion of respondents where both parents have Low or Medium fluency. This number is highest for Scheduled Castes, Other Backward Classes, and Scheduled Tribes, in that order.
5. Dependent Siblings

Figure 18 shows the number of siblings, including the respondent, who are financially dependent on the parents. Nearly 49.5% respondents have at least 1 dependent sibling other than themselves. About 40% of the total respondents are single children.

![Figure 18](image)

5.1 Gender-wise Dependent Siblings Distribution

In line with the overall ratio, Figure 19 shows that the distribution of single children, and those with siblings is similar between males and females.

![Figure 19](image)
III. Financial Background

This section discusses the financial background of the respondents with respect to annual parental income, education loan and expenditure in college.

1. Annual Parental Income

The respondents were asked their parents combined annual income at the time of survey. This has been taken as the indicator of the economic status of the students and used for subsequent comparisons in this report. Income has been measured in ‘Lakhs per annum’ or ‘LPA’ in Rupees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range (in Rupees)</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 LPA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 12 LPA</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 20 LPA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 36 LPA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 36 LPA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware/Don't Want to Disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

While about 8% respondents were in the Below 3 LPA bracket, double that figure are in the Above 36 LPA bracket. A similar proportion of respondents i.e. around 22%, are in the 6 to 12 LPA bracket, and the 12 to 20 LPA bracket.

1.1 Gender-wise Income Distribution

At a general level, a higher proportion of females are in the higher income brackets, compared to males. While 10.3% males fall in the income bracket below 3 LPA, the corresponding figure for females is only about 5.1%. In line with this trend, we find 21% of the females in the income bracket above Rs. 36 LPA as against 13% males. Figure 20 below shows the gender-wise distribution of income.
1.2 Caste-wise Income Distribution

Out of the total 318 respondents belonging to the category of Brahmin and Other Upper Castes, 43.1% of them fall in the income brackets between Rs 6 to 20 LPA. Out of the total 100 respondents belonging to the category of OBC, SC and ST, 55% of them fall within the same bracket.

Chances are that one in seven respondents in the OBC, or SC, or ST caste groups is in the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket. This figure is one in twelve for Brahmins and Other Upper Castes.

Respondents in the Above 36 LPA income bracket make up about 24.1% of those who Don’t Know their Caste group, the highest such figure across all caste groups. Around 20% OBCs fall in this income bracket, while the figure is about 18% and 17% for Other Upper Castes and Brahmins respectively. The parents of no ST respondent earn above Rs. 36 LPA, while about 3.6% of SC respondents’ do.
2. Average Income

We will now discuss the average income of the students by mapping it against different indicators. For this, we assume the middle value of the given income bracket as representative of the bracket. For e.g. for the bracket Rs. 3 to 6 LPA, the assumed value is Rs. 4.5 LPA. All figures in Tables 16, 17 and 18 are Lakhs Per Annum in Rupees.

Across all 544 respondents, the average combined parental income was Rs. 17.5 LPA.

2.1 Gender-wise Average Income

The average income of females is higher than it is for males. It is Rs. 19.4 LPA, and Rs. 16.3 LPA respectively.
2.2 Caste-wise Average Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Income: Caste-Wise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

Students who Don’t Know their Caste have the highest average income, at Rs. 21.5 LPA, which is nearly 33% more than the overall average income. STs and SCs have the lowest average incomes.

2.3 Religion-wise Average Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Income: Religion-Wise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atheism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Sikhs have the highest average income, followed by Atheists. The lowest figures are seen in Muslims and Christians respectively.

2.4 NRI/NRI Sponsored, Foreign National and PWD Category-wise Average Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Income: Category-Wise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Respondents who enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category have an average income that is nearly 62% higher than the overall average. Similarly, the figure in the Foreign National Category is about 37% higher than the overall average.

3. Education Loans

One of the most important components of financial demographics is to understand how students finance their education in NUJS. In order to assess the nature of financing, the respondents were asked to mark whether they took a loan for the full amount of the fees or partial loans or no loans. Alongside loans, the survey also captured the financial help extended through various scholarships. Based on this data, the total responses have been categorized as ‘Loan’ and ‘Non-Loan’ (see Table 19). The overwhelming majority of students (83.5%) do not depend on loans for financing their education.

The ‘Loan’ component includes all responses which has some component of loan in the overall financing of education by the student. It comprises of (i) Full Loan, (ii) Partial Loans, (iii) Partial Loan alongside Scholarships, (iv) Partial Loans alongside fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, (v) Partial Loan alongside Scholarship and fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, and (vi) Self-financing and Loan. There are 90 students who are studying on loans.
The ‘Non-Loan’ component includes (i) fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, (ii) Scholarship alongside fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, (iii) Only Scholarship, (iv) Self-financing, (v) Self-financing alongside fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, (vi) Scholarship alongside Self-financing and fees paid by Parents/Relative/Guardian, and (vii) Self alongside Scholarship. 454 students are not availing any loans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans (Full)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (Partial)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (Partial); Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Relative/Guardian; Loans (Partial)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Relative/Guardian; Loans (Partial); Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self; Loans (Full)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Relative/Guardian</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Non-Loan</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Relative/Guardian; Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self; Parents/Relative/Guardian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self; Parents/Relative/Guardian; Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self; Scholarships (Centre/State/Private/University)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
3.1 Gender-wise Loan Distribution

Figure 22

The gender-wise distribution of respondents who have taken loans indicates that 14% Females and 18.2% Males have financed their education through some form of loan.

3.2 Caste-wise Loan Distribution

Figure 23

Figure 23 indicates the proportion of students within caste groups who have obtained Loans to finance their education at NUJS. As can be observed, nearly 31% of STs and 25% of SCs have taken loans, the highest such figure across all caste-groups. This is in contrast with those who Don’t Know their Caste (8.4%), OBCs (13.3%), Brahmins (15.9%) and Other Upper Caste (17.3%).
Figure 24

3.3 Income-wise Loan Distribution

Figure 24 indicates the proportion of students within various income brackets who have taken loans to finance their education at NUJS. As can be observed, there is a consistent decrease in the percentage of students who took loan with increase in their parental income. The highest percentage (40%) is therefore visible for students with parental income Below Rs 3 LPA. In contrast to this, there is only one Respondent in the category of parental income Above Rs 36 LPA who has availed a loan.
3.4 Dependent Children-wise Loan Distribution

Figure 25 below depicts the proportion of students who took ‘Loan’ in relation to the number of dependent children that their parents have in total. The highest proportions of students who have availed loans belong to the category of students whose parents have 3 dependent children (26%).

3.5 Loan Collateral

When the 90 respondents who have obtained their education loan were asked if it was against some collateral, 24 (26.7%) answered in the affirmative. Another 60 said their loans were not against any collateral, while 6 (6.7%) chose to not answer the question.

3.5.1 Gender-wise Collateral Distribution

Nearly 40% of female loan-takers have taken loan against some collateral as against 30% of males.
3.5.2 Caste-wise Collateral Distribution

Figure 27 indicates the proportion of students within the various caste groups who have availed loans against collateral. Within the various caste-groups, the highest proportions of students who have taken loan against collateral are seen in the ST category (44.4%), followed by the Brahmins (36.3%).

3.5.3 Income-wise Collateral Distribution

Figure 28 above depicts the proportion of students who availed loan against collateral in relation to average annual parental income. The general trend is a consistent increase in the percentage of students who availed loan against collateral with the increase in the parental income. Thus, only 25% of students with parental income below Rs. 3 LPA availed loan against collateral as opposed to 33% of students with parental income above Rs. 12 LPA. The only exception visible is the income group more than Rs. 36 LPA.
3.5.4 Dependent Children-wise Collateral Distribution

In Figure 29 below, we see that the highest proportion (70%) of students who took loan against collateral belong the category of students whose parents have 3 dependent children. This trend is similar to the one observed for ‘Loan’ and ‘Non-Loan’ categories above.

![Bar Chart: No. of Dependent Children]

### 4. Expenditure

Apart from annual parental income, information regarding financial expenditure generally incurred by students at NUJS was sought. Since income may not always be an accurate representation of students’ capability to spend, the patterns of expenditure on various items seek to capture the financial status of the students holistically. The following charts showcase the responses received for (i) monthly expenditure, (ii) expenditure on phone and laptop, (iii) expenditure on printing notes and reading materials, (iv) frequency of expenditure on food (exclusive of mess), (v) frequency of travel outside Kolkata (exclusive of internships), and (vi) frequency of expenditure on entertainment.
4.1 Monthly Expenditure

As seen in Figure 30, nearly 60% respondents spend below Rs. 6k per month, while about 14% spend more than Rs. 10k per month.

4.2 Cost of Phone

One quarter of all respondents have a phone that cost below Rs. 10k. Another 39% own a phone which cost between Rs. 10k to 20k, while a similar proportion of respondents possess a phone that cost above Rs. 20k.
4.3 Cost of Laptop

Most respondents own a laptop that costs between Rs. 20k to 45k. On the other hand, the laptops of about 50% respondents cost more than Rs. 45k.

4.4 Proportion of Monthly Expenditure on Academics

The large proportion of about 64% respondents spend less than one-fifth of their monthly expenditure on academics. Nearly one-third respondents spend up to 60% of their monthly expenditure on academics.
4.5 Monthly Meal Frequency in Mess

Figure 34

Nearly one-third respondents answered that they had a maximum of 4 in 10 meals in the Mess, with 15% of these saying they had just 2 in 10 meals in the Mess. One-fifth respondents said they had nearly all their meals in the Mess.

4.6 Frequency of Meals in Canteen & Side Gate Shops

Figure 35

30% respondents said that about every fifth meal of theirs was in the canteen or at one of the shops at the side gate of the University campus. Another 34% said they had anywhere 3 to 4 meals of every 10 at these places, instead of the Mess. Slightly more than 12% respondents reported that they had more than 6 meals of every 10 meals at these places instead of the Mess.
4.7 Frequency of Leisure Travel in a Semester (out of Kolkata except internships)

Figure 36

About one-fifth of all respondents they did not travel outside of Kolkata for leisure, while a similar proportion said they travelled more than 3 times every semester.

4.8 Frequency of Expenditure at Cinema Halls

Figure 37

About 57% of all respondents made at least 1 to 3 visits to the Cinema Halls for a movie every semester. While 10% never make such visits, another 11% do so more than 6 times every semester.
4.9 Subscription to Streaming Platforms

In the figure above, 45% of the respondents do not have any online streaming platform’s subscription, while about 28% have subscription to more than 1 platforms from among Netflix, Hotstar, PrimeVideo, etc.
IV. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Nature of School

The respondents were asked to mark the category of their School as ‘Government’, ‘Private’, ‘Top Private School in Your Vicinity’ or ‘Others.’ The responses received under ‘Others’ included Public Boarding School, Semi-Government School, Convent, Government aided Private School, Anglo Indian Unaided School, Roman Catholic Missionary School, Mission School, Civil Service School and Boarding School. Figure 39 shows these responses.

An overwhelming majority of the students studied at Private Schools, while only about 8% studied at Government Schools.

1.1 Batch-wise School Distribution

We witness the share of respondents from Government Schools decreasing with each successive batch. The proportions of those who went to Private Schools or Top Private Schools have remained more or less similar.
1.2 Gender-wise School Distribution

The above figure shows that while a higher proportion of males went to Government Schools than females, the opposite is true when it comes to Top Private Schools.

1.3 Caste-wise School Distribution

Figure 42 gives details of the caste-wise distribution of schools attended by the respondents. It is amongst Other Upper Castes (55.4%), followed by those from Other Religions (51.1%) and Brahmins (49.7%) that we see the highest proportion of students who went to Top Private Schools.
The corresponding figures for the SC group (35.7%), ST group (24.1%), and OBC group (33.3%) is comparatively lower. While no OBC respondent attended a Government School, the proportion of those who did within different caste-groups is highest in the STs (20.6%) and SCs (14.2%).

1.4 Region-wise School Distribution

Figure 43 below shows the region-wise trend of the nature of school attended by respondents. Only 5.9% of the respondents who attended high school in a City have studied in a Government School as opposed to 15.2% of the respondents who attended high school in a Town.
1.5 Income-wise School Distribution

![Figure 44](image)

Figure 44 indicates that the percentage of students who attended Government School has reduced with the increase in annual parental income. Roughly, 1 out of 6 respondents whose parental income is below Rs 3 LPA attended Government School as against 1 out of 29 respondents whose parental income is above Rs 36 LPA. For those whose parental income is above Rs. 12 LPA, more than 50% of the respondents attended the Top Private School in their Vicinity.

2. School Fees

In addition to the nature of school, information was also collected from the Respondents regarding school fees. Figure 45 depicts the average yearly high school fees paid by the Respondents. Out of the 544 responses only 47 (about 9%) of the students paid fees below Rs. 5000.
2.2 Gender-wise School Fees Distribution

In line with the trend visible in nature of school attended by the Respondents, there is a greater percentage of female Respondents who have attended school with higher fees as opposed to male Respondents. For schools with fees above Rs. 80,000, 24.3% of female Respondents have attended them as against 17.7% of male Respondents.
2.3 Caste-wise School Fees Distribution

Figure 47 indicates the caste-wise distribution of the school fees paid by the respondents. A higher proportion of respondents in the SC and ST groups went to schools with fees below Rs. 5,000, as compared to respondents from other caste-groups. Additionally, while more than 40% of SC respondents paid below Rs. 20,000 as their annual school fees, a similar proportion, at around 34.5%, of STs and Brahmins did the same.

On the other hand, respondents who paid more than Rs. 50,000 per annum as their school fees form the highest proportions amongst those who Don’t Know their Caste, followed by the OBC group, and the Other Upper Castes group. More than 20% of respondents from Brahmin, Other Upper Caste, OBC, Other Religion and from those who Don’t Know their caste paid school fees exceeding Rs. 80,000 per annum.
2.4 Region-Wise Distribution of School Fees

While more than 40% of respondents from Towns paid less than Rs. 20,000 as their annual school fees, the corresponding figure for cities is about 25%. In Figure 48, a higher proportion of respondents from cities are in the higher fees brackets. No person who studied in a village paid fees above Rs. 50,000.

2.5 Income-wise Distribution of School Fees

Figure 49 indicates a general trend where school fees increases as income increases. Roughly 1 in 5 respondents with parental income below Rs. 3 LPA paid school fees below Rs. 5,000 as opposed to 1 in 44 respondents with parental income above Rs. 36 LPA. In line with this trend, 8.9% of Respondents with parental income below Rs. 3 LPA paid school fees more than Rs. 80,000 as opposed to 45.5% of Respondents with parental income above Rs 36 LPA.
### 3. Medium of Instruction in High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium of Instruction</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Hindi</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Urdu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Nepali</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20*

Table 20 indicates that an overwhelming majority of the Respondents (83.8%) attended high school with English as the medium of instruction.

### 4. School Board

![Figure 50](image)

Figure 50 above indicates the school board of the Respondents in Class 10. Nine out of ten Respondents have studied either in CBSE or ICSE schools. Just about 7% have studied in State Board schools. ‘Others’ includes CIE, IB, and NIOS.
5. Performance in Twelfth Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% in 12th</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 60%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 95%</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 95%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

Table 21 indicates that only 0.4% of the Respondents secured less than 60% in the twelfth standard. The majority of the Respondents (64.9%) have secured between 80-95% in the twelfth standard.

6. Stream

Figure 51 above shows that 42.5% of the respondents opted for Science stream in their pre-university education. This is followed by Commerce (37.1%) and Humanities/Arts (19.5%).

The Other 5 respondents opted for courses that allowed them greater flexibility in their subjects, e.g. humanities and management, or art, chemistry and psychology, etc.
6.1 Batch-wise Stream Distribution

The batch-wise trend indicates that the number of students from the Science stream has remained consistently higher than both Commerce and Humanities over the five batches surveyed.

6.2 Gender-wise Stream Distribution

Figure 53 indicates that a higher proportion of Males (45.9%) opted for the Science stream, compared to females (37.4%). However, at about 28%, nearly double the proportion of females chose the Humanities/Arts stream in comparison to males.
6.3 Caste-wise Stream Distribution

Across all caste-groups, the highest proportions of respondents who chose Humanities/Arts are in the ST and SC groups respectively. Respondents in the Other Upper Caste group followed by those who Don’t Know their Caste opted for Commerce in greater proportions than those in other caste-groups.

7. CLAT Coaching

The Respondents were asked to answer whether they attended CLAT Coaching prior to joining NUJS. Out of 544 Respondents, 84.9% attended CLAT coaching while 15.1% did not. These responses will be mapped further to understand the influence of certain indicators on the respondent’s decision to attend CLAT coaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAT Coaching</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Attend</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
7.1 Batch-wise CLAT Coaching Distribution

The batch-wise trend for CLAT Coaching indicates that there has been a consistent trend of Respondents who attended CLAT Coaching in the range between 80%-87% till 2017 and it has crossed 90% in 2018.

7.2 Gender-wise CLAT Coaching Distribution

Figure 56 indicates that 89.3% of female respondents attended CLAT Coaching as against 82.1% of male respondents.
7.3 Caste-wise CLAT Coaching Distribution

Figure 57 indicates that respondents who did not attend CLAT coaching formed less than 15% of the Brahmin, Other Upper Castes, OBC, and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups. This figure is nearly double for the SC, and ST groups, and amongst those from Other Religions.

7.4 Region-wise CLAT Coaching Distribution

While nearly 50% (3 of 7 respondents) from Villages did not attend CLAT coaching, the corresponding figure for towns and cities is lower at 13.9% and 18.9% respectively.
7.5 Income-wise CLAT Coaching

![Graph showing income-wise CLAT Coaching attendance](image)

Figure 59

As Figure 59 shows, roughly, 1 in 5 respondents with parental income below Rs 3 LPA did not attend CLAT Coaching as opposed to 1 in 10 Respondents with parental income more than Rs 36 LPA. A similar proportion as the former (about 18%) of respondents in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA income bracket did not attend CLAT coaching.

7.6 CLAT Coaching Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAT Coaching Fees (in Rupees)</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20k</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20k – 50k</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50k – 80k</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80k – 1 lac</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1 lac</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Attend</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

Table 22 shows the CLAT Coaching Fees paid by respondents. Nearly 38% paid between Rs. 20k to 50k, while another 23% paid between up to Rs. 80k. One-tenth of all respondents paid more than Rs. 80k per annum for their CLAT coaching.

8. Drop

The respondents were asked to mark whether they took a Drop prior to joining NUJS. Here, Drop refers to intervening period before leaving school and joining the University. The answers received in this section have been divided as seen in Table 23. These responses will be mapped against basic demographics in this section.
Nearly 52% of all respondents have taken a drop before joining NUJS.

### 8.1 Batch-wise Drop Distribution

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drop Year</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Drop</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop - Studied at Law Institute</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop - Studied at Non-Law Institute</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop (1 Year)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop (&gt;1 Year)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Want to Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

The highest proportion of respondents who took a Drop are found in the 2016 and 2017 batches respectively. The proportion of those who took a Drop has exceeded 50% in the latest 3 batches who answered this Survey. This figure is lowest for the batch of 2015, at about 42%.
8.2 Gender-wise Drop Distribution

Figure 61 indicates that while about 54.7% of male respondents took a Drop, the corresponding figure for females was lower at about 47.2%.

8.3 Caste-Wise Drop Distribution

Figure 62 indicates that it is amongst ST respondents (72.4%) that we see the highest proportion of those who did not take a Drop across all caste-groups. This figure is lowest in the OBC group (33.3%). Amongst the Brahmin, Other Upper Castes, and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups, the proportion of those who took a Drop and joined a Law/Non-Law Institute is in the range of 27% to 38%. The corresponding figures for the SC, ST, and OBC groups are in the range of 10% to 22%.
8.4 Region-wise Drop Distribution

As Figure 63 shows, a student from a town or a village is more likely to take a Drop than a student from a city.

8.5 Income-Wise Distribution of Drop Year

The percentage of Drop-takers falls with rise in income levels. While those with income levels below Rs. 3 LPA have taken the most Drops, the likelihood of Drop-takers is lowest at the income level of above Rs. 36 LPA.
V. **LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND (ENGLISH FLUENCY)**

The medium of instruction in NUJS is English. Most other law school activities are also transacted in English. Therefore, we thought it fit to try and understand the English fluency levels of the students when they joined the college, their subsequent growth and disparities.

The respondents were asked to mark on a scale of 0 to 5 their fluency in written and spoken English at the time of joining NUJS (‘fluency then’) and at the time of filling out the survey (‘fluency now’) respectively. The question required the Respondents to self-evaluate their levels of fluency. In designating the degree of fluency, the values 0-2 have been taken as ‘Low’, 3 as ‘Medium’, 4 as ‘High’ and 5 as ‘Extremely High’. Both written and spoken fluency (then and now) have been compared against basic demographic indicators to map the different levels of fluency among the students of NUJS.

1. **Fluency in Written English**

![Figure 65](image-url)

Figure 65 above shows that the self-evaluation of respondents reflects an overall improvement of fluency in written English after joining NUJS. The fall in number of students who rate their fluency as low and medium indicates the same. Yet, 11.6% of all respondents reported their fluency now as Medium/Low.
1.1 Batch-wise Written Fluency Distribution

![Batch-wise Written Fluency Distribution](image)

The improvement in written fluency, as self-assessed by the students, appears to be uniform across the batches. The 2018 batch, being the first-year batch at the time of survey has shown relatively lesser improvement.

1.2 Gender-wise Written Fluency Distribution

![Gender-wise Written Fluency Distribution](image)

At the time of joining the college, only 13.6% females assessed their written fluency as Low/ Medium, as against 30.4% males. That figure has now halved for females (6.1%) and males (14.9%).
The proportion of females rating their fluency as High/Extremely High has increased by around 7.5% as against the time of joining. However, for males there has been a 15.5% increase in the number of students rating their fluency as High/Extremely High.

1.3 Caste-wise Written Fluency Distribution

Figure 68 above indicates that the assessment of fluency by Respondents has improved over the years although not uniformly.

At the time of joining, 80% - 90% of respondents in the Brahmin, Other Upper Castes, Other Religions and those who marked their Caste as ‘Don’t Know’ groups assessed their written English fluency as High/Extremely High. In contrast, less than 60% of the respondents belonging to SC, ST and OBC groups rated their fluency as High/Extremely High whereas the figure at 55% was the lowest for the ST students.

Thus, the most improvement is also visible in these latter three caste groups. For instance, there is a nearly 20% increase in the SC group of respondents who rate their fluency as High/Extremely High now.
2. Fluency in Spoken English

Figure 69 above shows that the self-evaluation of respondents reflects an overall improvement of fluency in spoken English after joining NUJS. The fall in number of students who rate their fluency as low (14.2% to 3.7%) and increase in those who rated it as Extremely High (41% to 51.3%) indicates the same.

2.1 Batch-wise Spoken Fluency Distribution

The improvement in spoken fluency, as self-assessed by the students, appears to be uniform across the batches. The 2018 batch, being the first-year batch at the time of survey has shown relatively lesser improvement.
2.2 Gender-wise Spoken Fluency Distribution

At the time of joining, only about 21% females assessed their spoken fluency as Low/Medium, which figure has now decreased to 5.1%. Nearly half the females rated their fluency as Extremely High at the time of joining, which figure has now gone up to 61.2%. While about 44.6% males rated their fluency as Low/Medium at the time of joining, this figure has dropped drastically to 21.2%. Simultaneously, the proportion of males who said their fluency is Extremely High has increased from 35.5% to about 45%. In Figure 72, we can see a better improvement in the fluency in Spoken English of males from their time at NUJS.
2.3 Caste-wise Spoken Fluency Distribution

Similar to the self-assessment of fluency in Written English at the time of joining, a higher proportion of respondents from Brahmin, Other Upper Castes, Other Religion, and those who Don’t Know their Caste groups said their fluency in Spoken English is High/Extremely High. This is in comparison to respondents from SC, ST, and OBC groups.

Thus, we see that in these three groups, the most improvement in fluency Then and Now is seen in these groups. For example, nearly 79% of SCs rate their fluency as High/Extremely High now, as compared to 50% at the time of joining. In contrast, nearly 68% of Brahmins rated their fluency as such when they joined, as against about 85% now.

Figure 72 indicates that the assessment of fluency by Respondents has improved over the years although not uniformly.
VI. ADMISSION CATEGORY

1. Reservation Policy at NUJS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All India</th>
<th>West Bengal Domicile</th>
<th>Jammu &amp; Kashmir Domicile</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Caste</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Nationals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities (PWD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (Horizontal Reservation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Table 24 gives an overview of the various categories under which students are admitted at NUJS. While these are the maximum number of seats in a given category, there are minor variations found in the admission details of each successive batch, which are contingent on the pool of NUJS-aspirants in a given year.

2. Admission Category Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Plains)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Hills)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (General)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (OBC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (SC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (ST)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;K Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

In Table 25 above, we see category-wise distribution for 541 respondents from five batches who took the survey. 3 Respondents who have been admitted under Jammu and Kashmir Domicile in the General are shown separately as ‘J&K Residents’.
2.1 Gender-wise Admission Category Distribution

In the general category, males comprise 65.7% of the respondents. All admission categories other than ‘General’ are reserved categories. Nearly half of the respondents under reserved categories are females (47.2%). Females are in the majority (around 55-60%) in three categories, namely, NRI/NRI Sponsored, State Domicile (General), and State Domicile (SC) categories.

2.2 Caste-wise Admission Category Distribution

Respondents who identified as Brahmins, Other Upper Castes or Don’t Know their caste comprise about 90% of all those admitted under the General and NRI/NRI Sponsored categories. While 2 seats are reserved under ‘OBC-A’ and ‘OBC-B’ categories, a total of 15 respondents said they belong to the OBC group, out of which 11 of were admitted in the General category. 24 Respondents admitted under General category stated that caste was inapplicable or that they belonged to Other Religions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Category</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Other Upper Caste</th>
<th>OBC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Other Religion</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Hills)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Plains)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;K Residents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Domicile (General)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Domicile (OBC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Domicile (SC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Domicile (ST)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

Amongst 83 respondents who Don’t Know their caste, the highest number (44) of respondents took admission in the General category, while another 23 enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category. This latter category does not have a single respondent who identified with the SC or ST group.

In 15 respondents in the PWD category, 4 each identified themselves as Brahmin and Other Upper Castes. There are two OBCs, one ST, and no SC under the PWD category.

All students enrolled in the Foreign National category are from Brahmins, Other Upper Castes or Don’t Know their caste.

Other than one person who said the question on caste was inapplicable to them, everyone who was admitted under State Domicile (ST) category identified as STs. All those under State Domicile (SC) category identified as SCs.
### 2.3 Religion-wise Admission Category Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Category</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Atheist</th>
<th>Buddhism</th>
<th>Christianity</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Islam</th>
<th>Jainism</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(59.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;K Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Hills)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST (Plains)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (General)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (OBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (SC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domicile (ST)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

In trend with distribution across religions at NUJS, Hindus form the majority in all admission category groups, except in the ST (Hills) and State Domicile (ST) categories. Almost all students under Foreign National category are Hindus, apart from one Atheist and one Sikh. Similarly, almost three quarters of NRI/NRI Sponsored students are Hindus. The second largest group is of Atheists, with other minority religions also represented. Of the 29 students enrolled under different domicile categories, more than half are Hindus. While 6 respondents identified as Atheists, 4 identified as Muslims.

### 2.4 Income-wise Admission Category Distribution

The table below correlates the respondents’ admission category with their parents’ total income. Categories of WB Domicile have been clubbed within the parent category (except OBC). The table
also indicates the proportion of respondents within a category in a particular income bracket. Analysis of answers in the State Domicile (OBC) shall be excluded due to the small sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Category</th>
<th>Below 6 LPA</th>
<th>6-20 LPA</th>
<th>20-36 LPA</th>
<th>Above 36 LPA</th>
<th>Not Disclosed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>74 (21.7%)</td>
<td>155 (45.5%)</td>
<td>50 (14.7%)</td>
<td>48 (14.1%)</td>
<td>13 (3.8%)</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>16 (28.5%)</td>
<td>34 (60.7%)</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>8 (24.3%)</td>
<td>19 (57.5%)</td>
<td>6 (18.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td>5 (6.1%)</td>
<td>28 (34.5%)</td>
<td>15 (18.5%)</td>
<td>31 (38.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;K Residents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>4 (26.6%)</td>
<td>4 (26.6%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domicile (OBC)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

A higher proportion of students in the PWD category are in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket, as compared to any other category. This is followed by those who enrolled in the SC and ST category. Similarly, a higher proportion of respondents in the Rs. 6 LPA to Rs. 20 LPA bracket were admitted in the SC category followed by the ST and General category. No respondent in the ST category falls in the more than 36 LPA bracket.

In contrast, majority of respondents enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category fall in income brackets more than Rs. 20 LPA. Nearly one-third of the respondents in the Foreign National category fall in Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket.

Amongst those enrolled in the Domicile categories, only 5 out of 29 respondents belong to families that earn more than Rs. 20 LPA. Most of these respondents fall in the middle-income bracket of Rs. 6 to 20 LPA, while about 28% fall in the bracket Below Rs. 6 LPA.
Respondents from cities are in the majority across all admission categories. The highest disparity in distribution between city and town is seen in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category (95%-5%), and in the Foreign Nationals category (92%-8%). Respondents from towns outnumber those from cities only for State Domicile (OBC) category. Out of the 7 respondents from villages, 4 were admitted in the General category, while one each under PWD, State Domicile (SC) and State Domicile (ST) categories.
2.6 Loan-wise Admission Category Distribution

![Loan-wise Admission Category Distribution Chart]

The greatest number of loans has been taken by respondents in the General category. This is followed by respondents enrolled under the SC category. By proportion, the highest incidence of loans is seen amongst those enrolled under the two ST categories (35.7%). One quarter of the total respondents admitted under State Domicile (General), PWD and SC categories have also taken loans to study at NUJS.

2.7 Nature of School-wise Admission Category Distribution

![Nature of School-wise Admission Category Distribution Chart]

Nearly 29% students enrolled in the three ST categories attended Government schools. This figure stands at 10% for the SC, at 4.9% for the NRI/NRI Sponsored, and at 4.3% for General category.

Respondents who went to ‘Top Private Schools’ in their vicinity constitute the highest proportion in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category, at 58%. Students who went to such schools make up 49% of
those admitted in the General category. About 37% respondents in the SC category went to such schools.

2.8 CLAT Coaching-wise Admission Category Distribution

Nearly 83% of the respondents in this survey said they attended CLAT Coaching.

The number of those who did not attend is higher than those who attended CLAT coaching only for three categories. These are the Foreign National, State Domicile (ST), and J&K residents’ category. Across all other categories, more students attended CLAT coaching than those who did not. Amongst such categories, the group of respondents who did not attend any CLAT coaching form the highest proportion amongst students enrolled in the SC category, at 27.4% of respondents under the category.

In the NRI/NRI Sponsored category, nearly 95% respondents attended CLAT coaching, the highest such proportion across all categories.
PERFORMANCE AT NUJS
I. ACADEMICS

This section addresses the academic performance of the students of NUJS. It is divided into four parts. The first part seeks to understand the subjective importance of academics for individuals. The second part discusses the socioeconomic factors that the students think are determinative in academic performance of individuals. The third part deals with the actual academic performance of students and the impact of diversity indicators on academics. The final part presents responses on other academic matter including faculty approachability, opinions on repeat and improvement exam, class discussions, etc.

For our discussion, the Cumulative Grade Point Average (‘CGPA’) Value of the students has been taken as an indicator of academic performance.

1. Importance of Academics

The respondents were asked the extent to which academics is important in their law school life. They were asked to mark on a 5-point scale: Very Low, Low, Moderate, High, and Very High importance.

![Figure 78](image)

Nearly 67% respondents rated the importance of academics as High/Very High.
1.1 Batch-wise Importance of Academics Distribution

As Figure 79 shows, 2018 batch which was the junior-most batch surveyed has the maximum proportion of students who feel academics has High or Very High importance, followed by the 2016 batch. Barring the 2016 batch where the highest incidence is of respondents who chose the Very High importance option, the highest proportion of respondents in the other batches said academic was Highly important.

1.2 Gender-wise Importance of Academics Distribution

A greater proportion of females (71.9%) rated academics as of High/Very High importance than males (63.2%). In line with this, a greater proportion of males rated academics as of Low/Very Low importance than females.
1.3 Caste-wise Importance of Academics Distribution

The highest incidence of respondents who rated academics as of Low/Very Low importance is in the OBC group, followed by Brahmins, SC and Other Religion groups. It is in the Other Upper Caste, those who Don’t Know their Caste, and the Brahmin groups that we see the highest proportions of respondents who opted for the High/Very High importance options.

1.3 Income-wise Importance of Academics Distribution

There is a greater proportion of respondents who feel academics is of Low/Very Low importance within this income brackets of less than Rs. 6 LPA (more than 10%) as opposed to others.
Similarly, a higher proportion regard academics as of High/Very High importance in the income bracket of Rs. 12 LPA to Rs. 20 LPA that any other bracket.

2. Factors Influencing CGPA

The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they think certain factors influence the academic performance (CGPA) of a student on a scale of Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High. The factors were gender, caste, income, region, disability, schooling, fluency in English, parents’ education and parents’ occupation. In appropriate cases, responses to the question on the relevance of these factors to CGPA have also been marked against the actual status of the respondents with respect to these factors.

2.1 Gender

Overall, nearly 60% of the respondents felt that gender has Very Low influence upon the CGPA of a student.

A slightly higher proportion of males (76.5%) said Gender has Low/Very Low influence on CGPA as compared to females (74.2%). Similarly, the corresponding figures for those who said it has a High/Very High influence are again slightly higher among males (11.2%) than females (8.4%).
2.2 Caste

More than 60% of respondents from the groups of Brahmins, Other Upper Castes, Other Religion and those who Don’t Know their Caste felt that caste has Low/Very Low influence on a student’s CGPA. This figure is less than 50% for those from the SC, ST and OBC groups. Similarly, there is a greater proportion of OBC, SC and ST (over 20%), as compared to other caste groups who feel caste has High/Very High influence upon CGPA.

2.3 Income

Overall, more respondents said income has a Moderate influence on CGPA, than any other answer. In the Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket, nearly 40% respondents feel income has a Low/Very Low influence on CGPA. This is the highest such figure across all income brackets. About 33% of respondents in the Rs 12 to 20 LPA bracket, and the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA bracket said income has a High/Very High influence on CGPA. This is the highest such figure across all income brackets.
2.4 Place of Residence

Nearly 50% of the total respondents feel that place of residence has High/Very High influence upon CGPA. This figure is higher for those from Villages and Towns respectively.

2.5 Disability

About 50% of the respondents feel that disability has High/Very High influence upon CGPA. Among those who identified themselves as being differently abled, 33% feel that it has High/Very High influence. An equal number felt that it has Moderate or Low influence on CGPA.
2.6 Quality of Schooling

![Bar Chart: Quality of Schooling](chart1.png)

Figure 88

About 78% of total respondents feel schooling has High/Very High influence upon CGPA. This number is greater for those from Government Schools and Other Schools as against those from Private and Top Private Schools.

2.7 Fluency in English

![Pie Chart: Fluency in English](chart2.png)

Figure 89

About three-fourths of the total respondents feel fluency in English has a High/Very High influence upon CGPA.
2.8 Parents’ Education

![Figure 90](image)

About 43% respondents said parents’ educational qualifications have a High/Very High influence on a student’s CGPA, while about one-third chose the Low/Very Low options.

2.9 Parents’ Occupation

![Figure 91](image)

A similar proportion of respondents (around 36%) said parents’ occupations had either a Low/Very Low impact, or that it had High/Very High impact on CGPA.

3. Academic Performance

3.1 CGPA at NUJS

NUJS follows a 7-point grade value system (‘GPA’) for every subject. The table below shows the GPA allocation vis-à-vis marks obtained in a subject. **CGPA is calculated by taking the average of the sum of GPA of all subjects a student has completed.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Marks</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Description</th>
<th>Grade Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% and above</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% and above but below 75%</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% and above but below 70%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% and above but below 65%</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% and above but below 60%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% and above but below 55%</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% and above but below 50%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 40%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

Respondents were asked their CGPA and the responses are shown in the Figure below.

![Figure 92](image)

Overall, the highest proportion of respondents have a CGPA in the range of 4 - 4.99 (31.9%). Then, a similar proportion (around 24%) are in the 3 – 3.99 range and the 5 – 5.99 range. Around 5.3% of the total respondents have CGPA above 6, while nearly 14% scored CGPA below 3.
3.2 Batch-wise CGPA Distribution

CGPA across batches is not distributed uniformly. It must be noted that the number of subjects, nature and content of courses, and subjectivity in marking across batches differ which may explain the lack of proportionality in CGPAs.

3.3 Gender-wise CGPA Distribution

In comparison to the overall average, females are seen to be performing better in terms of CGPA. While 78.9% of the females have CGPA above 4, the corresponding figure for males is just above 50.7%. Nearly 9% of the females have CGPA above 6, as opposed to 3.04% of the total males. Similarly, while only 4.2% of the female students have a CGPA less than 3, 20.9% of male students have a CGPA of less than 3.
Among those with CGPA above 6, there are 8 from Brahmin and Other Upper Caste each, followed by 7 from those who Don’t Know their caste and 4 from Other Religions. There remaining 2 students include one each from the OBC and SC groups. Nobody from the ST group has a CGPA above 5.

Less than 10% of those belonging to Brahmin, Other Upper Caste and those who Don’t Know their caste have a CGPA of less than 3. However, more than 50% of ST, 30% of SC and 10% of OBC and Other Religions have a CGPA of less than 3.

Figure 95
### 3.5 Caste & Gender wise CGPA Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Females (proportion from total females in the Caste Group in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion from total males in the Caste Group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Caste</td>
<td>3 (4.62%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1 (4.35%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1 (9.09%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>1 (6.67%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3 (7.14%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

The table above undertakes a multi-factor analysis to indicate the CGPA of students with respect to both Caste & Gender. The two-factor analysis had revealed the general trend that females are performing better than males. However, the three-factor analysis shows that this is true across caste groups as well.
3.5.1 Caste, Gender & Above 5 CGPA

The inverted pyramid below shows the proportion of respondents within each caste-gender who have secured above 5 CGPA. It is arranged from high to low.

The top 4 levels of the pyramid are made of females alone from different caste groups beginning with Other Religions and followed by Brahmin, Don’t Know and Other Upper Caste groups.

While SC males form the last row with the lowest proportion, OBC and ST males as well as ST females do not find a place in the pyramid as none of them have a CGPA above 5.

![Pyramid Diagram]

Figure 96
3.6 Region-wise CGPA Distribution

Among those with CGPA above 6, 93.1% of the students are from Cities while the remaining 6.9% are from Towns. Nobody from Villages has a CGPA above 4. Less proportion of respondents belonging to City have a CGPA less than 3 as compared to those from Towns and Villages.

3.7 Income-wise CGPA Distribution

At all income levels below Rs. 12 LPA, more than 70% respondents have CGPA below 5.

Amongst those in the above Rs. 36 LPA income bracket, 43.1% scored CGPA above 5. This is the highest such figure across all income groups.
### 3.8 Caste & Income wise CGPA Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
<th>Income Below 3 LPA</th>
<th>3 to 6 LPA</th>
<th>6 to 12 LPA</th>
<th>12 to 20 LPA</th>
<th>20 to 36 LPA</th>
<th>Above 36 LPA</th>
<th>Not Disclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>4 (30.76%)</td>
<td>1 (3.70%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (7.14%)</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
<td>2 (20.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>11 (91.67%)</td>
<td>6 (46.17%)</td>
<td>16 (59.27%)</td>
<td>19 (61.29%)</td>
<td>14 (50.00%)</td>
<td>12 (50.00%)</td>
<td>5 (50.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (23.07%)</td>
<td>10 (37.03%)</td>
<td>12 (38.71%)</td>
<td>12 (42.86%)</td>
<td>11 (45.83%)</td>
<td>3 (30.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>3 (20.00%)</td>
<td>3 (23.07%)</td>
<td>1 (3.70%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (9.09%)</td>
<td>3 (30.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>6 (40.00%)</td>
<td>15 (65.22%)</td>
<td>26 (65.00%)</td>
<td>25 (64.10%)</td>
<td>14 (63.64%)</td>
<td>16 (51.61%)</td>
<td>2 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>6 (40.00%)</td>
<td>5 (21.74%)</td>
<td>9 (33.33%)</td>
<td>13 (27.27%)</td>
<td>6 (38.71%)</td>
<td>12 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (37.50%)</td>
<td>1 (9.09%)</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5.00%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>2 (66.67%)</td>
<td>1 (12.50%)</td>
<td>7 (63.64%)</td>
<td>12 (50.00%)</td>
<td>11 (78.57%)</td>
<td>11 (55.00%)</td>
<td>2 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>4 (50.00%)</td>
<td>3 (27.27%)</td>
<td>10 (41.67%)</td>
<td>3 (21.43%)</td>
<td>8 (40.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (66.67%)</td>
<td>1 (9.09%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>1 (66.67%)</td>
<td>5 (16.67%)</td>
<td>3 (33.33%)</td>
<td>2 (40.00%)</td>
<td>3 (37.50%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (16.67%)</td>
<td>5 (45.45%)</td>
<td>5 (33.33%)</td>
<td>3 (55.56%)</td>
<td>5 (62.50%)</td>
<td>2 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (50.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (50.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>7 (87.50%)</td>
<td>2 (25.00%)</td>
<td>6 (33.33%)</td>
<td>3 (18.75%)</td>
<td>1 (25.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>1 (12.50%)</td>
<td>5 (50.00%)</td>
<td>11 (61.11%)</td>
<td>11 (68.75%)</td>
<td>2 (50.00%)</td>
<td>1 (50.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (12.50%)</td>
<td>1 (5.56%)</td>
<td>2 (12.50%)</td>
<td>1 (25.00%)</td>
<td>1 (50.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (69.23%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (40.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (30.77%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (60.00%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31
The table above shows the distribution of CGPA with respect to the Caste and annual parental income of the students. For each caste group, the highest proportion with respect to an income category which has secured a CGPA below 3 has been highlighted in blue while the highest proportion which has secured CGPA above 5 has been highlighted in gold.

3.9 Gender & Income wise CGPA Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Brackets</th>
<th>Females (proportion from total females in the Income Group in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion from total males in the Income Group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 1 (9.09%) 3-5: 5 (45.45%)  Above 5: 5 (45.45%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 14 (41.18%) 3-5: 17 (50.00%)  Above 5: 3 (8.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 2 (6.90%) 3-5: 17 (58.62%)  Above 5: 10 (34.48%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 14 (37.84%) 3-5: 19 (51.35%)  Above 5: 4 (10.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 3 (7.69%) 3-5: 24 (61.54%)  Above 5: 12 (30.77%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 20 (23.81%) 3-5: 48 (57.14%)  Above 5: 16 (19.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 20 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 1 (1.85%) 3-5: 27 (50.00%)  Above 5: 26 (48.15%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 7 (10.00%) 3-5: 47 (67.14%)  Above 5: 16 (22.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 36 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 1 (3.13%) 3-5: 15 (46.88%)  Above 5: 16 (50%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 6 (12.77%) 3-5: 31 (65.96%)  Above 5: 10 (21.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 36 LPA</td>
<td>Below 3: 1 (2.22%) 3-5: 19 (42.22%)  Above 5: 25 (55.56%)</td>
<td>Below 3: 5 (11.63%) 3-5: 25 (58.14%)  Above 5: 13 (30.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Below 3: - 3-5: 2 (50.00%)  Above 5: 3 (21.43%)</td>
<td>Below 3: - 3-5: 7 (50.00%)  Above 5: 4 (28.57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

The table above shows the distribution of students’ CGPA with respect to their parents’ annual income and Gender. In each income bracket, a higher proportion of females are in the CGPA brackets above 3 and above 5 respectively, as compared to males.

A higher proportion of males in the lower income brackets are in the Below 3 CGPA bracket, as against males in higher income brackets. The same if true for females in the Below 3 CGPA bracket.

In the Below Rs. 3 LPA income bracket, nearly 90% females have CGPA above 3, while the figure is around 58% for males. On the other hand, nearly 97% females have CGPA above 3 in the income brackets above Rs. 20 LPA, while about 87% males do so.
3.9.1 Gender, Income & Above 5 CGPA

The inverted pyramid below shows the proportions of different gender-income groups which have secured a CGPA above 5 (arranged high to low). It is evident that females from all income categories outrank their male counterparts. The pyramid also shows that gender-income groups are arranged with descending order of income categories i.e., higher the income, higher is the proportion of the group having secured a CGPA above 5.

**Figure 99**
3.10 NRI/NRI Sponsored, Foreign National, and PWD Category-wise CGPA Distribution

In the NRI and PWD categories, 13.3% and 4.9% respondents respectively have CGPA below 3. Similarly, no respondent from the Foreign National category has a CGPA above 4.

While nearly 40% of the respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category scored CGPA above 5, this figure is around 20% for the PWD category.

3.11 Gender wise CGPA Distribution in NRI/NRI Sponsored, Foreign National and PWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Females (proportion from total females in the Category Group in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion from total males in the Category Group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI/NRI Sponsored</td>
<td>1(2.08%)</td>
<td>22(45.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33
3.12 Generations of Graduates-wise CGPA Distribution

Figures below show the CGPA of respondents with respect to number of generations of graduates on mother’s and father’s side respectively.

### 3.12.1 Mother’s Side

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations of Graduates on Mother’s Side</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 2</td>
<td>2-2.99</td>
<td>3-3.99</td>
<td>4-4.99</td>
<td>5-5.99</td>
<td>Above 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>10 (23.2%)</td>
<td>12 (27.9%)</td>
<td>12 (27.9%)</td>
<td>5 (11.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (3.8%)</td>
<td>28 (17.9%)</td>
<td>25 (16%)</td>
<td>51 (32.6%)</td>
<td>42 (26.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>18 (88.7%)</td>
<td>56 (27.6%)</td>
<td>63 (31%)</td>
<td>51 (25.1%)</td>
<td>12 (5.9%)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>21 (25.6%)</td>
<td>27 (32.9%)</td>
<td>20 (24.3%)</td>
<td>8 (9.7%)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>16 (26.7%)</td>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

Among those with:

(i) 0 generations of graduates: 25.6% of respondents have a CGPA below 3 while 18.6% have a CGPA of above 5;

(ii) 1 generation of graduates: 21.8% have a CGPA below 3 while 29.5% have a CGPA of above 5;

(iii) 2 generations of graduates: 10.3% have a CGPA below 3 while 31% have a CGPA above 5

(iv) 3 generations of graduates: 7.3% have a CGPA below 3 while 34.1% have a CGPA of above 5, and

(v) 4+ generations of graduates, 10% have a CGPA below 3 while 28.3% have a CGPA of above 5.

Overall, it can be seen that with an increase in number of generations of graduates on the mother’s side there is a concomitant improvement in the CGPA of the student. However, those with 3 generations of graduates are performing slightly better than those with 4 generations.
3.12.2 Father’s Side

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations of Graduates on Father’s Side</th>
<th>Below 2</th>
<th>2.299-3.99</th>
<th>3-3.99</th>
<th>4-4.99</th>
<th>5-5.99</th>
<th>Above 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (34.4%)</td>
<td>2 (6.8%)</td>
<td>10 (34.4%)</td>
<td>4 (13.6%)</td>
<td>3 (10.3%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (3.5%)</td>
<td>28 (16.7%)</td>
<td>39 (23.2%)</td>
<td>53 (31.5%)</td>
<td>38 (22.6%)</td>
<td>4 (2.3%)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>15 (7.6%)</td>
<td>48 (24.6%)</td>
<td>63 (32.3%)</td>
<td>57 (29.2%)</td>
<td>9 (4.6%)</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>8 (8.8%)</td>
<td>26 (28.5%)</td>
<td>28 (30.7%)</td>
<td>18 (19.8%)</td>
<td>9 (9.8%)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>15 (24.5%)</td>
<td>20 (32.7%)</td>
<td>16 (26.2%)</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

Among those with:

(i) 0 generations of graduates, 34.5% of respondents have a CGPA below 3 while 24.1% have a CGPA of above 5;

(ii) 1 generation of graduates, 20.2% have a CGPA below 3 while 25% have a CGPA of above 5;

(iii) 2 generations of graduates, 9.2% have a CGPA below 3 while 33.8% have a CGPA of above 5;

(iv) 3 generations of graduates, 11% have a CGPA below 3 while 29.7% have a CGPA of above 5, and

(v) 4+ generations of graduates, 9.8% have a CGPA below 3 while 32.8% have a CGPA of above 5.

Overall, it can be seen that with an increase in number of generations of graduates on the father’s side there is a concomitant increase in high performance (CGPA above 5) among the respondents surveyed. However, those with 2 generations of graduates are performing slightly better than others.
3.13 Parents’ Occupation-wise CGPA Distribution

3.13.1 Mother’s Occupation

Table 36 shows distribution of respondents across CGPA ranges by their mother’s occupation. The proportions shown are from the total number of mothers pursing that occupation. A majority of students of mothers across all professions except those categorized as ‘Others’ and ‘Management’ have CGPA above 4. This number is highest for teachers, at about 67%. The highest proportion of those who scored CGPA below 4 are found amongst respondents whose mothers are in the Legal Profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Occupation/CGPA</th>
<th>Below 2</th>
<th>2-2.99</th>
<th>3-3.99</th>
<th>4-4.99</th>
<th>5-5.99</th>
<th>Above 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-maker</td>
<td>9 (3.2%)</td>
<td>42 (14.9%)</td>
<td>55 (19.5%)</td>
<td>92 (32.6%)</td>
<td>68 (24.1%)</td>
<td>16 (5.7%)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (8.7%)</td>
<td>16 (20%)</td>
<td>31 (37.5%)</td>
<td>23 (28.7%)</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (10.4%)</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
<td>18 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (18.7%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>10 (35.7%)</td>
<td>8 (28.5%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Profession</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>9 (52.9%)</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
<td>15 (32.6%)</td>
<td>14 (30.4%)</td>
<td>9 (19.6%)</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

3.13.2 Father’s Occupation

Table 37 shows distribution of respondents across CGPA ranges by their father’s occupation. The proportions shown are from the total number of fathers pursing that occupation. Majority of respondents across all occupations scored CGPA above 4. The highest such proportion is seen amongst fathers who pursue Business. On the other hand, the highest proportion of wards who scored CGPA below 4, are of fathers who are in Government Service (46%), followed by Civil Servants (39.5%).
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Table 37

3.13.3 Family in Legal Profession

Table 38

Among those with

(i) Parent or Guardian in the Legal Profession: 15.5% have a CGPA below 3 while 29% have a CGPA above 5;
(ii) Other Close Relatives in Legal Profession: 15.6% have a CGPA below 3 while 30.3% have a CGPA above 5, and
(iii) No family in legal profession: 13.9% have a CGPA below 3 while 29.8% have a CGPA above 5.
Thus, it appears that students’ academic performance is not influenced heavily by their family in the legal profession.

### 3.14 Nature of School-wise CGPA Distribution

![Figure 101](image)

Among those with Above 6 CGPA, the highest proportion studied in Government School, followed by Top Private and Private Schools. Nobody who studied in a Government School has a CGPA below 2. However, among those with CGPA below 3, those from Government School form the largest proportion, followed by Private and Top Private School. Overall, those who studied from Top Private Schools seem to be performing better than others.

### 3.15 Gender & Nature of School wise CGPA Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School CGPA</th>
<th>Females (proportion from total females in the School Group in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion from total males in the School Group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>3 (3.75%)</td>
<td>45 (56.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Private School</td>
<td>5 (4.34%)</td>
<td>56 (48.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools</td>
<td>1 (7.69%)</td>
<td>8 (61.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9

Across the three types of schools, we see males and females who went to Top Private Schools are highlighted in the table in the Above 5 CGPA brackets, as compared to other Private Schools and Government Schools. Similarly, a higher proportion of students who went to Government Schools are in the Below 3 CGPA bracket amongst both males and females, as compared to the other types of schools.

3.16 Medium of Instruction-wise CGPA Distribution

![Figure 102](image)

All the 29 respondents who have Above 6 CGPA studied in high schools where the medium of instruction was English. Over 30% of those who studied in Hindi medium schools have a CGPA of less than 3.
3.17 School Board-wise CGPA Distribution

The greatest proportion of those with Above 6 CGPA studied in ICSE schools, followed by CBSE and State Boards. Similarly, those from ICSE schools form the lowest proportion of respondents with below 3 CGPA. There is only one respondent who studied at a State Board School and has Above 6 CGPA. No respondent who studied at International Board school is in the lowest or highest CGPA bracket while over 60% are in the 5-5.99 range.

3.18 Stream-wise CGPA Distribution
Figure 104 pits the CGPA of respondents against their stream in pre-university education. Respondents from the Commerce stream are performing better than the others as they form the highest proportion of those with Above 6 CGPA and lowest proportion of those with CGPA below 3 (excluding ‘Others’ streams). Despite the largest proportion of students coming from Science stream, they are not performing as well as their Commerce and Humanities/Arts counterparts.

3.19 Drop Year-wise CGPA Distribution

Respondents who took No Drop year form the highest proportion of those with CGPA above 5 (and Above 6) and also form the lowest proportion of those with CGPA below 3. Among those who took Drop (1 Year), 2.7% have Above 6 CGPA while 18.6% have CGPA below 3. For those who took Drop (>1 Year), 30% have CGPA below 3. Among the drop-takers, Drop- Studied at Law Institute group is performing better.
3.20 English Fluency-wise CGPA Distribution

3.20.1 Written English Fluency (Now)

Figure 106

Respondents who rated their written English fluency as Extremely High form the largest proportion of those with Above 6 CGPA while there is no person with Low fluency in that bracket. Over 40% of those with Extremely High fluency have a CGPA above 5 while the corresponding figure for respondents with Low fluency is 5%. Students with higher written fluency levels are performing better than others.

3.20.2 Spoken English Fluency (Now)

Figure 107

Among 29 respondents with CGPA above 6, 23 (nearly 80%) have Extremely High fluency in Spoken English.
No person with Low fluency in Spoken English has CGPA above 5. The largest proportion of those with below 3 CGPA said their fluency is Medium. Students with higher levels of spoken English fluency are performing better.

3.21 Repeats

The respondents were asked if they had failed in any subject. **One in every four respondents has given at least one repeat exam owing to failure in a subject.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether Taken Repeats?</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Remember</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40

In the sub-sections below, repeat-takers have been analysed with respect to few other indicators. For this purpose, responses under ‘Don’t Remember’ and ‘Others’ have not been considered.

3.21.1 Gender-wise Repeats Distribution

A larger proportion of male respondents (34.1%) have failed at least one subject as compared to females (15.3%).
3.21.2 Caste-wise Repeats Distribution

![Graph showing caste-wise repeats distribution]

The share of repeat-takers is the highest among respondents from the ST group (60.9%), followed by SC (41.1%). This figure is followed by repeat takers in the Other Religion group (26.1%) and Other Upper Castes (24.8%) group.

3.21.3 Religion-wise Repeats Distribution

Barring Jains, respondents from all other religions have taken a repeat exam at least once. While all Buddhists have taken a repeat exam, the proportion of repeat takers amongst is highest in Others and in Christian, amongst the other religions.
3.21.4 Income-wise Repeats Distribution

With the exception of the income bracket Rs. 20 LPA to Rs. 36 LPA, there has been a reduction of repeat-takers with increase in income levels. The proportion of repeat-takers among those whose income is Not Disclosed is nearly equal to those falling in the lowest income bracket.

3.21.5 Nature of School-wise Repeats Distribution

47.5% of respondents who studied at Government Schools have taken a repeat exam. This figure, at around 25%, is similar for respondents from Top Private Schools and from Private Schools.

3.21.6 English Fluency-wise Repeats Distribution

(i) Written English Fluency (Now)
More than 40% respondents with Medium fluency in Written English have taken a repeat exam. This figure is higher than for those with High fluency (30%), Low fluency (25%), and Extremely High fluency (22%).

(ii) Spoken English Fluency (Now)

A higher proportion of students with Medium fluency (36.2%) have taken repeat exams, as compared to other groups.
3.21.7 CGPA-wise Repeats Distribution

![Figure 114]

No respondent with Above 6 CGPA has taken a repeat exam. The proportion of repeat-takers increases with fall in the levels of CGPA with almost 90% of those with Below 2 CGPA having written a repeat exam.

4. Other Academic Matters

4.1 Opinion on Repeats and Improvements

At NUJS, students who fail a subject are required to take repeat while those students desirous of improving their performance in a subject can choose to give an improvement exam. Currently, the per subject fees for repeat exam is Rs. 1,000 and for an improvement exam is Rs. 2,000.

The respondents were asked which of the following statements they agreed with: (a) Repeat fees should be abolished; (b) Repeat fees should be reduced; (c) Improvement fees should be reduced; and (d) Improvements should be abolished. They could also choose not to answer. A total of 447 responses were received.

Key highlights:

- **287 (52.8% of total 544)** respondents agree that repeat fees should be abolished.
- 32 (5.9%) respondents want repeat fees to either be reduced or abolished.
- 128 (23.5%) respondents agree that repeat fees should be reduced.
- 89 respondents who are repeat-takers (63.6% of total 140 repeat-takers) agree that repeat fees should be abolished. While 11 (7.9%) want repeat fees to either be reduced or abolished, 29 (20.7%) agree that repeat fees should be reduced.
- **317 (58.2%)** of the respondents agreed that improvement fees should be reduced.
- 117 (21.5%) agreed that improvements should be abolished.

Separately, the respondents were also asked their view on abolishing improvement exams and were asked mark on a scale of 0-5 denoting their support (or opposition) to the same.
Figure above shows respondents’ opinion on the statement ‘whether improvement examinations should be abolished’. About 26% voice High or Very High support for abolishing the same while 44% are strictly in opposition.

### 4.2 Approachability of Faculty

Respondents were asked whether they found faculty members to be approachable for general academic purposes. They had to mark on a 5-point scale of Very Low, Low Moderate, High and Very High in relation to approachability. The responses received are depicted in the Figure below.

The highest proportion (36%) regarded the faculty as approachability as Moderate, followed by 22% who felt it was Low and 21% who rated it High. Only 8% rated it as Very High.
4.2.1 Batch-wise Faculty Approachability

The batch of 2017 has the largest proportion of respondents who rated faculty approachability as Very Low as well as Very High while other batches are in tune with the overall average.

4.2.2 Gender-wise Faculty Approachability

Females have rated faculty approachability less favourably than males although the difference is marginal. However, in rating it as Very Low or Very High, males outnumber the females.
4.2.3 Caste-wise Faculty Approachability

Respondents belonging to ST are highest in proportion in rating faculty approachability as Very Low and lowest in proportion among those who feel it is Very High. A significant proportion of OBC have rated it as Low. Over 30% of Other Upper Caste and Other Religion have rated it as High or Very High.

4.2.4 Region-wise Faculty Approachability

While the rating of faculty approachability by respondents from Cities and Towns is at similar levels, there is a stark disparity among those from Villages as over 30% has rated it as Low or Very Low and not a single person has rated it as Very High.
4.2.5 Category-wise Faculty Approachability

Respondents from PWD category have given the poorest ratings for faculty approachability with over 50% marking it as Low or Very Low. In contrast, over 50% of those from NRI/NRI Sponsored Category have rated it as High or Very High. Most respondents in the Foreign National category chose the Moderate option.

4.2.6 Spoken English Fluency-wise Faculty Approachability

More than 50% of those with Low fluency and more than 40% of those with Medium fluency have rated faculty approachability as Low or Very Low.
4.3 Class Discussions

The respondents were asked, on an average, the extent to which they find it difficult to follow what is being taught in the classroom. They had to mark on a 5-point scale of Very Low, Low Moderate, High and Very High in relation to the difficulty they faced in following classroom discussions. Figure 123 below shows the levels of difficulty.

![Figure 123](image)

4.4 Tolerance by Teachers of Opposing Views

The respondents were asked the extent to which they found NUJS teachers to be intolerant about opposing views. They had to mark on a 5-point scale of Very Low, Low Moderate, High and Very High in relation to the perceived intolerance.

![Figure 124](image)

The largest proportion of 33% felt that teachers were moderately intolerant to opposing views in classrooms.
4.5 Choice of Elective

The respondents from the third, fourth and fifth year of studies were asked to identify the factors that help them make a choice of electives each semester. The options were GPA, Internet, Elective Cap, Peer Pressure, Course Popularity, Others and None of the Above. Here Internet was given as an option since certain electives are available on a first cum first serve basis, i.e., depending on how swiftly a student can submit the online form for elective choices to the academic section. Elective Cap refers to the limit on the number of students who can take a particular elective course in a semester.

Out of a total of 544 responses:

- 220 respondents (40.4%) believed that none of the above criteria played a role in determining electives respectively.
- 171 (31.4%) believed that GPA was a decisive factor in picking electives.
- 141 (25.9%) believed that popularity of the elective played a crucial role.
- 73 (13.4%) believed that the elective cap influenced their choice of electives.
- 42 (7.7%) believed that internet connection played a significant role in determining an elective.
- 26 students (4.8%) believed that peer pressure played a significant role in the choices they made.

Few students felt that interest in the subject played an important role whereas few other students felt that the quality of teaching was important to them in picking their electives. Few others felt that content of the subject matter being taught, the opportunity to learn a particular subject and the topical relevance of the elective played a role in their decision-making process. Interestingly, stray responses averred towards the generosity of the faculty in terms of flexibility in granting attendance, the fascinating title of the course and least amount of effort required in completing course among other reasons in their decision-making process.

4.6 Quality of Teaching

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of teaching at NUJS. About 54% of the respondents rated the quality of teaching as Low or Very Low.
4.7 Open Book Exam

The respondents were asked their views on open book exam and whether they support it.

While 31% of the respondents rated their support for open book exams as Very High, 21% rated it as High.
II. **Research Publications & Paper Conferences**

1. **Research Publications**

Students at law schools are encouraged to publish research papers in peer-reviewed journals and law reviews. Students of NUJS, apart from the home-grown NUJS Law Review and Journal of Indian Law and Society and others, have published in many journals of international and national repute. This section seeks to understand the demographics of these students through correlations with diversity indicators.

The respondents to the survey were asked if they had published research papers (exclusive of blogs and online articles). **Out of the total 544 respondents, 101 (18.6%) have published research papers while 443 (81.4%) have not done so.**

1.1 **Batch-wise Research Publications Distribution**

![Figure 127](image)

Predictably, the number of respondents who have published research papers has decreased with every successive batch. The senior-most batch (2014) has most such publications while the junior-most batch (2018) has the least.
1.2 Gender-wise Research Publications Distribution

At about 22.9%, a higher proportion of females have published a research paper as opposed to 15.81% of males.

1.3 Caste-wise Research Publications Distribution

Among all caste groups, those from Other Religion (23.2%) have the highest proportion of such respondents who have published research papers; this is followed by Other Upper Castes (21.9%), OBCs (20%) and SCs (19.6%). Only 1 person from the ST group has published a research paper.
1.4 Religion-wise Research Publications Distribution

Nearly 28% of Jains have published research papers, the highest such figure across all religions. As with the overall proportion, about 20% Atheists and Hindus have published research papers.

None of the 4 Buddhists have been published. Similarly, only 1 out of 15 Muslims, and 1 out of 8 Sikhs have been published.

1.5 Region-wise Research Publications Distribution

While 19.6% of respondents from Cities have published research papers, the corresponding figure for towns is 13.9%. None of the 7 respondents from Villages have publications to their name.

1.6 Income-wise Research Publications Distribution
With the exception of income brackets below Rs. 6 LPA, a higher proportion of respondents have research publications to their name with successive income brackets. In the bracket below Rs. 3 LPA, about 19% respondents have published research papers, while the figure in the Rs. 3 - 6 LPA bracket falls to 7.5%

1.7 Category-wise Research Publications Distribution

A similar proportion of respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category (20/9%), and the PWD Category (20%) have published research papers. The figure is lower for Foreign National Category entrants at 8.3%.

1.8 CGPA-wise Research Paper Distribution
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Respondents with CGPA above 5 comprise nearly 45% of all respondents (101) who have research publications to their name. In the CGPA range of 3 to 5, an average of 18.1% of the respondents have published research papers. Only 1 out of 78 respondents, with a CGPA below 3 has published a research paper.

1.9 Written English Fluency-wise (Now) Research Paper Distribution

About 21%, and 17.1% of the respondents with Extremely High and High fluency respectively in Written English have published research papers. The corresponding figure, on average amongst respondents with Medium and Low fluency, is 10.1%.
2. Number of Research Papers

![Figure 135]

79% of such respondents who have research publications to their names have published only 1 to 2 papers.

3. Paper Conferences

The respondents were also asked if they had presented their paper(s) at a conference. 42 respondents (7.7%) answered that they have taken part in such conferences while 499 (91.7%) answered in the negative.

![Figure 136]
3.1 Batch-wise Paper Conferences Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>Presented at Paper Conferences</th>
<th>Never Presented at Paper Conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td>86 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14 (13.6%)</td>
<td>89 (86.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6 (5.6%)</td>
<td>100 (94.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5 (4.5%)</td>
<td>104 (95.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
<td>120 (97.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41

The batches of 2014 and 2015 have 14 respondents each who have presented at paper conferences, while the recently enrolled batches have lower numbers.

3.2 Gender-wise Paper Conferences Distribution

A marginally higher proportion of females (8.4%) have presented at paper conferences than males (7.2%).
3.3 Caste-wise Paper Conferences Distribution

A similar proportion of respondents from caste groups of Brahmins (8.9%), Other Upper Castes (9.2%), and SCs (8.9%) have presented at paper conferences. The corresponding figures are lowest for the OBC group (0%), and the ST group (3.5%).

3.4 Region-wise Paper Conference Distribution

1 out of 7 respondents from villages has presented at a paper conference. This figure is at 8.1% for those from Cities, and at 5.1% for those from Towns.

3.5 Income-wise Paper Conference Distribution

It is seen that as one moves to successive income brackets, the proportion of those who have presented at paper conferences increases marginally. The only exception to this trend is the Rs. 20 – 36 LPA income bracket.
While no respondent from the PWD category has participated in a paper conference, 1 out of 12 respondents in the Foreign National Category has done so. The corresponding figure for the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category is 8.6% (7 out of 81 respondents).

A similar proportion of respondents (around 9%) in the three CGPA brackets of 3 – 3.99, 4 – 4.99, and 5 – 5.99 have presented at paper conferences. Only 1 in 78 respondents with CGPA below 3 have done so.
3.9 English Fluency-wise Paper Conferences Distribution

3.9.1 Written Fluency (Now)

1 out of 11 respondents with Low fluency in Written English has presented at paper conferences. While 8.3% of respondents with Extremely High fluency have done so, the corresponding figure for those with Medium and Low fluency is 7.4% and 6.5% respectively.

3.9.2 Spoken Fluency (Now)

8.3% respondents with High/Extremely High fluency have presented at paper conferences, compared to 4.8% respondents with Low/Medium fluency in Spoken English.
III. MOOTS, DEBATES, & ADR COMPETITIONS

1. Moots
Out of 544 respondents, 69% have participated in mooting at some level. This includes 56% who have attended competitions outside NUJS, and 12% who have mooted in the university rounds. While nearly a quarter of the respondents have mooted at the international level, about 32% have never attempted the activity.

Figure 142

1.1 Batch-wise Moot Participation Distribution
In the senior batches, a similar proportion of students, around 24-30%, have mooted at the international level. Nearly three-quarters of all respondents across batches have mooted at some level, except in the 2018 batch where a majority have never mooted.

Figure 143
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1.2 Gender-wise Moot Participation Distribution

At 89%, females had a higher proportion of participation in moots than males did at 86%. This trend is true for female to male participation in international moots (26% to 21%), and for national moots (61% to 53%).

![Figure 144]

1.3 Caste-wise Moot Participation Distribution

In Figure 145, we see that the highest intra-caste group proportion for those who have done any mooting is for those who Don’t Know their Caste (80%), and Other Upper Caste (72%). The same is true for those who have done international moots in these two groups, at about 29%.

On the other hand, the lowest proportions for those who have mooted are seen amongst SCs (52%) and STs (41%). Lesser than 15% OBC, SC, and ST respondents have done international moots.
### 1.4 Caste & Gender wise Moot Participation Distribution

![Bar Chart](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Females (proportion of females from total females in the caste group in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion of females from total females in the caste group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>9 (17.3%)</td>
<td>17 (32.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>4 (6.2%)</td>
<td>24 (36.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
<td>17 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
<td>8 (34.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42

No ST female has represented university in an international moot while only 1 ST Male has done the same. OBC, SC and ST forms the largest proportion of people who have not done the moots.
while Other Upper Castes (67.7% males and 63.9% females), Brahmins (61.6% males and 46.7% females), and people not knowing their caste (66.7% Males and 68.3% Females) have the highest representation in national and international moots amongst the group themselves.

1.4.1 Caste, Gender & International Moot Participation

In the inverted pyramid below, the caste-gender groups have been arranged as per their proportion of participation in international moots (high to low).

While the females from Other Religions top the chart, the bottom four rungs are made of females from SC and males from OBC, SC and ST.

Since no female from ST has taken part in international moots, they go unrepresented in the pyramid.

![Inverted Pyramid with caste-gender groups and their participation proportion]

1.5 Religion-wise Moot Participation Distribution

The proportion of respondents who have mooted at any level is spread across international moots (23%), national moots (33%) and university rounds (12%). In terms of intra-religion proportion of respondents who have mooted internationally, Jains (44%) and Sikhs (38%) occupy the top two places. Those who answered ‘Others’ for religion, followed by Christians and Muslims have the lowest such proportions. Respondents who followed Islam and ‘Others’ are the only two religions to have a majority of respondents who have never mooted.
1.6 Region-wise Moot Participation Distribution

Nearly 70% respondents from who finished high school in cities have mooted, while the number is 62% and 43% for those from towns and villages respectively. While no person from a village has done an international moot, about 10% of town respondents have. Nearly a quarter of the respondents from cities have mooted internationally.

1.6 Income-wise Moot Participation Distribution

It is amongst respondents in the 20 to 36 lacs bracket, and in the more than 36 lacs bracket that we see the highest proportion within the income bracket of those who have mooted at some level. Nearly 40% respondents in the below 6 lacs brackets have never mooted. This ratio is 33% in the 6 to 20 lacs bracket and falls further as income increases. On the other hand, about 38% respondents
in the more than 36 lacs bracket have done international moots, whereas only about 12% of those in the below 6 LPA bracket have done so.

![Figure 148](image)

### 1.7 Gender & Income wise Moot Participation Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Females (proportion of females from total females in the Income Bracket in brackets)</th>
<th>Males (proportion of males from total males in the Income Bracket in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below 3 LPA</strong></td>
<td>6 (54.55%)</td>
<td>2 (18.18%)</td>
<td>3 (27.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 to 6 LPA</strong></td>
<td>12 (41.38%)</td>
<td>5 (17.24%)</td>
<td>8 (27.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 to 12 LPA</strong></td>
<td>1 (2.56%)</td>
<td>15 (38.46%)</td>
<td>8 (20.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 to 20 LPA</strong></td>
<td>6 (11.11%)</td>
<td>21 (38.89%)</td>
<td>10 (18.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 to 36 LPA</strong></td>
<td>4 (12.50%)</td>
<td>9 (28.13%)</td>
<td>12 (37.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above 36 LPA</strong></td>
<td>6 (13.33%)</td>
<td>9 (20.00%)</td>
<td>18 (40.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undisclosed</strong></td>
<td>1 (25.00%)</td>
<td>2 (50.00%)</td>
<td>1 (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43

In the table above, the cell with the highest participation in each income bracket has been highlighted for males and females. Amongst females, only those whose parents earn more than Rs. 20 LPA have done an international moot. Nearly half the males in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket have never mooted. For males, as for females, the highest proportion of those who have done an international moot is seen in the Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket.
1.7.1 Gender, Income & International Moots Participation

The inverted pyramid above shows the proportion of income-gender groups that has participated in international moots arranged from high to low. The top rung is made of females with income Above 36 LPA while the bottom rung is made of males with income Below 3 LPA.
1.8 Income & Caste wise Moot Participation Distribution

The table below shows the caste-income group distribution for moot participation. The proportion of respondents from the total number of respondents from a particular caste-income group is given in the brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Moot</th>
<th>Income Brackets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>3 (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>5 (41.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>- (7.69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>1 (6.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6 (40.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>4 (26.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4 (26.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>- (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2(66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>- (25.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>- (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each caste, the caste-income group with the highest proportion of participation in international moot has been highlighted in orange. Invariably, for each caste, it is either the 20-36 LPA or Above 36 LPA income group which has seen the maximum international moot participation.

### 1.9 Loan-wise Moot Participation Distribution

Amongst 90 respondents who have availed a loan to study at NUJS, about 33% have never mooted. This number is similar at 31% for those who have not availed any loan. About 7% of those who availed a loan have mooted internationally, while 26% of those who haven’t taken a loan have done...
the same. For national moots, this number is 47% and 31% for those with and without loans, respectively.

1.10 Category-wise Moot Participation Distribution

Amongst 15 respondents who said they are differently abled, nearly a quarter have never mooted. It is amongst those enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category that we find the highest intra-group proportion of those who have mooted at some level. No foreign nationals have done an international moot. Nearly 45% of those admitted under NRI/NRI Sponsored category have done an international moot, the highest such proportion across all admission categories.

1.11 CGPA-wise Moot Participation Distribution

Figure 150

Figure 151
The proportion of respondents who have done an international moot increase in each successive CGPA bracket. Thus, the highest such proportion is found amongst those with CGPA above 6, and so on. A similar trend is seen for all respondents who have mooted at any level, including national and university rounds. Nonetheless, around 36% respondents in the brackets 3-3.99, 4-4.99, and 5-5.99 respectively have done a national moot. This figure is at 20% for the Above 6 CGPA bracket, and at 19% in the below 3 CGPA bracket.

1.12 English Fluency-wise Moot Participation Distribution

1.12.1 Spoken English Fluency

Amongst those who answered their fluency in spoken English now is high, nearly 71% have mooted at some level. The corresponding figure is 58% for those with Medium fluency, and 52% for those with Low fluency. 31% respondents with Extremely High fluency have mooted internationally, while the figures for those with High and Medium fluency are 17% and 6% respectively.

![Figure 152]

1.12.2 Written English Fluency

![Figure 153]
About 70% of those who have High or Extremely High fluency in written English have mooted at some level. Of 9 respondents who said they have Low or Extremely Low written fluency, about half have mooted, but not at the international level. Nearly 53% respondents with Medium fluency have mooted, with one-tenth with international level mooting experience.

1.13 Expenditure on Moots

1.13.1 Income-wise Expenditure on Moot Distribution

About 40% respondents have spent up to Rs. 25,000 in all income brackets, except in the More than Rs. 36 LPA bracket (28.4%). In the latter bracket, about 30% respondents have spent above Rs. 75K on moots. The corresponding proportion in the 20 to 36 LPA bracket is 23%, and in the 6 to 20 lacs bracket is 15.5%. This proportion is lowest in the Below 6 LPA bracket, at 12.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Incurred on Moots</th>
<th>Combined Parental Income Bracket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 6 lacs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 25K</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25K to 75K</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75K to 1.5 lacs</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Lacs to 5 lacs</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 lacs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

1.13.2 Loan-wise Expenditure on Moot Distribution

Amongst 48 respondents who have availed loans and incurred any expenditure on moots, nearly 80% have spent up to Rs. 25K. Nearly a third have had no such expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Incurred on Moots</th>
<th>Participated in Moots?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 25K</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25K to 75K</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75K to 1.5 lacs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Lacs to 5 lacs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 lacs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46
2. Debating

Just about half the total respondents have debated at some level, while the other half never has. 24% respondents have debated in competitions outside NUJS, including 3% who have international experience.

![Figure 154]

2.1 Batch-wise Debate Participation Distribution

At nearly 65%, the 2017 batch has the highest participation in debates. The lowest participation is seen in the 2016 batch, at 37%. The proportions of those who have done University Rounds is similar across batches. There is quite some variance in participation in National level debates. 35% respondents in the 2017 batch did National level debates.

![Figure 155]
2.2 Gender-wise Debate Participation Distribution

Nearly half the female and half the male respondents have debated at some level. Similarly, a similar proportion at about 21% of males and females has debated at the National level. Thrice the number of males as females has done an International debate.

![Gender-wise Debate Participation Distribution](image1)

2.3 Caste-wise Debate Participation Distribution

The caste groups with the highest proportion of respondents who have debated are those who Don’t Know their caste (60.2%), and Other Upper Castes (56%). About 28%, 32%, and 40% respondents amongst SCs, STs and OBCs respectively have debated at any level. These are the lowest participation levels. No respondent from these caste groups has done an international debate, while a few in the Brahmin, Other Upper Caste, and Don’t Know their Caste groups have.

![Caste-wise Debate Participation Distribution](image2)
2.4 Caste & Gender wise Debate Participation Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Debate Competitions</th>
<th>Caste Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>12 (23.1%)</td>
<td>16 (24.6%)</td>
<td>15 (35.7%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>7 (30.4%)</td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>14 (26.9%)</td>
<td>15 (23.1%)</td>
<td>10 (23.8%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>1 (4.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25 (48.1%)</td>
<td>32 (49.2%)</td>
<td>16 (38.1%)</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>15 (65.2%)</td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>15 (16.3%)</td>
<td>37 (34.3%)</td>
<td>14 (34.1%)</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>8 (24.2%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>29 (31.5%)</td>
<td>24 (22.2%)</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>5 (5.4%)</td>
<td>3 (2.8%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>43 (46.7%)</td>
<td>44 (40.7%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>16 (57.1%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>23 (69.7%)</td>
<td>15 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47

Table 47 shows the distribution of students who have participated in Debate competitions with respect to their caste and gender.

The caste-wise analysis of debate participation revealed that those who Don’t Know their caste (60.2%), and Other Upper Castes (56%) have the highest proportion of respondents who have debated. Here, we see that a similar proportion of males and females from these Caste Groups have done National/International debates. Nonetheless, the proportion of males in these Caste Groups who have never debated is higher than that of such females.

Amongst Brahmins, a lesser proportion of males have never debated, than females. However, about 37% of male Brahmins have done National/International debates, as compared to about 29% of female Brahmins.

In 6 female OBCs, only 1 has gone for a National debate, while in 9 male OBCs, only 2 have gone for such a debate. No respondent from the OBC, SC, ST groups (male or female) has gone for an International debate.

Similarly, of 23 female SCs, and 33 male SCs, only 1 and 2 respondents respectively have gone for a National debate. No ST respondent has gone for a debate outside college.

It is amongst female OBCs (66.7%) and SCs (65.2%) that we find the highest proportion of respondents who have Never debated. The corresponding figure for males is seen in the ST group, where about 83.3% males have Never debated.
2.5 Religion-wise Debate Participation Distribution

6 out of 10 Christians and 5 out of 12 from who answered ‘Others’ for religion have debated. Similarly, 6 out of 8 Sikhs and 2 out of 4 Buddhists have debated.

![Figure 158](image)

2.6 Region-wise Debate Participation Distribution

All students who have participated in international debates are from cities. Similarly, nearly 90% respondents who have participated in national level debates are from cities. 5 out of 7 students who are from villages have not participated in any kind of debating activity including University Rounds.

![Figure 159](image)

2.7 Income-wise Debate Participation Distribution

The ratio of those who have done a National level debate to those who have done any debating is highest in the Below 6 LPA group, at nearly 1:4. This shows that out of every 4 respondents who...
debates in the University Rounds, only 1 goes for a National level debate. This ratio decreases as income increases. It is highest for respondents in the More than 36 LPA bracket, at about 1:1.6.

![Graph showing distribution of debate participation by income and gender]

**Figure 160**

**2.8 Gender & Income wise Debate Participation Distribution**

Table 48 shows the distribution of students who have participated in debates with respect to their annual parental income & gender.

In the income bracket below Rs 6 LPA, we see that 5% females have done National debates (2 out of 40 females), while no female has done an International debate. On the other hand, 14.1% males have done National/International debates (10 out of 71 males).

Similarly, in the income bracket between Rs. 6 to 20 LPA, about 23.3% males have done National/International debates, while the corresponding figure for females is 19.3%.

The proportion of males who have Never debated is lower than the proportion of females across all income brackets, except among those above Rs. 20 LPA, where the proportion of males is higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Debate Competitions</th>
<th>Income Brackets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (proportion of females from total females in the Caste Group in brackets)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8 (72.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (proportion)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the income brackets above Rs. 20 LPA, a similar proportion of males and females have participated in National and International debates (around 35.5%).

Thus, we see that as we move upwards on the income bracket, the difference in debate participation of males and females reduces.

### 2.9 Income and Caste wise Debate Participation Distribution

The table below shows the distribution of students who participated in Debates with respect to their caste and parental income. The proportion of respondents from the total number of respondents from a particular caste-income group is given in the brackets.
In the income bracket below Rs. 6 LPA, nearly a quarter of the respondents from Brahmin (25%), Other Upper Caste (24.1%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (25%) groups have done National/International debates. This figure is lower for those from Other Religion (16.5%) and from the SC group (12.5%). None of the 6 OBC or 8 ST respondents in this income bracket have gone for a debate competition outside NUJS.

Similarly, in the income bracket between Rs 6 to 20 LPA, a higher proportion of Brahmins (32.7%), and Other Upper Castes (26.5%) have done National/International debates than other Caste Groups. This is followed by those who Don’t Know their Caste (22.8%), OBCs (20%), and Other Religion (20%) groups. Among 34 SCs in this income bracket, only 1 (2.9%) has done such a debate. None of the 16 STs in this income bracket have done a debate outside NUJS.

In the higher income brackets i.e. above Rs. 20 LPA, we find that slightly above 50% of OBCs and those from Other Religion have debated Nationally/Internationally. About 46.1% Brahmins in the income bracket have done, while the figure for Other Upper Castes is 32.1%. We see that 26.4% of those who Don’t Know their Caste, and only 16.7% SCs in this income bracket have done so. None of the 5 STs in this income bracket have debated outside NUJS.

Table 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>12 (92.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the income bracket below Rs. 6 LPA, nearly a quarter of the respondents from Brahmin (25%), Other Upper Caste (24.1%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (25%) groups have done National/International debates. This figure is lower for those from Other Religion (16.5%) and from the SC group (12.5%). None of the 6 OBC or 8 ST respondents in this income bracket have gone for a debate competition outside NUJS.

Similarly, in the income bracket between Rs 6 to 20 LPA, a higher proportion of Brahmins (32.7%), and Other Upper Castes (26.5%) have done National/International debates than other Caste Groups. This is followed by those who Don’t Know their Caste (22.8%), OBCs (20%), and Other Religion (20%) groups. Among 34 SCs in this income bracket, only 1 (2.9%) has done such a debate. None of the 16 STs in this income bracket have done a debate outside NUJS.

In the higher income brackets i.e. above Rs. 20 LPA, we find that slightly above 50% of OBCs and those from Other Religion have debated Nationally/Internationally. About 46.1% Brahmins in the income bracket have done, while the figure for Other Upper Castes is 32.1%. We see that 26.4% of those who Don’t Know their Caste, and only 16.7% SCs in this income bracket have done so. None of the 5 STs in this income bracket have debated outside NUJS.
2.10 Loan-wise Debate Participation Distribution

Nearly 55% of respondents who have availed a loan have never debated. Of 90 respondents, only about 0.03% have debated internationally, while about 12% have done so at the National level.

2.11 Category-wise Debate Participation Distribution

While one-third respondents who enrolled in Foreign National category have debated at the University level, none have gone for competitions outside NUJS. About 59% of those in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category have debated, with about 32% have gone for National and International debates. About 60% who enrolled in the PWD category have never debated, while only 1 respondent has gone for a debate competition outside NUJS.

Figure 161

2.12 CGPA-wise Debate Participation Distribution

An increasing proportion of respondents have debated at the National level as we move to the successive CGPA bracket. The highest incidence of respondents, by aggregate and by proportion, who have debated internationally is seen in the 5-5.99 CGPA bracket. Nearly 70% respondents with CGPA Below 3 have never debated. This proportion is lowest for those with CGPA Above 6, at about 34%.
2.10 Spoken English Fluency-wise Debate Participation Distribution

Apart from 1 respondent, everyone who has done an International debate has high or extremely high fluency in spoken English. Similarly, nobody who has done a National level debate fluency below Medium in spoken English.

2.11 Expenditure on Debate

2.11.1 Income-wise Expenditure on Debate Participation

17 respondents out of 274 who answered they have debated at some level did not answer this question on expenditure incurred on debates. Nearly half the respondents who have debated have not incurred any expenditure, presumably since they did so at the University Rounds level.

Amongst those who incurred any kind of expenditure, about 75% respondents spent below Rs. 30,000 on debates. Of 22 respondents who spent above Rs. 50,000 on debates, 2 respondents (10%) are in the Below 6 lacs income bracket. A higher proportion of respondents in the income brackets
of 6 to 20 LPA (36%), 20 to 36 lacs (27%), and More than 36 LPA (23%) have spent above Rs. 75,000 on debates than in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket (4.8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure on Debates</th>
<th>Combined Parental Income Brackets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 6 LPA</td>
<td>6 to 20 LPA</td>
<td>20 to 36 LPA</td>
<td>More Than 36 LPA</td>
<td>Unaware/ Undisclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000 to 1 Lakh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 Lakhs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 Lakhs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 50

2.11.2 Loan-wise Expenditure on Debate Participation Distribution

Nearly 60% of those who have availed loans have not incurred any expenditure on debates, presumably at the University level. About 17% spent between Rs. 1 to 10K on debates. An equal number of respondents (3) who have availed loans spent between Rs. 10K to 30K, and above Rs. 50K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Whether Availed Loan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availed Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 1 to 10K</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 10K to 30K</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 30K to 50K</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 50K to 75K</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 75K to 1 lac</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 1 lac to 5 lacs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Rs. 5 lacs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 51
3. ADR Competitions

Less than half the respondents at NUJS (about 37%) have done an ADR activity.

3.1 Batch-wise ADR Participation Distribution

The distribution of those who have done an ADR activity is unevenly spread across batches. The highest incidence is seen in the 2017 batch at nearly 50%, while the lowest is seen in the 2018 batch, at about 30%.

3.2 Gender-wise ADR Participation Distribution

While nearly 45% females have done an ADR activity at some level, the corresponding proportion for males is about 32.5%. Similarly, double the proportion of females have done an international ADR competition as compared to males.
3.3 Caste-wise ADR Participation Distribution

About 40% respondents across all caste groups have done an ADR activity, except amongst SCs and STs, where the proportion is around 20%. The highest proportion of those who have done an International ADR activity is seen in the Don’t Know their Caste group.

3.4 Gender and Caste wise ADR Participation Distribution

Across all caste groups, a higher proportion of females have done National and International level ADR Competitions than males. The exception to this is the Don’t Know their Caste group, where a similar proportion of males and females have attended National and International ADR Competitions.
Table 51

More than 20% among females, and more than 15% among males have attended National and International level ADR Competitions across all Caste Groups, except in the OBC, SC, and ST group. While no male respondent from these three Caste Groups has attended such an ADR Competition, only 4 out of 40 (10%) females from these Caste groups have done so.

3.5 Religion-wise ADR Participation Distribution

About 40% respondents across religions have done an ADR activity, with the exception of Jainism (28%) and Buddhism (25%).

3.6 Region-wise ADR Participation Distribution

About 39% respondents from cities have done an ADR competition, while the corresponding number for towns and villages is 32% and 29% respectively. No person from a village has gone for an International ADR Competition.
3.7 Income-wise ADR Participation Distribution

An equal number of respondents from the 6 to 20 lacs bracket, and from the More than 36 lacs bracket went for International ADR Competitions. There intra-bracket proportions are 4.5% and 12.5% respectively.

Nearly 71% respondents in the Below 6 lacs bracket have never done an ADR activity, the highest such proportion across income brackets. This proportion decreases with successive income brackets.

3.8 Gender and Income wise ADR Participation Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (proportion)</th>
<th>ADR Competitions</th>
<th>Income Brackets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across all income brackets, more females have done National and International ADR Competitions than males. The intra-bracket difference between males and females is highest in the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, where 36.4% females have done these Competitions, as compared to 5.8% males.

With the exception of the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, the trend across all other brackets is that as the income increases, so does the respective proportions of males and females who have done National and International ADR Competitions.

Across all income brackets, a higher proportion of males have Never done an ADR Competition, as compared to females. The exception here is the Rs. 12 to 20 LPA bracket, where the figures are similar for males and females.

### 3.9 Caste and Income wise ADR Participation Distribution

The proportion of respondents from the total number of respondents from a particular caste-income group is given in the brackets.

Across all Caste Groups, respondents in higher income bracket seem to be likelier to go for a National or an International ADR Competition than those in lower income brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>ADR Competitions</th>
<th>Income Brackets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 3 LPA</td>
<td>3 to 6 LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the income bracket below Rs. 6 LPA, we see that 1 ST attended an international ADR Competition, while no other SC, or OBC, or respondent from Other Religion has gone for a National or International ADR Competition. On the other hand, 8% Brahmins, and 18.4% Other Upper Castes who are in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket have gone for such competitions.
Similarly, in the income bracket between Rs. 6 to 20 LPA, we find that no SC, ST, OBC, or respondents from Other Religion, has gone for a National or International ADR Competitions. The corresponding figure in this income bracket for Brahmins, Other Upper Castes, and those who Don’t Know their Caste is 15.5%, 13.9%, and 28.5% respectively.

3.10 Loan-wise ADR Participation Distribution

Nearly 77% respondents who have availed loans to study at NUJS have never done an ADR activity. Only about 8% such respondents have gone for an ADR Competition outside NUJS.

3.11 Category-wise ADR Participation Distribution

Of 15 respondents in the PWD admission category, only 1 has participated in an ADR, which was at the National level. About 80% have never done an ADR activity. About 33% of those enrolled in Foreign National category, and 28% of those in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category have gone for ADR Competitions outside NUJS, while roughly 43% respondents in both categories have never done an ADR activity.

3.12 CGPA-wise ADR Participation Distribution

The lowest incidence of respondents who have done an ADR activity is seen amongst those with CGPA Below 2 (~7%) and with CGPA 2-2.99 (~26%). Other CGPA brackets have near identical proportion, around 42%, of such respondents. Nearly half the respondents who have done an International ADR activity have CGPA 5-5.99.
3.13 English Fluency-wise ADR Participation Distribution

3.13.1 Spoken English Fluency

Amongst 20 respondents with the lowest fluency in spoken English, only 2 have participated in ADR Competitions outside NUJS. These 2 took part in International ADR Competitions, which otherwise saw participation only from those with High or Extremely High fluency, who made up about 94% of all such respondents.

3.13.2 Written English Fluency

Only 1 of 9 respondents with the lowest fluency in written English has done an ADR Competition outside NUJS, which was at the International level. 91% respondents who have done an international ADR Competition have High or Extremely High fluency.
3.14 Expenditure on ADR

Of 189 respondents who answered how much expenditure they incurred to pursue ADR activities at NUJS, nearly half did not spend anything. These respondents presumably did the activity at NUJS. The next highest proportion, at 28%, is of those who spent between Rs. 1 to 25K, with another 19% who spent up to Rs. 75K.

3.14.1 Income-wise Expenditure on ADR Distribution

The highest proportion of those who have spent above Rs. 75,000 on ADR activities are in the income brackets of More than Rs. 36 LPA followed by the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA bracket. These income brackets also have the highest proportions of respondents who spent below Rs. 25,000, 34.1% and 32.3% respectively. In the Below Rs. 6 LPA bracket, 4 each out of 12 (33.3%) who have done an ADR Competition have spent below Rs. 25,000, and above Rs. 75,000.
### Table 54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADR Participation</th>
<th>1-25,000</th>
<th>26,000-75,000</th>
<th>75,000-1,50,000</th>
<th>1,50,000-5,00,000</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000-75,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000-1,50,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,50,000-5,00,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADR Participation</th>
<th>Whether Availed Loan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availed Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000-75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000-1,50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,50,000-5,00,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.14.2 Loan-wise Expenditure on ADR Distribution

Amongst 20 respondents who have availed loans and done ADR Competition, about 60% did not spend anything. One-fifth spent between Rs. 1 to 25K, while 1 respondent spent between Rs. 1.5 lacs to 5 lacs.
IV. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1. Journal Membership

NUJS students were asked whether they have been a member of any academic journal. The options provided were i) NUJS Law Review, ii) JILS, iii) None and iv) Other. Respondents could mark multiple options. 39 students have been editors or members of the JILS journals and 54 of NUJS law review. 6 students, 2 of whom were also members of the NUJS Law Review, have been a part from these two.

![Figure 175]

1.1 Batch-wise Journal Membership Distribution

More respondents from the 2016 batch are members of journals than any other batch. Respondents from the 2015 are members of the most variety of journals. Predictably, the NUJS Law Review and JILS make up more than 60%, and in some cases 80%, of the total respondents in each batch.

![Figure 176]
By aggregate, 45 females have been members of academic journals, as against 42 males. Amongst all females who have been members of journals, about 46.7% have been members of JILS, while about 64.4% have been members of the NUJS Law Review. The corresponding figures for males are 42.8% for JILS, and 59.5% for the NUJS Law Review.

Apart from 3 SC respondents who were members of JILS, and 1 ST respondent who was a member of the NUJS Law Review, no other person from these two Caste Groups has been a member of any academic journal. Similarly, 1, and 2 OBC respondents are members of the JILS, and the NUJS Law Review respectively.

The majority membership of the JILS and NUJS Law Review is through Brahmins and Other Upper Caste respondents, followed by those who Don’t Know their Caste.
1.4 Religion-wise Journal Membership Distribution

The JILS is more religiously diverse than the NUJS Law Review. Of 39 students in the JILS, there are 2 Christians, 1 Muslim, 1 Jain, and 1 Sikh respondent. On the other hand, of 54 respondents in the NUJS Law Review, there is 1 Christian, 1 Atheist and 1 Jain. All other respondents in both these journals reported to be Hindus.

1.5 Region-wise Journal Membership Distribution

None of the 7 students from villages have been members or editors of any journals.

Membership in academic journals is significantly higher among students from cities as compared to students residing in towns. Overall, 17.9% of students from cities have been a part of academic journals in contrast to only 6.33% students from towns.
Membership of academic journals seems to be somewhat evenly spread across family income brackets.

Overall, of all respondents in the below Rs. 6 LPA income bracket, 11.71% have been members of journals, while this figure is 16.9% for those in the above Rs. 6 LPA income bracket. It increases to 22.1% for respondents in the income bracket above Rs. 20 LPA.

1.7 Category-wise Journal Membership Distribution

13.3% respondents admitted in the PWD Category have been members of journals.

One-fifth, or 19.7% respondents enrolled in the NRI/NRI sponsored students have been members of journals. No Foreign National students have ever had a journal’s membership.
1.8 Nature of School-wise Journal Membership Distribution

![Bar chart showing membership distribution across journals by school type.](image)

**Figure 183**

Respondents from Private and Top Private School make up 80% or more in each of the journals’ memberships. Students from Government Schools and Other Schools also find minor representation in the JILS and the NUJS Law Review.

18.15% respondents from Top Private Schools in their Vicinity and 14.67% respondents from Private Schools have been members of academic journals. This is higher than the 9.52% of Respondents from government schools who have been a part of academic journals.

1.9 CGPA-wise Journal Membership Distribution

![Bar chart showing membership distribution across journals by CGPA.](image)

**Figure 184**
Respondents who have scored a higher CGPA in college have been more involved in academic journals. Thus, we see no students with CGPA below 3 who is a member of a journal.

15 out of 72 students having CGPA less than 3 have been a part of at least 1 academic journal. Among these 8 (11.1%) have been members of JILS, 6 (8.3%) have been a part of NUJS law review and 1 (1.4%) has been a member of both.

15 out of 29 students having CGPA above 6 have been part of a journal. 4 (13.7%) of these students have been a part of JILS, 7 (24.1%) have been members of NUJS law review, 3 (10.3%) have been members of both. When we account for 2 others who have been a part of Other journals, more than 50% of respondents who have CGPA above 6 are seen to be members of academic journals.

1.10 Written English Fluency-wise Journal Membership Distribution

Among 87 respondents who are members of journals, only 2 respondents said they have Low and Medium fluency respectively in Written English. all other members of academic journals have High/Extremely High fluency.
55.2% of 48 respondents who have been members of academic journals have not published a single research paper. Among these, 21 (43.8%) respondents each are members of the JILS and the NUJS Law Review.

Among the remaining 39 respondents who have published at least one research paper, 8 (20.5%) are members of the JILS, while 21 others (53.8%) are members of the NUJS Law Review. Another 7 (17.9%) are members of both these journals.

2. SJA Society Membership

Respondents were asked if they had been a member of any Student Juridical Association (SJA) Society.

13% respondents have been in three or more SJA Societies, while slightly more than one-third of all respondents have not been in any SJA Society.
2.1 Batch-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

The 2014 batch was in their final year at the time of the survey. Thus, we can evidently witness the highest number of students who have been a part of more than three SJA committees in the 2014 batch.

2.2 Gender-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

There is seeming uniformity in the distribution of number of SJA Societies where males and females are members.

There is a slightly higher representation of female students as compared to male students in SJA societies. 36.4% of 214 female respondents have been members of three or more SJA societies as compared to 33.7% of 329 male respondents.
SJA societies are comprised of a larger section of Respondents from Brahmin and Other Upper Caste groups, than from SC, ST and OBC groups.

50 out of 318 respondents (15.7%) who are Brahmins or Other Upper Caste groups have been members of three or more SJA Societies, while only 3 out of 100 respondents (3%) from the SC, ST or OBC groups have been members of three or more SJA Societies.

2.4 Religion-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

Figure 191
More than 70% respondents who belong to Other religions, followed by about 46.7% Muslims are not in any SJA Society. This is the highest such figure across all religions. The exception is Buddhists, where out of 4, 3 have never been a member of any SJA Society.

Nearly 20% respondents who are Atheist are in three or more SJA societies. This is the highest such figure, closely followed by Jains, Muslims, and Hindus.

2.5 Region-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

![Figure 192](image)

Nearly 45.5% respondents from Towns and 3 out of 7 respondents (42.8%) from Villages have never been in an SJA Society. The figure for Cities is lower at 31.6%.

Similarly, a higher percentage of respondents from Cities (14.62%) have been members of three or more SJA societies in contrast with those from Towns (3.8%) and Villages (1 out of 7).

2.6 Income-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

![Figure 193](image)
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Nearly 60% respondents in the below Rs. 3 LPA income bracket have not been a part of any SJA Society. This figure is similar for the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA bracket, and the Rs. 6 to 12 LPA bracket, at about 40%. Only 25.3% respondents in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA bracket have never been in an SJA Society, the lowest such figure across all income brackets.

Similarly, a higher proportion of respondents in the higher income brackets have been members of one or more SJA Societies, as compared to the lower income brackets. Thus, while 44.4% respondents in the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket have been members of one or more SJA Societies, the figure is 73% for respondents in the bracket above Rs. 20 LPA.

### 2.7 Category-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

In 15 respondents in the PWD Category, 2 have never been part of any SJA Society. 1 such respondent has been in three or more SJA Societies.

A similar proportion of respondents enrolled in the Foreign National and NRI/NRI Sponsored Categories have been part of one or more SJA Societies. Nonetheless, only 1 out of 12 Foreign National respondents is in three or more Societies. On the other hand, 17 (21%) out of 81 in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category are in three or more Societies.

![Figure 194](image-url)
2.8 Nature of School-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

![Figure 195](image)

The highest proportion of respondents who were not in any SJA Society is seen in the Others (33.3%) type of school, followed by respondents from Government Schools (40.5%). The lowest such figure is seen among respondents from Top Private Schools in the Vicinity. Similarly, the largest percentage of students who have been members of three or more SJA societies are those who have completed their schooling from top private schools in their vicinity.

2.9 CGPA-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution

The membership in SJA societies is evidently higher with each subsequent CGPA bracket. 5.1% respondents having CGPA below 3 have been members of three or more SJA societies in contrast with 24.1% respondent dents with CGPA above 6 who have been members of three or more SJA societies.

![Figure 196](image)
2.10 *Spoken English Fluency-wise SJA Society Membership Distribution*

![Bar chart showing membership distribution by fluency level.](chart.png)

**Figure 197**

55% respondents with Medium fluency and 35% respondents with Low fluency in Spoken English have not been in any SJA Societies. This figure is 41.5% for respondents with High fluency and lower for those with Extremely High fluency (24%).

As we move from Low to Medium to High fluency, we see that a higher proportion of respondents have been in two or more SJA Societies among respondents with better fluency in Spoken English.
3. Non-SJA Society Membership

Respondents were asked if they had been a member of any Non-SJA Society.

Overall, 36% respondents have not been a part of any non-SJA Society, while 11% have been members of more than three such Societies.

3.1 Batch-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

Unlike the trend SJA societies, the 5th year batch does not have the largest overall participation in committees. Instead, the 2017 batch (73.3%) and 2015 batch (65%) have the highest proportion of students who have been part of one or more non-SJA Societies. This is true for membership to three or more non-SJA Societies as well.
3.2 Gender-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

A higher proportion of females (71.5%) have been member of one or more non-SJA Society, than males (58.3%)

A similar proportion of males (10.9%) and females (11.2%) have been part of three or more non-SJA Societies.

3.3 Caste-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

The largest proportion of respondents who were not in any non-SJA Society is seen amongst STs (58.6%), and SCs (46.4%). The lowest such figure is seen amongst OBCs (13.3%).

On the other hand, 12.9% respondents who are from the Brahmins or Other Upper Castes groups have been members of three or more non-SJA committees. This is slightly higher in comparison to the figure among respondents from the SC, ST, and OBC groups i.e. 10%.
3.4 Religion-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

![Figure 202](image)

46.1% respondents from ‘Other’ religions and 43.8% Christians have not been in any non-SJA Society. This is the highest such proportion across all religions. The exception is Buddhism, where 3 out of 4 respondents have not been part of any non-SJA Society.

3.5 Region-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

![Figure 203](image)

2 out of 7 respondents from Villages have not been in any non-SJA Society, while 1 is in three Societies.

A higher proportion of respondents from Towns (43%) have not been in any non-SJA Society, as compared to Cities (35.6%). Similarly, the highest proportion of respondents who have been in two or more Societies are from Cities (29.7%).
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3.6 Income-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

The distribution of membership of non-SJA Societies is more or less evenly spread across different income brackets. For instance, 10.8% respondents having family income less than Rs. 6 LPA have been members of three or more Non-SJA societies. This figure is 12.5% for respondents in the More than Rs. 20 LPA bracket.

3.7 Category-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

4 out of 15 respondents admitted in the PWD Category have never been a member of a non-SJA Society, while 3 others have been a part of three or more Societies. Half of all respondents in the Foreign National Category have not been in any non-SJA Society. This figure is 28.4% for respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category.
14.8% of all NRI/NRI Sponsored students have been a part of three or more Non-SJA societies. 1 out of 12 Foreign students has done the same.

3.8 Nature of School-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

About 23.8% respondents from Government Schools have not been in any non-SJA Society. This is the lowest such figure, while a higher proportion of respondents from Other type of schools are in zero Societies than respondents from any other type of school.

3.9 CGPA-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

The proportion of respondents who are members of one or more non-SJA Societies is seen to be increasing as we move higher on the CGPA range. Thus, 24.1% respondents with CGPA above 6 are not in any Society, while the figure is nearly 70% for respondents with CGPA below 2.
3.10 Spoken English Fluency-wise Non-SJA Society Membership Distribution

A higher proportion of students with Low fluency (55%) in Spoken English are members of one or more non-SJA Societies, as compared to those with Medium fluency (50%). Respondents with Extremely High fluency have the highest proportion of such respondents, at 67.3%.

4. Social Initiatives Membership

Respondents were asked if they had been a part of any Social Initiatives, which indicatively included the Legal Aid Society, IDIA, HSF-BRIDGE Project, Sealdah Project, or any other activity related to the student body/NUJS faculty/cells).

Nearly three quarters the respondents have been part of one (28%) or zero (45%) Social Initiatives. About 10% have been part of three or more Initiatives.
4.1 Batch-wise Social Initiatives Membership Distribution

Nearly half the respondents in the 2014, 2015, and 2017 batch have been a part of at least one Social Initiative.

In the 2014 batch, about 17% respondents have been a member of three or more such Initiatives. This is the highest such figure, followed by the 2015 batch (16.6%) and the 2017 batch (11%).

4.2 Gender-wise Social Initiatives Membership Distribution

Female respondents (64.4%) have undertaken more Social Initiatives than male respondents (49.2%). A higher proportion of females have been a part of three or more such Initiatives than men.
4.3 Caste-wise Social Initiatives Membership Distribution

Slightly more than 60% respondents in the ST group have not been a part of any Social Initiative. This is the highest such figure, followed by a similar proportion seen in the SC, Brahmins, and Other Religion groups, around 47%.

About 14.4% respondents in the Other Upper Castes group have been a part of three or more Initiatives, followed by 11.6% of those from Other Religion group, and 10.7% from the SC group.

4.4 Income-wise Social Initiatives Membership Distribution

About half the respondents in the income brackets above Rs. 20 LPA have not been a part of any Social Initiative. This figure is lowest among respondents in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA bracket (30.3%) and in the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket (42.2%).
On the other hand, while 15.5% respondents in the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket have taken part in three or more Initiatives, the figure is 14.7% for respondents in the above Rs. 36 LPA bracket.

5. **Office Bearers**

Apart from membership in various committees, the survey also captured data regarding positions of responsibility held by respondents in these committees. This section shall map the diversity of students who have been office bearers in committees. Respondents were asked to mark whether they have been office bearers of the following: (i) SJA (ii) SJA Society (iii) Non-SJA Society (iv) Others and (v) None. The Respondents could mark more than one option based on how many positions of responsibility they had held at the time of survey:

![Figure 214]

Overall, a majority of the students (68.6%) have not held any position of responsibility. Amongst those who have been Office Bearers, 7.7% have held position of responsibility in more than one committee, as shown above.
5.1 Batch-wise Office Bearers Distribution

The 2015 batch (53.3%) has the highest proportion of Office Bearers across all batches. This figure is understandably lowest in the 2018 batch.

At 7%, the 2014 batch has the highest proportion of SJA Office Bearers. This is followed by the 2015 batch, at 4.9%. These two batches have a similar proportion of respondents who have been Office Bearers in more than 1 committees, at about 13%.

5.2 Gender-wise Office Bearers Distribution

The 2015 batch (53.3%) has the highest proportion of Office Bearers across all batches. This figure is understandably lowest in the 2018 batch.

At 7%, the 2014 batch has the highest proportion of SJA Office Bearers. This is followed by the 2015 batch, at 4.9%. These two batches have a similar proportion of respondents who have been Office Bearers in more than 1 committees, at about 13%.
A similar proportion of males and females have been Office Bearers of committees at NUJS. About 4.2% males have been SJA Office Bearers, compared to 2.8% females.

Similarly, 8.5% males have been Office Bearers of more than 1 committee, as against 6.5% females.

### 5.3 Caste-wise Office Bearers Distribution

Figure 217 shows the caste-wise distribution of the students who have been office bearers of the various committees.

Among 20 SJA Office Bearers, all Caste Groups have seen representation. 5 each have been Brahmins and respondents from the Other Religion group. Another 4 are from the Other Upper Castes group. 1 OBC and ST each, and 2 SCs and those who Don’t Know their Caste each make the remaining SJA Office Bearers.

Out of the 42 students who have been Office Bearers more than once, 33 belong to the group that identifies as Brahmin and Other Upper Caste. In fact, there is no student from the ST category that has held more than one position of responsibility. In line with this trend, 89.7% of students belonging to the ST category have never been office bearers as opposed to 68.3% of Brahmins and 61% of students belonging to Other Upper Caste.

### 5.4 Caste and Gender wise Office Bearers Distribution

We shall now discuss the respondents’ status as office bearers of SJA and Non-SJA Societies, as well as other Cells in NUJS, through the lens of Caste and Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Group</th>
<th>Females (proportion from total females who are office bearers in the Caste Group in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56

More than one third the females in the Brahmins (35.7%), Other Upper Castes (41.3%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (39.9%) groups have been an officer bearer for the SJA, or an SJA or non-SJA Society. This figure is lower for OBCs (37.5%), SCs (24%), STs (9.1%), and those from Other Religion (26.6%). It must be noted that only 1 amongst 11 females who are STs was an office bearer.

Table 57

Amongst males as well, the trend observed is that a higher proportion of respondents in the Caste Groups of Brahmins (35.9%), Other Upper Castes (46.1%), those from Other Religion (30.9%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (29.5%) have been Office Bearers of the SJA or an SJA or non-SJA Society. This proportion is lower amongst OBCs (22.2%), SCs (20.6%), and STs (11.1%).

Across all Caste Groups except two, the proportion of females who are office bearers is higher than that of male office bearers. The exceptions are those belonging to Other Religion, and STs.
5.5 Religion-wise Officer Bearer Distribution

While no Buddhist has been an Office Bearer, Christians have the least representation as Office Bearers among the other religions. The respondents who are Sikhs (50%), followed by Muslims (46.7%) and Jains (38.9%) have the highest proportions of Office Bearers amongst them. 86% of all respondents who have been Office Bearers more than once have been Hindus.

5.6 Income-wise Office Bearer Distribution

The proportion of respondents in each income bracket who were SJA Office Bearers is seen to be decreasing as income increases. The exception is the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, which has not had any respondent become an SJA Office Bearer.

About 12.3% respondents in the Rs. 12 to 20 LPA bracket have been Office Bearers for more than 1 committee. This is the highest such figure across all income bracket, whereas the lowest figure of 3% is seen in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA income bracket.
Among 20 SJA Office Bearers, 2 went to Government Schools, 6 went to Private Schools, while the majority of 12 (60%) went to Top Private Schools.

About 45% respondents from Top Private Schools have been Officer Bearers, while the figure is lower for Government Schools (30%), and Private Schools (24.9%), and even lower for students from Other types of schools (22.2%).

5.8 CGPA-wise Office Bearers Distribution

Figure 221 shows the distribution of students who have been office bearers with respect to their CGPA at the time of survey. There is an increase in the proportion of respondents who have been an Office Bearer, with an increase in CGPA. Thus, more than 50% respondents with CGPA above 6 have been Office Bearers, while less than 15% respondents with CGPA below 3 have done so.
Among 20 SJA Office Bearers, 6 each have CGPA between 4 – 4.99, and 5 – 5.99. Another 5 have CGPA between 3 – 3.99, while 2 have CGPA less than 3. Only 1 SJA Office Bearer has CGPA above 6.

Similarly, among 42 respondents who have been Office Bearers of more than one committee, only 1 respondent had CGPA below 3, as opposed to 33 students with CGPA above 4.

**5.8 NRI/NRI Sponsored, Foreign National and PWD Category-wise Office Bearers Distribution**

Only 3 among 15 (20%) respondents enrolled in the PWD Category have been Office Bearers. This figure is higher for respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category (37%), and even higher for those in the Foreign National Category (50%).
2 out of 12 (16.7%) respondents in the Foreign National Category have held office more than once, as compared to 8 out of 81 (9.8%) in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category. No respondent in the PWD Category has held office more than once.

In 20 SJA Office Bearers, 3 respondents were admitted under the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category, while 1 each was under the Foreign National and PWD Category.

6. SJA Elections

The representatives of the Student Juridical Association of NUJS, namely the President and Vice-President, are elected every year by the general body of students. Respondents were asked to identify the factors that affect their choice of candidates in SJA Elections. They could pick multiple factors.

Most respondents look for candidate’s approachability (74.6%), GB address (61%) and Manifesto (60.3%) before making choice of candidate in SJA elections. Some also answered that Religion (4), Caste (5) and Gender (51) are relevant factors affecting their choice of candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Affecting Choice of Candidate in SJA Elections</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caste</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Moot, Debates and ADR</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB Address/ Speech</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Academic Track Record</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifesto</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in English</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58
V. **Career Choices, Internships & Placements**

1. **Influence of Financial Status and Fees on Career Choices**

1.1 **Financial Status and Choice**

Respondents were asked how important, on a scale of 1 to 5, was their family's financial status and economic background, a factor in making career-related decisions. We consider 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High. Accordingly, 60.8% of all respondents feel that this influence is High/Very High.

1.1.1 **Batch-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice**

Respondents across all batches have a similar distribution through the five options. About 60% respondents of all batches feel that their financial status had a High/Very High impact on their career decisions.

1.1.2 **Gender-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice**

A higher proportion of male respondents (63.8%) as compared to female respondents (56.1%) feel that financial status has High/Very High influence on their career related decisions.

1.1.3 **Caste-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice**

![Figure 223](image)

Around 60% respondents across all caste groups said that their career decisions are impacted Highly/Very Highly by their financial status. This figure is lowest in the OBC and Other Religion groups, at 53.3% and 53.4% respectively. It is highest amongst Other Upper Castes, at 65.3%.
1.1.5 Region-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice

5 out of 7 respondents from Villages rated the influence on financial status on career decisions as High/Very High. The corresponding figure for Towns was similar, at 71.4%, but lower for Cities, at 58.9%. One-fifth of the respondents from Cities rated the influence as Low/Very Low.

1.1.6 Income-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice

There seems to have a direct relation in income level and the perception on the influence of financial status on career decisions. A lower proportion of respondents from higher income brackets rated this influence as High/Very High, as compared to respondents belonging to lower income brackets. For instance, 71.17% respondents in the below Rs. 6 LPA bracket marked the influence as High/Very High while only 52.27% from the above Rs. 36 LPA marked it as such.
1.1.7 Loan-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice

![Pie chart](image)

Figure 226

73.33% (66 out of 90) respondents who have taken loans to study at NUJS feel that their financial status affects their decisions pertaining to their careers Highly/Very Highly. The corresponding figure for all 544 respondents is 60.8%.

1.1.8 Admission Category-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice

![Bar chart](image)

Figure 227

Half the respondents in the Foreign National Category rated the influence of their economic background on their career decision as High/Very High. This figure was slightly higher for those enrolled in the PWD Category, at 53.3%, and slightly lower for respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category, at 41.9%.
1.1.9 Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice and Family in Legal Profession

Around 60% of the respondents in the groups with Parents or Guardians in the Legal Profession, in the group with Other Close Relatives in the profession, and in the group with no such family relations, said the influence of financial status was High/Very High on their career decisions.

1.1.10 CGPA-Wise Distribution of Influence of Financial Status on Career Choice

A similar proportion of respondents across all CGPA groups, at around 60%, feel that their economic background has a High/Very High impact on their career decisions. The exception is the group with CGPA below 2, where 12 out of 13 respondents feel as such.
1.2 Influence of Annual NUJS Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

The respondents were asked to mark on a scale of 1-5, what they felt personally to be the degree of correlation between the annual fees at NUJS and their decision to opt for a law firm job. We consider 1 as Very Low, 2 as Low, 3 as Moderate, 4 as High, and 5 as Very High.

48.9% respondents feel that there the correlation between fees and a law firm job was High/Very High.

1.2.1 Batch-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

The proportion of respondents who said there is a High/Very High correlation between their fees and decision to opt for a law firm job is higher in the 2016 (51.8%) and 2018 (52.8%) batches, as compared to other batches. It is lower than 50% in the other three batches.
1.2.2 Gender-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

A slightly higher proportion of females (51.4%) said the correlation between fees and law firm jobs is High/Very High, as compared to males (47.1%).

1.2.3 Batch-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

The proportion of respondents who said the correlation between college fees and their decision to opt for a law firm job is High/Very High is highest amongst Brahmins (55.8%), followed by STs (55.2%), and SCs. The corresponding figure is lower than 50% for other caste groups.
1.2.5 Region-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

6 out of 7 respondents from Villages said the correlation between fees and decision to choose a law firm job is High/Very High. A slightly higher proportion of respondents from Cities (53.1%) said the correlation is High/Very High, as compared to those from Towns (47.6%).

1.2.6 Income-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

We see that as income increases, a lower proportion of respondents in that income bracket feel that college fees have a High/Very High correlation with their decision to opt for a law firm job. Thus,
the proportion is highest, at 77.8%, in the lowest income bracket of below Rs. 3 LPA. And it is the lowest, at 28.7%, in the highest income bracket of more than Rs. 36 LPA.

1.2.7 Loan-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

Nearly three quarters, at 74.4% of respondents who have taken loans for their college education marked a High/Very High correlation between college fees and decision to opt for a law firm job. This is higher than the overall figure of 48.9%.

1.2.8 Category-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

One third respondents who enrolled in the PWD Category answered they perceived a High/Very High correlation between college fees and opting for a law firm job.
This figure is higher for those in the Foreign National Category (41.7%), and even so among those in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category (48.1%).

1.2.9 Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm and Family in Legal Profession

About 45% respondents with Parents or Guardians in the legal profession said there is a High/Very High correlation between their fees at NUJS and decision to work at a law firm. This figure is lower, at about 39%, amongst those with Other Close Relatives in the legal profession.

1.2.10 CGPA-wise Distribution of Influence of Fees on Decision to Opt for Law Firm

Figure 238
Across all CGPA groups, about 44% - 54% of respondents feel there is a High/Very High correlation between fees and decision to work at a law firm. The figure is highest amongst respondents with CGPA between 2 – 2.99, and lowest amongst those with CGPA above 6.

2. **Active Consideration of pursing a Foreign LLM**

Respondents were asked if they were actively considering doing an LLM program from an international college after graduation.

![Figure 239](image)

About one third of all respondents answered positively to the question, while 22% were undecided.

2.1 **Batch-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants**

![Figure 240](image)
Nearly 45% respondents from the 2018 batch want to pursue a foreign LLM, while only 24.2% of the 2015 batch said so. The proportion of respondents who answered affirmatively to considering a foreign LLM is seen to be increasing with successive batches, with the exception of the 2015 batch.

2.2 Gender-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

Nearly 41.1% females wish to pursue a foreign LLM, compared to about 30% males. The figure for females is higher than the overall figure.

2.3 Caste-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

The proportion of respondents who wish to pursue an LLM from a foreign university is more than the overall figure for OBCs (53.3%), those who Don’t Know their Caste (44.5%), those from Other Upper Castes (43.6%), SC (42.4%), and ST (42.2%).
Religion (39.5%) group, and for Other Upper Castes (35.8%). The figure for Brahmins is marginally lower than the overall figure, at 33.8%.

Amongst SCs and STs, 19.6% and 10.3% respondents respectively plan to study abroad for an LLM. The latter is the lowest figure across all caste groups.

2.4 Region-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

2 out of 7 respondents from Villages plan to pursue a foreign LLM. 35.3% respondents from Cities plan to do the same, as compared to 29.1% respondents from Towns.

2.5 Income-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

Figure 243

Figure 244
A higher proportion of respondents are seen to be actively considering a foreign LLM in the higher income brackets than in the lower brackets. In the below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, only about 15.5% respondents answered the question in the affirmative. In contrast to this, the corresponding figure for respondents in the more than Rs. 36 LPA bracket is 51.1%.

2.6 Loan-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

![Figure 245](image)

Among respondents who took a loan to pay the college fees, only 24.4% of respondents felt that they were going to pursue a foreign LLM after graduating from college, which is lower than the overall figure. On the other hand, the majority of 54% of such respondents answered negatively.

2.7 Category-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

![Figure 246](image)
About one quarter of the 15 respondents admitted in the PWD Category (26.6%) answered that they plan to pursue a foreign LLM. This figure was higher among those enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category, at 46.9%. It was even higher for those in the Foreign National Category, at 58.3%. Both of these latter figures are higher than the overall figure of 34.8%.

2.8 Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants and Family in Legal Profession

Figure 247

Nearly 40.5% of the respondents who have Parents or Guardians in the legal profession plan to go for a foreign LLM. Amongst respondents who have Other Close Relatives in the legal profession, this figure is 38.5%. These figures are higher than the overall figure. They are also higher than the proportion of respondents who don’t have any family relations in the legal profession and plan to go for a foreign LLM, at 31.4%.
2.9 CGPA-wise Distribution of Foreign LLM Aspirants

It is seen that there is a direct correlation between the CGPA of a respondent, and the proportion of respondents who are actively considering pursuing a foreign LLM in that CGPA group. Thus, while only 15.3% respondents with CGPA below 2 currently wish to pursue a foreign LLM, the figure is 55.1% amongst respondents with CGPA above 6. Similarly, the proportion of students who Can’t Say is also highest in the group with CGPA below 2, while it is lowest in the group with CGPA above 6.

3. Internships

Respondents were asked if the Recruitment and Placement Committee of their batch had assisted in securing an internship for them. The mandate of securing such internships is granted to the RPC from the Third Year onward. Thus, only responses of the Batches of 2014 to 2016 are considered for this question. The responses received were either ‘Yes’ or ‘No’.

3.1 Internships Secured through RPC (Responses only from 3rd Years and Above)
Among 306 respondents to this question, 45.1% answered affirmatively. The majority of 55.8% respondents had not received an internship through the RPC.

3.1.1 Batch-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC

![Batch-wise Distribution](image)

Figure 250

A similar proportion of about 60% respondents from the 2014 and 2015 batches said they have received an internship through the RPC. These students were in the Fifth Year and Fourth Year respectively at the time of this Survey. On the other hand, from the then Third Year Batch, only about 17.1% respondents answered affirmatively. A plausible reason for this low figure is that this questionnaire was filled during their Sixth Semester, while experience suggests that most internships are scheduled for after the Sixth Semester.

3.1.2 Gender-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC

![Gender-wise Distribution](image)

Figure 251

A higher proportion of females (52.6%) reported to have secured internships through the RPC, as compared to males (37.4%).
3.1.3 Caste-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC

![Caste-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC](image)

There is a disparity between the figures for OBCs, SCs and STs on the one hand, and the other caste groups on the other. Amongst those from Other Religion (68.1%), those who Don’t Know their Caste (53.3%), Brahmins (48.2%), and Other Upper Castes (44%), the proportion of respondents who have secured an internship through the RPC is considerably higher than the SCs (28.1%), STs and OBCs (12.5% each).

3.1.4 Category-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC

![Category-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC](image)

Only 1 out of 6 (16.7%) respondents admitted in the PWD Category was able to secure an internship through RPC. Similarly, only 1 out of 7 (14.3%) respondents enrolled in the Foreign National Category had secured an internship through the RPC.
The corresponding figure in the NRI/NRI Sponsored Category was higher, at 46.8%.

3.1.5 Distribution of Internships through RPC and Family in Legal Profession

A similar proportion of respondents secured an internship through the RPC from the three groups: those with Parents or Relatives in the legal profession, those with Other Close Relatives in the profession, and those without any family relations in the legal profession. These figures are in line with the overall figure.

3.1.6 CGPA-wise Distribution of Internships through RPC

With an increase in CGPA, we also see an increase in the proportion of respondents in that CGPA bracket who have secured an internship through the RPC. Thus, while none of the 7 respondents
with CGPA less than 2 got an internship through the RPC, the corresponding figure for respondents with CGPA above 6 is 80.9%.

3.2 Tier of Firm where Internship Secured through the RPC

Respondents who marked ‘Yes’ when asked if they had secured an internship through the RPC were further asked about the tier of the firm where such internship took place. In common understanding, law firms are classified into Tiers I, II, and III based on criteria such as size, experience, expertise, quality of service, etc. This classification of firms in the Survey is merely indicative. On this basis, we received 130 responses.

3.2.1 Batch-wise Distribution of Tier of Firm where Internship Secured

The more senior batches have a higher proportion of internships in Tier 1 firms. Thus, in the 2014 batch, 92.7% respondents interned at a Tier 1 firm, while the figure was 87.9% and 76.4% for the 2015 and 2016 batches respectively. While only the 2014 batch has 1 respondent who secured an internship at a Tier 3 firm, no respondent in the other two batches has interned at a Tier 3 firm.
3.2.2 Gender-wise Distribution of Tier of Firm where Internship Secured

Amongst those who have secured an internship through the RPC, a higher proportion of females (94.1%) have interned at Tier 1 firms as compared to males (82.2%). The opposite of this is true for Tier 2 firms, where 16.1% of the males, and 5.8% of the females, have interned.

3.2.3 Caste-wise Distribution of Tier of Firm where Internship Secured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Group</th>
<th>Total Respondents in the 3 eligible batches</th>
<th>Internship through RPC (proportion from total respondents in those batches in brackets)</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>42 (42.4%) 35 (83.3%) 5 (16.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24 (36.9%) 22 (91.7%) 2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (7.6%) 1 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15 (48.3%) 12 (80%) 3 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40 (32.5%) 38 (95%) 2 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8 (19%) 6 (75%) 1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 (10%) 1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59

Less than 20% respondents in the OBC, ST, and SC caste groups secured an internship through the RPC. Amongst OBCs, the 1 person who got an internship got it at a Tier 1 firm. Among 2 STs who got such internships, 1 each interned at a Tier 1 and Tier 2 firm respectively. Three quarters (6 out
of 8) SCs who secured an internship through the RPC interned at Tier 1 firms. The other 2 interned at a Tier 2 and Tier 3 firm respectively.

More than 90% respondents in the Other Upper Castes group, and those who Don’t Know their Caste, interned at a Tier 1 firm. The figure is above 80% for Brahmins and those from Other Religions.

3.2.4 CGPA-wise Distribution of Tier of Firm where Internship Secured

![CGPA-wise Distribution of Tier of Firm where Internship Secured](image)

Figure 258

2 out of 3 respondents with CGPA below 3 interned at a Tier 2 firm. Similarly, about half the respondents in the CGPA 3-3.99 bracket interned at Tier 2 firms, while this figure is 13.3% for respondents in the CGPA 4-4.99 bracket.

Respondents with CGPA above 5 form about 63% of all respondents who have secured an internship through the RPC. All respondents in these CGPA brackets secured an internship with Tier 1 firms.
4. Scholarships

There are different types of scholarships that students can avail in NUJS such as the NUJS Merit-cum-Means Scholarships, Aditya Birla Scholarship, State Scholarships for SC and ST students, Reema Ray Scholarship, etc. While some scholarships offer a full fee waiver, others are partial in nature, meaning that the students must make up for the remaining amount of their tuition and other fees.

4.1 Overview of Scholarship Recipients

![Pie chart showing the distribution of scholarship recipients.]

Figure 259

About 10% of all respondents, or 52 students, are the recipients of various scholarships at NUJS.

4.1.1 Distribution of Scholarship Recipients by Cost of Mobile Phone

![Pie chart showing the distribution of respondents based on the cost of their mobile phones.]

Figure 260

The largest proportion of 44% of respondents who receive scholarships own a phone between Rs. 10k to Rs. 20k. Nearly one-fifth of such respondents have phones that cost above Rs. 20k.
4.1.2 Distribution of Scholarship Recipients by Cost of Laptop

While 60% of 52 respondents who receive scholarships said they own a laptop that costs less than Rs. 45k, about one-quarter of these students own a laptop above that price. Nearly 15% of such respondents own a laptop they received as part of an Award or Assistance.

4.2 Recipients of Aditya Birla Scholarship (ABS) and the NUJS Merit-cum-Means Scholarship (MCM)

The Aditya Birla Scholarship (ABS) is for students from IITs, IIMs, BITS, XLRI and 5 of the top National Law Universities. Only the top 20 students from each University, based on their entrance exam ranking at the time of admission, can apply for this scholarship. In NUJS, this means that only the top 20 rankers from the General category get the chance to apply for this. 10 respondents said they are recipients of this Scholarship, which entitles the recipient to an amount of Rs. 1.8 lacs per annum or fees at actuals, whichever is lower.

The NUJS Merit Cum Means Scholarship (MCM) is a University instituted Scholarship to help students from lower income backgrounds based on their financial status and academic performance at NUJS. Thus, these students are offered different amounts of scholarships as a proportion of their annual tuition fees. 30 respondents are recipients of the NUJS MCM Scholarship.

4.2.1 Batch-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

The above figure shows the batch wise break up of students who received the ABS and the MCM. More students have received the ABS in recent years than earlier, while the proportion of those who received the MCM Scholarship is higher amongst those who are presently in the senior batches.
4.2.2 Gender-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

Females form a higher proportion of recipients for both the ABS and the MCM Scholarship.

4.2.3 Caste-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

There is no SC, ST, or OBC recipient of the Aditya Birla Scholarship. Other Upper Castes make the largest group at nearly half of all ABS recipients, followed by Brahmins and those who Don’t Know their Caste.

Amongst recipients of the MCM Scholarship, Other Upper Castes comprise nearly 37%, while Brahmins form another 26%. SC, ST and OBC recipients form 20% of these 30 MCM recipients.
4.2.4 Gender and Caste-wise Distribution of MCM Scholarship

Among both male and female beneficiaries of the Merit Cum Means Scholarship, nearly 60% respondents are either Brahmins or Other Upper Castes. Respondents who Don’t Know their Caste form another 23.1% and 11.7% of the female and male beneficiary groups respectively.

Amongst 13 females, there is 1 SC respondent and none from the ST group. Amongst 17 males, there are one SC and ST respondent each.
### 4.2.5 Income-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

![Income Distribution Chart](chart.png)

Amongst respondents who are in the Below 3 LPA bracket, nobody received the ABS, while they form nearly 70% of the MCM Scholarship recipients. Others who received the MCM Scholarship are in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA bracket, while one person said they are in the Rs. 6 to 12 LPA bracket.

Respondents in the Rs. 12 to 20 LPA bracket form the largest group amongst those who received the ABS. 3 out of 10 such beneficiaries are in the above Rs. 20 LPA bracket.

### 4.2.6 Gender and Income-wise Distribution of MCM Scholarship

![Gender Income Distribution Chart](chart.png)

In the group of 13 female recipients of the MCM Scholarship, nearly half of the group is either in the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, and the other half in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA bracket. One female said she is in the Rs. 6 to 12 LPA bracket, even as the upper limit to apply for the MCM Scholarship is Rs. 6
LPA. Amongst 17 male recipients, a majority of 82.3% males are in the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket. The other 3 recipients are in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA bracket.

4.2.7 Caste and Income-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

Amongst 20 recipients of the MCM Scholarship who are in the income bracket below Rs. 3 LPA, we see nearly 70% respondents are Brahmins or Other Upper Castes. One each of these 20 recipients are from the SC and ST group, while two others are from the OBC group and those who Don’t Know their Caste group.

In the remaining 10 recipients, 9 are in the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA income bracket. Here, 4 recipients are Brahmins and Other Upper Castes, while 3 others Don’t Know their Caste. The remaining two recipients are from the SC group and the OBC group each.

4.2.8 Loan-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

While no student who has received an ABS has taken a loan, 14 (47%) out of 30 students who received the MCM Scholarship took loans.

4.2.9 Region-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

All 10 ABS recipients are from cities, which is also the case for nearly 80% recipients of the MCM Scholarship recipients. Of 30 such beneficiaries of the latter, 2 are from Villages, while 4 are from Towns.
4.2.10 CGPA-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

All ABS recipients have a CGPA above 4, while about 20% of MCM recipients have CGPA below 4. Another 40% of MCM recipients have CGPA above 5.

4.2.11 Repeats-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

None of the ABS recipients have ever appeared for a Repeat Examination, while 7 (23.3%) out of 30 recipients of the MCM Scholarship have done so.
4.2.12 Publication of Research papers-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

Only 2 of 10 ABS recipients have written Research Papers, while an equal proportion (20%) of recipients of the MCM Scholarship have done so i.e. 6 out of 30 recipients.

4.2.13 Paper Conferences-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

While no ABS recipient has presented at a Paper Conference, 3 (10%) out of 30 MCM recipients have done so.

4.2.14 Debates, Moots and ADR-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

2 (20%) ABS recipients each out of 10 have debated and mooted internationally, while 1 person has done an international ADR competition. Nearly half the ABS recipients have never debated or mooted, while nearly all have done an ADR Competition outside NUJS.

Only 1 (3.3%), 2 (6.7%), and 3 (10%) MCM Scholarship recipients have done an international Debate, ADR, and Moot Court Competition respectively. More than 80% of these beneficiaries have mooted at some level. While about half of them have debated, 75% of these debaters have done so at the University level. These figures are lower for ADR Competitions.

4.2.15 Foreign LLM Aspiration-wise Distribution of ABS and MCM Scholarship

When asked if they plan to pursue an LL.M. Degree from a foreign university, 7 (70%) out of 10 ABS recipients said yes. The corresponding figure among MCM Scholarship recipients was 6 (20%) out of 30.
LIFE AT NUJS
I. **Peer-to-Peer Support at NUJS**

This chapter will discuss the effectiveness of formal and informal support systems that have been built by and for NUJS students. Through such networks senior students often focus on reaching out to junior students to build friendly and professional networks. Here, we analyse the Buddy Initiative; Mentorship Programmes for Moots, Debates and ADR Competitions, and Senior’s Assistance in writing Research Papers each against various diversity indicators.

**1. Buddy Initiative**

Buddy Initiative is an institutional arrangement facilitated by seniors from fourth and fifth years who sign up as buddies and are assigned to incoming first years each year. A buddy is expected to act as a friend and guide to new students and help them in every way possible to settle into the law school environment comfortably.

The respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of Buddy Initiative System on a 5-point scale of Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High. The Figure below shows the responses received.

![Figure 272](image)

While one-third of the total respondents feel the Buddy Initiative has had High effectiveness, a slightly higher proportion at 35% rated it as Moderately effective.
1.1 Batch-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

The number of respondents who rated the effectiveness of Buddy Initiative as High and Very High has increased year-on-year.

1.2 Gender-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

As can be observed, there is not a drastic difference in the rating of the Buddy Initiative system between male and female students.
1.3 Caste-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

Across caste groups, the least proportions of those who rated the BI as of Low or Very Low effectiveness are found amongst Brahmins and those who Don’t Know their Caste. The highest such proportion is seen amongst OBCs.

On the other hand, those belonging to SC, ST and OBC groups have rated the effectiveness of Buddy Initiative as Very High in the least proportions. However, those from SC have rated it as High in the largest proportion.

1.4 Income-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

Figure 275

Figure 276
Among the students in the below Rs. 3 LPA, nobody has rated the effectiveness to be Very High. Among the students of the Rs. 3 to 6 LPA income bracket who rated the Buddy Initiative system, the least number of students rated it Very High. Among all income brackets, the highest proportion of students has rated the Buddy Initiative to be Moderate.

1.5 Religion-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

No student from Sikh and Buddhist religions, have rated the system to be Very High or Very Low. Nearly 40% Atheists and 65% of those belonging to Other religions have rated the BI as having Low or Very Low effectiveness.

1.6 Region-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

As can be seen, nobody from village has marked system to be above Moderate.
1.7 NRI/NRI Sponsored, PWD and Foreign National Categories and Buddy Initiative Distribution

Of 15 students in the PWD, one-third each feel the BI is of Very Low effectiveness, or of High/Very High Effectiveness. Similarly, one-third in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category also answered High/Very High.

Nearly 42% in the Foreign National category rated BI as of High/Very High effectiveness.

1.8 Nature of School-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

There does not seem to be a significant difference in perception of the effectiveness of the buddy initiative based on the category of schooling that students have received.
1.9 Spoken English Fluency (Now)-wise Buddy Initiative Distribution

At about 38%, a similar proportion of those who said the BI has Low/Very Low effectiveness is seen amongst those with Low, and High fluency in Spoken English. The least proportion of those who rated the BI as such is amongst those with Medium fluency.

1.10 Buddy Approachability

To find out how approachable their buddies were, the respondents were asked their level of comfortability in approaching their buddy for each and every doubt irrespective of how silly the doubt was. The 495 responses that were received are given in the Figure below.

About one-third respondents said they were comfortable/extremely comfortable in approaching their Senior Buddy. Over 17% said they never approached the Buddy.
1.11 Frequency of Buddy Meets under the Buddy Initiative

480 Respondents answered if their buddies kept a regular check on them and followed up with them on their progress. They had to rate the frequency on a 5-point scale of Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High. Over 61% said the frequency was Low/Very Low.

![Pie chart showing frequency of buddy meets]

Figure 283
2. **Debate Mentorship**

The Debate Mentorship program was started in 2016 by the Literary and Debating Society. This part will discuss the program’s effectiveness through responses of the batches of 2016, 2017 and 2018. Of a total of 338 respondents from these 3 batches, 250 chose to answer this question. The overall as well as batch-wise responses are given in the Figure below.
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Figure 284

The debate mentorship has improved with time. The proportion of people who have marked High/Very high have increased with each year.

2.1 **Gender-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution**

![](image2.png)

Figure 285

There is no significant difference in the perception of the effectiveness of debate mentorship between male and female students.
2.2 Caste-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

100% of those in the OBC group, and about 51% of the SC group rated the Debate Mentorship as of Low/Very Low effectiveness. The largest proportion of Brahmins and those who said the question on caste was Not Applicable/Other Religion were the most satisfied with the Mentorship program.

2.3 Income-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

Respondents from families which earn above Rs. 20 LPA reported to be most satisfied with the Debate Mentorship program. About 40% of those in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA bracket rated the effectiveness of the program as High/Very High.
On the other hand, about 66% of those in the Below 6 LPA bracket said the Debate Mentorship had Low/Very Low effectiveness.

### 2.4 Religion-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

Nearly 60% respondents across all religions except Atheism, and Others found the effectiveness of the Debate Mentorship to be Moderate or higher.
2.5 Region-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

No student from village has marked the debate mentorship to be highly effective. About 27% respondents from towns, and from cities, said the Mentorship program was of High/Very High effectiveness.

2.6 NRI/NRI Sponsored, PWD and Foreign National Categories and Debate Mentorship Distribution

Amongst 5 students who enrolled in the PWD category and answered the question, 3 and 2 students answered the Debate Mentorship program had Low and High effectiveness respectively.

About 30% respondents in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category and Foreign National category said the program was of Low/Very Low effectiveness.
2.7 Nature of School-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

Figure 291

About 40% and 25% respondents from Government Schools answered that the Debate Mentorship program had High/Very High and Low effectiveness respectively.

Nearly 50% respondents who went to Private Schools said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness.

2.8 Spoken English Fluency-wise Debate Mentorship Distribution

Figure 292

Out of the students who have marked their Fluency as Medium, only 5 have rated it as Very High and only 8 have rated it as High.
3. Moot Mentorship

The Moot Mentorship program was started in 2017 and focused on initiating first years into the activity. This part will analyse the effectiveness of this program. We will discuss responses only from those enrolled either in 2017 or 2018. Out of a total of 232 students from 1st and 2nd year, 186 respondents chose to answer this question.

Figure 293 shows the overall and batch-wise responses. While about 36% respondents said the program was Highly/Very Highly effective, about 38% marked that the effectiveness was Low/Very Low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher proportion of respondents said the program’s effectiveness was moderate or better in the 2018 batch as compared to the 2017 batch.
3.1 Gender-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

About 42% males said the Moot Mentorship program was Highly/Very Highly effective, while a similar proportion of females marked it as being of Low/Very Low effectiveness.

3.2 Caste-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

While 100% OBC respondents marked the Moot Mentorship as being of Low/Very Low effectiveness, 50% of SC respondents and those from Other Religions marked it as such.

Respondents from the Other Upper Castes (61%), Brahmins group (37.5%), and from Other Religions (37.5%) had the highest proportions of those who said the programme had High/Very High effectiveness across all caste groups.
3.3 Income-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 296](image-url)

Students in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA income bracket have the highest proportion of those who said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness.

At around 40%, a similar proportion of respondents in the Below 6 LPA bracket, 20 to 36 LPA bracket, and the More than Rs. 36 LPA bracket felt the Mentorship was Highly/Very Highly effective. No student in the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket said the program had High/Very High effectiveness.

3.4 Religion-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 297](image-url)

Across religions, the highest proportion of those who answered the program had High/Very High effectiveness was seen in those who identified as Jains, followed by Christians and Atheists. No respondent who identified as Muslims or as Others say the program had High/Very High effectiveness.
3.5 Region-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

Nearly 50% respondents from Towns, and 32% from Cities said they found the program to be Highly/Very Highly effective. Around 36% from both these places said it had Low/Very Low effectiveness.

Only 2 of 7 respondents from Villages answered the question on the effectiveness of the Moot Mentorship program.

3.6 NRI/NRI Sponsored, PWD and Foreign National Categories and Moot Mentorship Distribution

Of 6 students in the PWD category, 4 said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness, while 1 opted for Very High option. Nearly 34% students in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category said it was
Highly/Very Highly effective, while about 40% chose the Low/Very Low answer. All 5 Foreign National students found the effectiveness of the moot mentorship program to be moderate or better.

### 3.7 Nature of School-wise Moot Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 300](image)

Nearly 68% respondents from Government Schools, compared to 40% from Top Private Schools, and about 25% from Private Schools felt the Moot Mentorship program was Highly/Very Highly effective.

The highest proportion of those who said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness were from Private Schools (48%), followed by those from Top Private Schools (32%).

### 3.8 Spoken English Fluency (Now) and Moot Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 301](image)

Of 7 respondents with Low fluency in Spoken English, 4 rated the program as having Low/Very Low effectiveness.
Amongst those with High and Extremely High fluency, an average of about 35% respondents said the Mentorship program was Highly/Very Highly effective.

3.9 Senior Assistance for Moots

When asked about the effectiveness of Seniors’ assistance for moots, nearly 61% said it was High/Very High. On the other hand, about 20% said it was Low/Very Low.
4. ADR Mentorship

We will now discuss the effectiveness of the ADR Mentorship program, which started in 2017. Thus, responses of only the 2017 and 2018 batches have been considered. From a total of 232 such students, 153 answered this question. The Figure below shows the overall as well as batch-wise responses.

Overall, while about 43% respondents said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness, about 30% opted for the High/Very High option.

A greater proportion of students from the 2018 batch found the ADR mentorship program to be Highly/Very Highly effective, in comparison to the 2017 batch.

In the 2017 batch, nearly 51% felt the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness.
4.1 Gender-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

There is no significant difference between male and female students in their perception of the effectiveness of the ADR mentorship program.

4.2 Caste-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

Out of the 5 OBC students, 4 rated it Very Low and 1 rated it Very High.

Amongst other caste groups, the highest proportions of those who said the Mentorship program had Low/Very Low effectiveness are in the ST group (65%), followed by Other Upper Castes and those from Other Religions (53% each).

Brahmins (44%) followed by Other Upper Castes (33%) and those who Don’t Know their Caste (30%) rated the program as Highly/Very Highly effective in higher proportions than other groups.
4.3 Income-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

Nearly 50% respondents in three income brackets of Below Rs. 6 LPA, Rs. 6 to 12 LPA, and Rs. 20 to 36 LPA said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness.

Approximately 37% respondents each in the Below Rs. 6 LPA bracket and in the Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket said it was Highly/Very Highly effective. This is the highest such proportion across all income brackets.

4.4 Religion-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

Apart from 1 person from ‘Other’ religion who rated the program as having Very Low effectiveness, the highest proportions of those who said it had Low/Very Low effectiveness are seen amongst Jains and Christians. About 40% Muslim, and Atheist respondents each said the programme was Highly/Very Highly effective. This is the highest such proportion across religions.
4.5 Region-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 308](image)

1 each amongst 2 students from Villages said the program had High and Low effectiveness respectively.

Respondents from Cities and Towns answered the question on effectiveness of the ADR Mentorship program similarly across all options.

4.6 NRI/NRI Sponsored, PWD, and Foreign National Category and ADR Mentorship Distribution

![Figure 309](image)

Nearly 30% enrolled in the NRI/NRI Sponsored category said the program was Highly/Very Highly effective, while about 37% opted for the Low/Very Low option. Of 5 PWD students who responded to this question, 1 rated it Very High, while 4 rated it Low/Very Low. Amongst 5 Foreign National students who responded to this question, 2 of them rated it Very Low, whereas 3 marked it High/Very High.
Nearly 55% respondents from Government Schools found the program to be Highly/Very Highly effective. The corresponding proportions for Private Schools and Top Private Schools are about 30%.

On the other hand, while about 55% students from Private Schools said the program had Low/Very Low effectiveness, this proportion is lowest for respondents from Government Schools, at about 22%.
4.8 Spoken English Fluency (Now)-wise ADR Mentorship Distribution

Amongst 7 respondents with Low fluency in spoken English, 5 said the effectiveness of the program was Low/Very Low.

A similar proportion of respondents in other fluency-groups (around 40%) found the program to be of Low/Very Low effectiveness.

5. Senior Assistance in Writing Papers

When asked about the effectiveness of Seniors’ assistance in writing academic papers, a similar proportion of respondents said it was High/Very High and Low/Very Low.
II. **Peer Influence**

Peer influence is inevitable in any social setting. It is especially so in NUJS, where in a 5-acre campus, students often find themselves in a close-knit community. This leads to numerous interactions with others which influence a student’s behaviour towards academics, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and also their social life. This chapter provides an account of the impact of peer influence on students at NUJS. The responses have further been mapped against diversity indicators to bring out a more telling picture of peer influence in our lives.

### 1. Peer Pressure

Respondents were asked the extent to which peer pressure influences their decisions to participate in different activities, including co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. They were asked to mark on a range of 0 to 5 where 5 denotes Very High, 4 denotes High, 3 denotes Moderate, 2 denotes Low, 1 and 0 denote Very Low.

#### 1.1. Moots

Students were asked the extent of peer pressure they experience in college to participate in moot court competitions. 518 responses were received. The Figure below shows overall responses.

![Figure 313](image)

Nearly 47% said that peer influence to moot was Low/Very Low, as against 34% who said it was High/Very High.

#### 1.1.1 Peer Influence on Moots: Batch-wise Distribution

Over the years, a higher proportion of respondents said that peer influence to moot was High/Very High. For e.g. around 38% respondents from the 2016 batch onwards answered as such, compared to around 24% in 2015, and around 31% the year before that.
1.1.2 Peer Influence on Moots: Gender-wise Distribution

As seen in the figure, a higher proportion of females (40%) feel High/Very High peer influence to moot, compared to males (27%). On the other hand, more males (48%) feel Low/Very Low peer influence to moot, compared to females (43%).

1.1.3 Peer Influence on Moots: Caste-wise Moots Distribution

Minor variations are seen across caste groups. At just over 50%, respondents who Don’t Know their Caste form the highest proportion of those who said peer influence to moot is Low/Very Low. This is followed by SC and Brahmin respondents.
OBC respondents, followed by Other Upper Caste respondents said they feel High/Very High peer influence to moot in the highest proportions.

### 1.1.4 Peer Influence on Moots: Income-wise Distribution

The highest proportion of students among all income brackets rated the peer pressure to moot to be Very Low.
1.2. Debates

Students were asked the extent of peer pressure they experience in college to participate in Debate Competitions. A total of 508 responses were received and are presented in the Figure below.

![Figure 318](Attach:1304.png)

About 65% respondents felt Low/Very Low peer influence to debate, while 18% said it was High/Very High.

1.2.1 Peer Influence on Debates: Batch-wise Distribution

![Figure 319](Attach:1305.png)

The proportion of respondents who said they felt High/Very High peer influence to moot has hovered around 20% across all batches, except in the 2015 batch where it was 12%.

1.2.2 Peer Influence on Debates: Gender-wise Distribution

There is not a stark difference in the influence to debate felt by students of different genders.
The majority of respondents across caste groups said they felt Low/Very Low peer influence to debate, in line with the overall trend. The highest such proportion is amongst OBC respondents, at about 70%.

The majority of respondents across income brackets felt Low/Very Low pressure to debate. At about 20%, the highest proportion of those who felt High/Very High peer influence to debate are in the Rs. 6 to 12 LPA income bracket.
1.3. ADR Competitions

Students were asked the extent of peer pressure they experience in college to participate in ADR Competitions. A total of 491 responses were received and they are presented in the Figure below.

![Figure 323]

Just above 75% respondents said that peer influence to participate in ADR Competitions was Low/Very Low.

1.3.1 Peer Influence on ADR: Batch-wise Distribution

![Figure 324]

The proportion of respondents who answered peer influence to participate in ADR Competitions was High/Very High is highest for the 2018 batch, at about 16%. For all other batches, the figure is below 10%.
1.3.2 Peer Influence on ADR: Gender-wise Distribution

While the majority of both males and females said they felt Low/Very Low pressure from peers to participate in ADR Competitions, a higher proportion of females (15%) chose the High/Very High options compared to males (8.5%).

1.3.3 Peer Influence on ADR: Caste-wise Distribution

Across all caste groups, the majority felt Low/Very Low peer influence to participate in ADR Competitions.

The highest proportions of student who said they felt Moderate or higher pressure from peers are in the ST group (42%), followed by the SC group (31%).
1.3.4 Peer Influence on ADR: Income-wise Distribution

![Bar chart showing peer influence on ADR by income bracket.](image)

Nearly 15% of those in the 6-12 LPA bracket felt High/Very High pressure, the highest such figure across all brackets.

1.4. Journal

A total of 491 responses were received on the question on the extent to which peer pressure influence their decision to attain membership of the numerous journals at NUJS, and elsewhere.

1.4.1 Peer Influence to Join a Journal: Batch-wise Distribution

![Pie chart showing peer influence to join a journal.](image)

While 66% said the pressure to attain membership of a journal was Low/Very Low, about 16% said it was High/Very High.
1.4.2 Batch-wise Journal Distribution

The trend over the years has not been uniform. Nearly 20% respondents from the 2016 batch felt High/Very High peer influence to get membership in a journal, while about 19% from the 2018 batch felt so. This figure is lowest for the 2017 and 2014 batches, at about 13%.

1.4.2 Peer Influence to Join a Journal: Gender-wise Distribution

A higher proportion of females (21%) felt High/Very High peer influence to attain membership in a journal than males (11%).
1.4.3 Peer Influence to Join a Journal: Caste-wise Distribution

The majority of respondents across all caste groups felt Low/Very Low pressure to get membership in a journal. The highest proportion of those who chose the High/Very High options are seen in the SC group, followed by the ST group, and the Other Religions group.

1.4.4 Peer Influence to Join a Journal: Income-wise Distribution

The majority of respondents said peer influence to attain membership in a journal is Low/Very Low across income brackets. In the Rs. 6 to 12 LPA bracket, the proportion of respondents who felt the pressure is Moderate or higher is about 40%, the highest such figure across all income brackets.
1.5. Committee

Respondents were asked to rate the extent of peer influence on getting membership in the numerous SJA and non-SJA Committees at NUJS. A total of 509 responses were received. The Figure below shows the break-up of the responses.

While about 53% said they felt Low/Very Low peer influence to join a Committee, 28% said it was High/Very High.

1.5.1 Peer Influence to Join a Committee: Batch-wise Distribution

The proportion of respondents who said the pressure to join a Committee was High/Very High has increased gradually over the years. In the 2014 batch, it is about 20%, while it goes up to about 27% for the 2016 batch, and to about 48% for the latest batch to join.
1.5.2 Peer Influence to Join a Committee: Gender-wise Distribution

At about 32.5%, a slightly higher proportion of females felt High/Very High peer pressure to join a Committee, compared to about 25% of males.

1.5.3 Peer Influence to Join a Committee: Caste-wise Distribution

The majority of respondents across all caste groups said they felt Low/Very Low peer pressure to join a Committee. The highest proportion of those who felt High/Very High influence are in the OBC group, at about 36% of all OBC respondents. Amongst all other caste groups this figure is between 26%-29%, with the exception of the ST group.
The highest proportion of students to mark that the influence is High/Very High are in the Rs. 6-12 LPA income bracket (38%), followed by the Rs. 20-36 LPA bracket and the Below Rs. 6 LPA bracket (each around 30%).

1.6. Volunteering in College Events

Respondents were asked the extent to which peer influence affected their decision to volunteer in the various events that take place at NUJS. 496 responses were received, seen in the Figure below.

The respondents are divided 50-50 between those who felt the pressure to volunteer was Low/Very Low and those who felt it was Moderate or higher.

1.6.1 Peer Influence to Volunteer in College Events: Batch-wise Distribution

There is no uniform trend across batches. Nonetheless, it is seen that the 2018 batch has by far the highest proportion of such respondents who felt there is High/Very High peer influence to volunteer, at about 53%. For other batches, this figure ranges from 19% - 27%. The proportion of respondents who said peer influence had Low/Very Low impact on their decision has decreased across successive batches.
1.6.2 Peer Influence to Volunteer in College Events: Gender-wise Distribution

There is no significant difference between responses received from male and female respondents.

1.6.3 Peer Influence to Volunteer in College Events: Caste-wise Distribution

Nearly half the respondents across all caste groups said they felt Low/Very Low peer pressure to volunteer for college events. It is in the OBC group (54%), followed by those who Don’t Know their Caste (33%), that we find the highest proportion of respondents who chose the High/Very High option.
1.6.4 Peer Influence to Volunteer in College Events: Income-wise Distribution

Responses across all income brackets conform to the overall trend. There are two exceptions. Amongst those who did not disclose their parental incomes, more than 70% said there was Low/Very Low peer pressure to volunteer. Similarly, the proportion of those who chose the High/Very High options in this bracket is half the overall proportion. Second, nearly 40% respondents in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA bracket said they felt High/Very High pressure, which is about 10% more than the overall trend.

1.7. Choice of Electives

To understand the impact of peer influence on the choice of elective subjects on offer, we shall now discuss responses from students who enrolled between 2014 to 2016 i.e. batches third year and upwards, who are offered elective choices. Of a total of 309 respondents from these batches, 292 answered this question.
Only about 18% respondents said that peer influence had a High/Very High impact on their choice of electives. The majority opted for the Low/Very Low options.

1.8. Consumption of Intoxicants

Among 507 respondents who answered the extent of peer influence on their decision to consume intoxicants, just above 50% said they experienced Low/Very Low influence. Nearly one-third chose the High/Very High influence options.

1.9. Parties

In response to the impact of peer influence on respondents’ decision to attend college parties, nearly 43% of 508 responses said the influence was High/Very High. About 40% respondents answered Low/Very Low influence.
2. Were you close to any Senior in your first year?

Respondents were asked if they were close to any senior friend in their first year. About 30% answered negatively. The figure below shows the overall distribution.

![Overall Distribution](image)

**Figure 345**

2.1 Close to Senior in First Year and Gender-wise Distribution

![Gender Distribution](image)

**Figure 346**

At just above 70%, a higher proportion of males were friends with senior students than females (59%)

2.3 Close to Senior in First Year and Caste-wise Distribution

Across all caste groups, those from Other Religions (74%), Brahmins (71%), and those who Don’t Know their Caste (70%) have the highest proportions of such students who were close to seniors in their first year. The lowest such figures are seen amongst STs (44%), and OBCs (46%).
2.4 Nature of School-wise Senior Distribution

A higher proportion of students from Top Private Schools (71%) were close to seniors in their first year, as against students from other Private Schools (66%) and Government schools (47.62%).

3. Interaction with Opposite Gender

Respondents were asked if they spoke to any person of any gender other than theirs in the first year.

While about 14% males did not speak/remember speaking with somebody from other genders in their first year, the figure was less than half for females at nearly 6%.
Out of 541 students, a majority of the students (about 59%) consumed intoxicating substances for the first time upon joining college.

**4.1 Consumption of Intoxicants: Gender-wise Distribution**
A higher proportion of females (about 66%) were trying out substances/intoxicants for the first time in their lives at NUJS, as compared to males (about 54%).

III. **Peer Behaviour and Discrimination**

This chapter seeks to understand certain aspects of peer behaviour including ragging and sexual harassment, and the degree to which they affect the lives of NUJS students. It also contains discussion on peer-induced discrimination faced by all and institutional disadvantages faced especially by differently abled students. The frequency of availing professional help for mental health related issues has also been analysed. The final section contains some discussion on certain aspects which can play a major role in life at NUJS.

1. **Ragging**

Respondents were asked if they had been ragged by their seniors. Nearly 60% said they have been ragged.

![Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 352**

**1.1 Batch-wise Ragging Distribution**

![Line Chart](image)

**Figure 353**

Except for a slight increase in ragging from the 2015 to 2016 batch, there seems to be a continuous decline in ragging in campus.
1.2 Gender-wise Ragging Distribution

![Bar Chart]

The number of male identified students who said they were ragged was significantly much more (75.16%) than the number of female identified students who also answered in the affirmative (37.09%).

1.3 Caste-wise Ragging Distribution

![Bar Chart]

A higher proportion of Brahmin (66.90%) and Other Upper Caste (65.32%) students were ragged, in comparison to OBC (53.33%), SC (53.57%) and ST students (27.59%).
1.4 Income-wise Ragging Distribution

Students in the income bracket Below Rs. 6 LPA (69%), and in the Rs. 20 to 36 LPA (67%) bracket, experienced ragging relatively more than other income brackets.

1.5 Region-wise Ragging Distribution

5 respondents, out of 7 who are from villages were ragged in their First Year. A slightly higher proportion of students from Towns experienced ragging than those from Cities.

2. Sexual Harassment

The respondents were asked if they had faced sexual harassment from someone associated with the college. 14.70% of students in NUJS have been sexually harassed by someone who is an individual associated with the college. While 4.41% of students did not want to answer the question, about 81% marked no.
2.1 Gender-wise Sexual Harassment Distribution

As can be seen, 1 out of every 5 female-identified students and 1 out of every 10 male students has been sexually harassed by someone associated with NUJS.

2.2 Sexual Orientation-wise Sexual Harassment Distribution

Those who marked answers other than ‘Heterosexual’ when asked for their sexual orientation have faced significantly higher instances of sexual harassment (nearly 32%), compared to Heterosexuals (13%).
3. Discrimination

In this section, respondents were asked a set of questions to understand if they felt discriminated against at NUJS on the basis of different identity indicators. They marked on a range of 0 to 5 where 5 denotes very high, 4 denotes high, 3 denotes moderate, 2 denotes low, 1 and 0 cumulatively denotes very low.

3.1 Gender Discrimination

When asked if there was gender discrimination on the NUJS campus, about 58% answered it was Low/Very Low, while about 22% chose the High/Very High options.

3.1.1 Gender-wise Gender Discrimination

At nearly 30%, a considerably higher proportion of females said there was High/Very High discrimination based on Gender on the campus, while the corresponding figure for males was about 17%.
3.2. Sexual Orientation Discrimination

The majority of about 56% respondents felt there exists High/Very High discrimination based on Sexual Orientation on the NUJS campus.

3.2.1 Sexual Orientation-wise Sexual Orientation Discrimination

Out of the 486 heterosexual respondents, nearly 40% feel that there is very low discrimination on campus on basis of sexual orientation. About 22% of heterosexual respondents also feel that such discrimination is High/Very High.

Whereas, out of the 3 students who identify themselves as gay feel, 2 feel that such discrimination is moderate and 1 feels that it is very high. Among bisexual respondents too, 11 out of 37 students feel that there is very high discrimination while 4 feel that this is high.
3.3. Caste Discrimination

Overall, nearly 70% respondents feel there is Low/Very Low caste-based discrimination on the NUJS campus. About 13% feel it is High/Very High.

3.3.1 Caste-wise Caste Discrimination

Across all caste-groups, the highest proportions of those who said there is Low/Very Low caste-based discrimination are amongst Brahmins, followed by those from Other Religions, Other Upper Castes, and those who Don’t Know their Caste.

The highest proportions of such respondents who said it was High/Very are seen in the SC group, followed by Brahmins, OBC group, and those who Don’t Know their Caste.
3.4. Class Discrimination

Nearly an equal proportion of respondents i.e. around 40% answered that class-based discrimination was either High/Very High or Low/Very Low. The remaining chose the Moderate option.

3.4.1 Income-wise Class Discrimination

It is amongst those in the Below Rs. 6 LPA, and Rs. 6 to 12 LPA income brackets that we find the highest proportion of respondents who said class-based discrimination was High/Very High, in comparison to other income brackets.
3.5. Religious Discrimination

Just above three-quarters of all respondents feel there is Low/Very Low religion-based discrimination on campus. About 11% said it was High/Very High.

3.5.1 Religion-wise Religious Discrimination

The majority of respondents across all religions said religion-based discrimination was Low/Very Low. It is amongst Sikhs, Buddhists, and ‘Others’ the we find the highest proportion of respondents who felt such discrimination was High/Very High.
3.6. Religious Bias in Celebration of Festivals at NUJS

While the majority of all respondents said there is no religious bias in the festivals celebrated on campus, about 30% affirmed the existence of religious bias.

3.6.1 Religion-wise Religious Bias in Festivals

A majority of both Muslims, and Atheists feel there is a religious bias in the celebration of festivals at NUJS. It is amongst Buddhists (0), Christians (18%) and Hindus (25%) that we see the lowest proportion of respondents who agreed that religious bias exists.
When asked about the extent to which discrimination based on CLAT Rank exists, about 17% respondents said such discrimination was High/Very High, with a similar proportion (18%) saying it was Moderate.
3.7.1 Category-wise CLAT Rank Discrimination

In comparison to other admission categories, it is amongst respondents from the State Domicile category (horizontal reservation in the SC, ST, and OBC categories) that we see the highest proportion of those who said CLAT Rank based discrimination was High/Very High. Similarly, 2 out of 3 respondents in the J&K Residents category said such discrimination was High/Very High.

3.8. CGPA Discrimination

In the question of whether students feel there is discrimination on basis of the CGPA, nearly 50% said it was High/Very High. On the other hand, about 33% said it was Low/Very Low.
3.8.1 CGPA-wise CGPA Discrimination

![Figure 376]

It is amongst respondents in the Below 2 CGPA bracket (63%), and the 3-3.99 bracket (57%) that we find the highest proportions of respondents who said there was High/Very High discrimination based on CGPA. This is followed by respondents in the 5-5.99 bracket, at nearly 50%.

3.9. Discrimination on Political Views

The responses to the question on the extent of intolerance of people on campus towards opposing political views are in the chart depicted below.

![Figure 377]

The largest proportion of respondents (33%) feel there is Moderate discrimination based on political views on campus. Nearly 33% chose the High/Very High options.
3.10. Movie Choices-related Discrimination

![Figure 378](image)

Nearly a quarter of the respondents felt there High/Very High discrimination on campus based on one’s taste in movies.

3.11 Disability & Discrimination

Respondents were asked if they were differently abled, and if so, their opinion was sought on a further set of five questions regarding infrastructure support, faculty, academics and extra-curricular activities.

- 15 (2.75%) of the total respondents (544) stated that they are differently abled.
- 9 (60%) out of these 15 students were of the opinion that there can be some improvements in the infrastructural support for persons who are differently abled, 5 (33.3%) people marked no and only one person thought that the infrastructural support is adequate.
- 3 students marked no for the question on whether the faculty is accommodative of their disability. 5 of them opined that only some faculty is accommodating, 2 marked that most faculty is accommodative and 5 marked yes.
- To the question of whether project submission/ mid-sem exams/ end-sem examinations are suited to their needs, 6 students marked no, while 5 students answered in the affirmative. 3 others felt most are accommodative, while 1 person said only some are accommodative.
- 10 students thought that their disability has affected their CGPA while 5 have not.
- To the question of whether they think their disability has affected their participation in moot court competition/ debates / ADR competitions, 6 students said yes and 9 said no.
4. Professional Help

To the question of if they have ever consulted any professional help ever during law school, about one-fifth, or 19% of the respondents answered positively.

4.1 Gender-wise Professional Help Distribution

A higher proportion of female respondents (25%) have taken professional help during law school than males (15%).
4.2 Sexual Orientation-wise Professional Help Distribution

While about 23% of Heterosexuals have consulted professional help, the figure is higher at about 28% for Non-Heterosexuals at NUJS.

4.3 Professional Help Distribution for those who have faced Sexual Harassment by someone related to NUJS

Out of the 80 sexual harassment survivors in NUJS, 38 respondents have said they have taken professional help.

4.4 Caste-wise Professional Help Distribution

Figure 381

Figure 382
The highest proportions of those who have taken professional help are seen amongst respondents in the SC group (23%), followed by Other Upper Castes (21%), those who Don’t Know their Caste (20%), and Brahmins (18%).

**4.5 Income-wise Professional Help Distribution**

![Income-wise Professional Help Distribution](image)

While nearly 25% respondents in the Above 36 LPA bracket have taken professional help, the corresponding figure is highest in the Below 6 LPA bracket (20%).

**4.6 Scholarship Recipient-wise Professional Help Distribution**

14 out of 52 scholarship recipients have taken professional help. This means that nearly 1 in every 4 scholarship recipients has taken professional help.

**4.7 Ragging-wise Professional Help Distribution**

68 out of 322 students who reported they were ragged have sought professional help in the past.
5. Miscellaneous

5.1 Gender Neutral Hostel

Nearly 18% respondents rated the idea of having gender neutral hostels Very Highly, while another 34% rated it Highly. On the other end, about 27% said their support for the proposition was Low/Very Low.

5.1.1 Gender-wise Gender Neutral Hostel Distribution

A higher proportion of males (nearly 60%) support the idea of gender-neutral hostels Highly/Very Highly, as compared to females (45%). One person who identified as Transgender was not supportive of such an idea.
5.2 Medical Facilities & Improvements Needed

To the question of whether students believe that there is a lack of proper medical aid in the campus, about 89% marked yes while only 4% marked no. The rest said can’t say.

A follow-up question asked the students to mark the option through which the medical facilities provided by the college can be improved.

- 363 students (67%) marked that there should be a doctor available in campus 24*7.
- 379 (70%) marked that there should be a tie-up with a local hospital that can provide medical treatment at a subsidised rate.
- 335 students (62%) marked that there should be collaboration with a local hospital to provide emergency treatment.
- 190 students (35%) marked that the college should provide for subsidized medical treatment in high end hospitals like Apollo for its students.
- 289 students (53%) marked that there should be medical facilities that should be made accessible through tie-ups with Pharmaceuticals, etc.
- 131 students (24%) marked that there should be a mandatory medical insurance policy for students in upcoming batches.
- 228 students (42%) marked that there should be an option for students of upcoming batches to avail a medical insurance policy.
DIVERSITY WITHIN DIVERSITY CENSUS TEAM

This section maps the diversity within the group of 33 volunteers who were involved in the NUJS Diversity Census.

1. Batches

The volunteers were asked which batch they were studying in at the time of filling up the NUJS Diversity Census Form, 2019-20. Among 544 students who responded, 33 students participated in assisting the other students in filling up responses to the Form. Out of these volunteers, 13 (39.4%) were from the 2018 batch, 6 (18.2%) from the 2017 batch, 5 (15.2%) each from the 2016 batch and the 2014 batch, while 4 (12.1%) belonged to the 2015 batch.

2. Category

Volunteers were asked under what category they had received admission at the time of joining NUJS. Out of the 33 volunteers, 22 (66.7%) belonged to the General Category, 4 (12.1%) belonged to the NRI Category, 2 (6.1%) belonged to the PWD Category, 3 (9.1%) belonged to the SC Category, 1 (3%) belonged to the State Domicile General category and 1 (3%) belonged to the State Domicile SC Category respectively.

3. Gender

Volunteers were asked what gender they identified with at the time of filling up the form. Out of the 33 volunteers, 14 (42.4%) students were female whereas 19 (57.6%) were male respectively.

4. Religion

Out of the 33 volunteers, 22 (66.7%) students were Hindu, 5 (15.2%) were atheists, 2 (6.1%) were Christians, 2 (6.1%) were followers of Islam, and 2 (6.1%) were Sikh respectively.

5. Caste

Volunteers were asked which caste they belonged to. Out of 33 volunteers, 10 (30.3%) volunteers each identified as Brahmins and Other Upper Castes. Then, 5 (15.2%) said the question on caste was Not Applicable/they belonged to Other Religion, while another 4 (12.1%) identified as Scheduled Castes. In the remaining 4 volunteers, we see 2 (6.1%) who said they were OBCs, while 2 others Don’t Know their Caste.

6. Background

Out of the 33 volunteers, 26 (78.8%) students came from cities whereas 6 (18.2%) came from towns whereas 1 (3%) student came from a village.

7. Parental and Average Income
Out of the 33 students, 11 each (33.3%) are in the income brackets of Rs. 6 to 12 LPA, and of Rs. 12 to 20 LPA. In the remaining 11 students, 6 (18.2%) were in Rs. 3 to 6 LPA, and 2 (6.1%) each in the Below Rs. 3 LPA bracket, and in the Above Rs. 36 LPA bracket respectively.

Assuming the mean value for each income bracket, the average income of 33 diversity census was Rs. 12,18,750/-. 

8. Primary language of instruction in the school

Out of 33 volunteers who were part of the diversity census team, only 1 Volunteer (3%) came from a school which had only Hindi as the primary language of instruction. There were 8 volunteers (24.2%) who had both English and Hindi as primary languages of instruction in their school while there were 24 Volunteers (72.7) who came from a purely English background as language of instruction in their school. There was no volunteer from other vernacular background.

9. Nature of High school

There were 2 Volunteers (6.1%) who termed their school as convent while 14 volunteers (42.4) associated themselves with top private high school. There were 17 (51.5%) volunteers who termed their high school as merely private school. Interestingly, there was no volunteer who studied from government school.

10. Boards, Stream and 12th Percentage

There were 21 Volunteers (63.6%) went to CBSE schools, while 9 volunteers (27.3%) went to ISC schools. Only 3 volunteers (9.1%) were from State Boards.

Most of the volunteers from census team came from Science background (16 members or 48.5%) while 12 Volunteers (36.4%) came from commerce background while 5 Volunteers came from Humanities background (15.2%).

14 volunteers (42.4%) scored between 80-89% in class 12th, 10 volunteers (30%) scored between 90-95%, while 7 volunteers (21.2%) scored above 95% while only 2 volunteers (6.1%) scored between 70-79%.

11. Fluency in Spoken English now

Most of the volunteers in diversity census were comfortable in spoken English which is evident as 27 of 33 volunteers (81.9%) rated their fluency in spoken English as High/Very High. 2 volunteers marked their fluency as Medium while 4 others rated it as Low.
12. Fluency in Written English Now

Most volunteers were comfortable in written English too as 25 volunteers (75.8%) said they are Highly/Extremely Highly fluent in the language. 4 (12.1%) rated their written fluency as Medium, while 3 (9.1%) said it was Low/Very Low.

13. CGPA

Volunteers were asked what their attest CGPA was. Out of the 33 volunteers, 2 (6.1%) had a CGPA of 2-2.99, while 8 (24.2%) had a CGPA of 3-3.99. Another 10 (30%) had a CGPA from 4- 4.99, and 11 (33.3%) others had a CGPA between 5-5.99. Only 2 (6.1%) had a CGPA Above 6.

14. Membership of SJA Societies & Office Bearers

Out of the 33 volunteers, 6 (12.1%) had been a part of 3 or more societies, and 9 (27.3%) had been a part of 2 societies. Another 13 (39.4%) have been a part of 1 society while 5 (15.2%) had never been a part of any SJA society.

Out of 33 volunteers, 21 (63.6%) had never been office bearers. In the remaining 12 volunteers, 7 (21.2%) had been office bearers of SJA societies, 2 (6.1%) had been office bearers of Non-SJA societies, and 4 (12.1%) had been office bearers of the SJA.

15. Research Papers

Out of 33 volunteers, 6 (18.2%) had published the research papers, while 27 (81.8%) haven’t published any paper.

16. Debates Participation

Out of 33 volunteers, 4 (12.1%) had participated in International tournaments, 6 (18.2%) had participated in National tournaments, 10 (30%) had participated in University Rounds and 13 (39.40%) had never participated in the activity.

17. Moot Court Participation

Out of 33 volunteers, 4 (12.1%) had participated in International competitions, 14 (42.4%) had participated in national competitions, 3 (9.1%) had participated in University rounds and 12 (36.3%) had not participated in any moot.

18. ADR Participation

Out of 33 volunteers, 2 (6.1%) had participated in International competitions, 3(9.1%) had participated in national competitions, 4 (12.1%) had participated in University rounds, and 24 (72.7%) had not participated in any ADR. Additionally, one volunteer had participated in all three competitions. 8 volunteers represented the university in at least two competitions on the national/international levels in these activities.
APPENDIX

The categorization of responses to the question of ‘what is your caste (sect)’ into different caste-groups is as follows.

Respondents could choose one amongst the ‘Brahmin’, ‘Baniya’, ‘Kshatriya’, ‘Kayastha’, ‘OBC’, ‘SC’, ‘ST’, ‘Don’t Know’, ‘Other Religion/ Not Applicable’, and ‘Other’ options. Some respondents also gave answers such as ‘Sindhi’, ‘Marwari’, ‘Yadav’ etc. We have referred to the Central Government’s lists of SCs, STs and OBCs as notified by law. In some cases, we have also referred to the State Government’s lists as well, in reference to the state that the respondent comes from. 25 respondents who chose ‘Kayastha’ have been categorised as Other Upper Castes. The answers we received have been categorised into these caste-groups as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Group</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>Proportion of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Upper Castes</td>
<td>Sindhi (3) Nair (1) Naidu (1) Marwadi (1) Kshatriya (61) Kayastha (25) Jain (1) General Hindu (1) Gowda (1) Bhumihar (1) Baniya (75) Acyuta (1) Yadav (1) Arora Sikh (1)</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Backward Classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Caste</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>