

# Struggling to control research quality, India reverses the “publish or perish” policy and decentralizes quality control

Ajit Sane<sup>1</sup>, Suraj Sharma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ramachandran International Institute of Management, India.  
Corresponding author

Email: saneajit4@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1713-9159>.

<sup>2</sup> Arihant Institute of Business Management, India.

---

## ABSTRACT

**Objective.** This study highlighted potential limitations in a policy aimed at mandating the publication of research papers as a means of ensuring quality. It explored the underlying mechanisms and rationales suggesting that such policies may, in some cases, yield unintended consequences, potentially affecting research quality adversely. The study also evaluated the decision to decentralize quality control at the level of local universities.

**Design/Methodology/Approach.** A dual approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative elements, was employed in the analysis. A survey was conducted on approximately 400 research scholars, who were asked to respond to a predetermined questionnaire. Two hypotheses were tested: first, that mandatory measures may not effectively promote quality; and second, that a decentralized approach to control quality will be effective. These hypotheses were tested based on survey data. Furthermore, an additional five experts were interviewed to explore the matter in greater depth.

**Results/Discussion.** The hypothesis that the “publish or perish” policy has not been effective in enhancing research quality was corroborated. The data suggested that mandating publication for quality assurance purposes may have had unintended negative effects. This trend appeared to be associated with the growth of journals characterized as cloned, predatory, or of questionable integrity, which offered publication opportunities in exchange for fees. As a result, a commercialized journal ecosystem began to take shape. Many research scholars engaged with such journals to meet the formal requirements for publication. The second hypothesis, which postulated the efficacy of a decentralized approach to quality control, was not supported by the data. Despite the prevailing sentiment that decentralization had been a successful strategy, researchers expressed reservations regarding its efficacy.

**Conclusions.** The implementation of a “publish or perish” policy did not necessarily result in the desired enhancement of research quality. Given the recognized limitations of the quality policy at the national level, research scholars were also doubtful about the potential success of decentralized quality controls

**Received:** 14-04-2025. **Accepted:** 25-04-2025. **Published:** 11-05-2025.

**How to cite:** Sane, A., & Sharma, S. (2025). Struggling to control research quality, India reverses the “publish or perish” policy and decentralizes quality control. *Iberoamerican Journal of Science Measurement and Communication*; 5(2), 1-17. DOI: 10.47909/ijsmc.224

**Copyright:** © 2025 The author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC 4.0 license which permits copying and redistributing the material in any medium or format, adapting, transforming, and building upon the material as long as the license terms are followed.

at the local university level. In light of these challenges, experts had proposed alternative mechanisms to ensure the quality of research.

**Keywords:** publish or perish; university grants commission; research quality; academic research; decentralization.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

THE POLICY of “publish or perish” is a widespread phenomenon. For instance, in Poland and other European nations, at least one peer-reviewed publication is a prerequisite for obtaining a PhD (Sorokowski *et al.*, 2017). A potential pitfall of compulsion is its proclivity to engender counterproductive outcomes (Albertella *et al.*, 2019; De Haan *et al.*, 2013; Sinclair, 1997; van den Hout *et al.*, 2008). This phenomenon can be exemplified by the compulsory publishing requirement in India. Contrary to the expectation of enhancing the rigor and validity of their research, scholars have been observed publishing research that does not always adhere to the highest standards of scientific integrity. The University Grants Commission Consortium for Academic and Research Ethics (UGC-CARE) endeavored to intervene by publishing a cloned journal list on its website. In an effort to align with international standards for excellence in research, the UGC, the governing body for higher education in India, has initiated a program known as the “Quality Mandate.” This initiative, launched in 2018, has established a dedicated CARE to facilitate the implementation of the aforementioned plan. As of March 2025, the UGC had identified more than 200 journals as cloned, referring to websites that imitate legitimate academic journals (University Grants Commission, 2025). However, the proliferation of journals characterized as cloned, predatory, or of questionable integrity has become a widespread issue, with thousands of these publications currently in circulation. For instance, Patwardhan (2019) has written about the removal of approximately 4,000 predatory journal titles from the recognized journal database.

In February 2025, the UGC discontinued the use of quality listings maintained by a designated body that had been set up to help guide research publication standards. On November 7, 2022, the UGC revised its PhD policy by removing the requirement for doctoral candidates to

publish research papers in specified categories of peer-reviewed journals (University Grants Commission, 2022). The intention to rescind the policy was communicated to the press several months before its actual withdrawal. “The UGC is currently making amendments to the UGC Regulations, 2016. The rule required PhD scholars to publish at least one research paper in a UGC refereed/peer-reviewed journal before the submission of the dissertation/thesis for adjudication,” writes Iftikhar (2022) under the caption “UGC considers scrapping rule on publishing research for PhD,” published in a leading Indian national daily the *Hindustan Times*. “UGC considers scrapping rule on publishing research for PhD,” reports another national daily (*Times News Network*, 2022). In 2016, the UGC incorporated a stipulation into its PhD regulations stipulating the mandatory publication of at least one research paper in a designated category of peer-reviewed journals by research scholars prior to thesis submission (University Grants Commission, 2016). Subsequently, the institution established the CARE initiative, which stipulated the journals in which research scholars were obligated to publish their research articles. The primary objective of this initiative was to enhance research quality, ensure academic integrity and ethics, and foster a culture of scholarly excellence. Popularly known as UGC-CARE (University Grants Commission, 2018), the apex body categorized journals into two groups, which were considered primary avenues for research publication. Group I journals are Indian journals that have been evaluated and selected by the UGC-CARE based on their standing, peer-review systems, and other quality considerations. Group II journals are defined as those journals that are indexed in globally recognized databases, such as Scopus or Web of Science, which are widely regarded as the gold standard for indexing in the field of scholarly communication. Prior to submitting their thesis, research scholars are required to publish at least one research article in a journal that falls within either

Group I or Group II of the UGC-CARE listing. This phenomenon is not unique to the United States; similar practices can be observed in other countries as well.

The study endeavors to comprehend the rationale behind the implementation of the “publish or perish” quality policy and the subsequent decision to discontinue it. A review of potential alternative mechanisms to substitute for the policy is also conducted. Furthermore, the decision to decentralize research quality control at the local university level is evaluated. The study is grounded in the perspectives of approximately 400 research scholars and five experts in academic research. The quality of Indian PhDs has been the subject of intermittent scrutiny. “Higher education in India has expanded a lot over the last decade. But with growth in quantity, keeping a tab on quality becomes a major concern,” said UGC member Sushma Yadav, explaining the rationale of the study to be done by the UGC for the quality of Indian PhD theses over the last decade.

Our output is quite large, but [Indian research] does not figure anywhere on global rankings. Many PhD scholars do not know what they are doing. If you sit over 15-20 books and then write something, that is not what research is. Without original thinking and innovation, they will not make any dent. (Jebaraj, 2019)

Roy (2022) has similarly expressed concerns regarding the quality of Indian PhD programs. The UGC is the primary institutional entity responsible for regulating the quality of academic research in India. In an effort to enhance the rigor and credibility of research conducted within Indian institutions, the UGC mandated the publication of research findings in peer-reviewed journals. However, some publishers viewed this shift as an opportunity for commercial gain. The academic publishing landscape has seen a rise in journals that duplicate existing titles, operate with predatory practices, or lack clear indicators of authenticity. Studies have noted that some questionable journals have published large volumes of low-quality articles by researchers within single issues, sometimes spanning tens of thousands of pages (Khedkar *et al.*, 2022).

This mandatory requirement led to a ‘journal business’ in India. Making anything mandatory does not improve the quality of research. Therefore, UGC is now considering doing away with this requirement while strongly recommending research scholars to publish the research outcomes of their PhD in peer-reviewed journals, apply for patents, and present in conferences. (UGC chairperson M. Jagdish Kumar told *Hindustan Times*, a leading Indian national daily; Iftikhar, 2022)

The prevailing inclination to disseminate scholarly work has yielded outcomes that are, at best, suboptimal. The UGC has delegated the responsibility of establishing guidelines for the publication of research journals to individual universities. Consequently, the institution has retracted its involvement in the quality control initiative by reversing the “publish or perish” policy. The responsibility for ensuring the quality of research has been transferred to individual universities, research supervisors, and research scholars. However, the question arises as to whether the apex body possessed the capacity to regulate the quality of research and whether individual universities will possess a similar capability. In the context of these developments, this study seeks to address two research inquiries:

- RQ1: Did the “publish or perish” policy succeed in improving research quality?
- RQ2: How far the attempt to decentralize quality control at local levels is likely to succeed?

It is anticipated that the publication will furnish policymakers with significant insights pertaining to academic research publications. It is anticipated that this decision will encourage other nations to adopt a similar approach and abandon the “publish or perish” policy, as India has done. Concurrently, it puts forth alternative mechanisms to achieve the objectives underlying the policy’s establishment.

### 1.1. Literature review

A comprehensive review of the extant literature on the “publish or perish” policy and decentralization in educational institutions was conducted, with a focus on its impact on quality.

### 1.1.1. "Publish or perish" policy

Amutuhaire (2022) posits that "publish or perish" is a global phenomenon in which researchers compete for academic spaces. However, the policy is expected to have a negative impact on African researchers rather than enhancing the quality of research. The author has identified several contextual issues that should be addressed when formulating the policy. African researchers have restricted access to high-quality academic journals, which hinders the ability to establish and maintain standards within the research community. Furthermore, the financial constraints experienced by these entities often preclude their ability to meet the substantial publication charges demanded by traditional publishers. Research has indicated a sporadic rise in the number of open-access journals from 2018 onwards (Pandita & Singh, 2022). This phenomenon can be attributed to the "publish or perish" policy, which has been a hallmark of academic publishing. In the context of communication studies, the "publish or perish" policy has been observed to prioritize publications in Scopus-indexed journals as the gold standard (Demeter *et al.*, 2022). Due to increased globalization, the policy now stands as "publish in journals of international repute or perish." A recent study by Kendall and Linacre (2022) has documented a sporadic rise in predatory journals over the last decade. This phenomenon underscores the mounting influence of the "publish or perish" policy, whereby researchers are compelled to manage their publications. The findings of an investigation reveal that a predatory journal published 20% more papers after discovering that it had published a spoof paper (Kendall, 2021). This phenomenon effectively subverts the authorities' attempts to regulate journals characterized as cloned or of questionable integrity. A recent study has indicated that the proliferation of open-access journals has resulted in certain journals adopting unethical practices. These journals have been found to accept financial compensation from authors, thereby compromising the standards of academic rigor and quality (Tindall *et al.*, 2021). The prevalence of predatory journals has escalated to such a degree that endeavors to expose them through undercover investigations have increased (Teixeira da Silva, 2021).

"Publish or perish" is not just a policy. This phenomenon has been referred to as a "model" in academic discourse. Variations of the "pay to publish or perish" model have been discussed in the literature (Al-Khatib & Teixeira da Silva, 2017). A review of the extant literature reveals a paucity of studies that have examined the relationship between "publish or perish" policies and the outcomes of scholarly publications. For instance, a study has been conducted on the impact of this policy on Central Asian journalism and mass communication faculties (Kurambayev & Freedman, 2021). The findings of this study indicate that authors are engaging in unethical practices due to the pressure of research publications. Research of a similar nature was conducted for Information Systems Research (Wiener *et al.*, 2018).

The existence of the policy is well-documented, as evidenced by a study on the policy conducted in 2005 (De Rond & Miller, 2005). It has been noted by authors that the policy's deleterious effects, particularly in regard to creativity, require attention. A number of studies have been conducted with the objective of providing education and protection to authors from predatory journals and publishers, given their substantial growth in the wake of the "publish or perish" mantra (Al-Khatib, 2016). The policy is so pervasive that scholars have referred to it as a "culture" (Al-Khatib, 2016; De Rond & Miller, 2005; Kurambayev & Freedman, 2021). Research has identified specific nations that have been identified as leading contributors to predatory publications. For instance, Eshchanov *et al.* (2021) state that researchers from Uzbekistan are at the top of the list of predatory publications. Demir (2018) asserts that researchers from 146 countries have published their papers in predatory journals. The prevailing incentives, the pressure to publish, and a lack of awareness were the primary factors that encouraged researchers to publish in predatory journals. The most significant contributions are derived from India, followed by Nigeria and Turkey. While the majority of submissions to this journal are from scholars in developing countries who benefit from the low submission fees, it is only a matter of time before unsuspecting scholars in Europe and North America become entangled in such journals (Simón, 2016). The mounting pressure to publish has

had deleterious effects on the academic climate, particularly in the domain of online publishing, where faculties are susceptible to ethical misconduct (Bretag, 2012).

There is a divergence in the perception of the merits and drawbacks of the “publish or perish” policy. In a study of economists, approximately two-thirds of respondents expressed a favorable opinion of the policy, while approximately one-third expressed an unfavorable opinion. In a similar vein, full professors exhibited a greater propensity to perceive the policy in a favorable light, in contrast to other faculty members who demonstrated a more balanced perspective, acknowledging both advantages and disadvantages (Van Dalen, 2021). In an effort to cultivate a culture of research integrity, measures have been implemented to mitigate the adverse consequences associated with the “publish or perish” policy (Becker & Lukka, 2022). A notable challenge associated with this policy pertains to the redundancy of studies conducted by authors and publishers, which results in the repetition of identical research. In the context of tourism and hospitality journals, while the number of journal issues and articles has increased considerably, there has been a notable decline in sections such as book reviews and conference notes (Ertaş & Kozak, 2020). In another study related to the tourism and hospitality domain, the author observed a decline in the quality of publications in four leading tourism and hospitality management journals between 1990 and 2010 due to the “publish or perish” policy (Yankholmes, 2014). The policy is associated with three adverse implications. One such concern pertains to the ethical implications of research processes. Secondly, such contributions are not beneficial for society. Thirdly, the policy excludes social justice issues and undermines academic identities as well as the dignity of the academic community (Madikizela-Madiya, 2022). It is recommended that suggestions for a more open and international research environment be considered, as such changes could benefit early career researchers who have yet to build up a solid publication record. Researchers operating within this paradigm are more susceptible to the pitfalls of the “publish or perish” policy. Consequently, it is imperative that structural modifications be implemented

to safeguard their interests (Tie & Wang, 2022). A number of studies have modified the traditional “publish or perish” policy to “publish and perish,” underscoring the detrimental consequences of the original policy (Hall, 2011; Nyamnjoh, 2004).

### 1.1.2. Decentralization in educational institutions and its impact on quality

A substantial body of literature indicates a close correlation between the concept of “publish or perish” and the quality of research outcomes (Dani, 2018; Lambovska & Todorova, 2021; Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016). Consequently, this study undertakes a comprehensive review of the impact of UGC decentralization decisions, with a specific focus on their implications for quality assurance. Uwakwe *et al.* (2008) found that decentralization and privatization had a positive impact on the quality of education in a Nigerian study. The decentralized policy was associated with a number of positive outcomes, including enhanced workers’ welfare, increased community participation, and expanded access to education. A review of the literature on decentralization in the Dutch PGME accreditation system was conducted by Akdemir *et al.* (2017). The prevailing belief is that the decentralization of decision-making will engender greater local autonomy, leading to enhanced accountability and reduced oversight by the accrediting body. Kyriacou and Roca-Sagalés’ (2011) seminal study revealed a positive correlation between fiscal decentralization and enhanced government quality. Rondinelli (2017) has articulated a congruent perspective on decentralization and governance. In the context of governance and quality in education, Mok (2004) has stated that there is an absence of evidence to support the claim that a centralized or decentralized approach is superior. As Hanson (1997) has demonstrated, the quality of education can be enhanced or diminished through decentralization, as measured by test scores. The attribution of these changes to decentralization reform may not be feasible due to the numerous socioeconomic and organizational variables involved.

In the context of Vietnamese higher educational institutions (HEIs), Tran (2014) has advanced the argument that decentralization

does not inherently constitute a positive development, particularly in instances where grassroots organizations that acquire power lack the capacity to effect meaningful change and concurrently, the central ministry divests control over the objectives and outcomes that these grassroots organizations are tasked with achieving. Leung (2004) has observed that educational decentralization in the Eastern world was undertaken with the objective of enhancing the quality of education. Ho (2004) has posited that the success and quality enhancement witnessed in educational institutions of East Asian countries can be attributed to the implementation of decentralization policies. Derqui (2010) has observed that decentralization in educational institutions in Argentina and Brazil is linked with improved quality of education. The decentralization of education—defined as the process of transferring decision-making power from higher to lower units of school management—has emerged as a global phenomenon in the pursuit of quality education (Caldwell & Spinks, 1988; Clune & Witte, 1990; Fiske, 1996; Hanson, 1998; Mitchell, 1997; Prawda, 1993; Varghese, 1996). A comprehensive review of the extant literature reveals a predominant critical stance toward the “publish or perish” policy. However, no study has examined the official reversal of the “publish or perish” quality policy at a national level. While authors have underscored the policy’s deleterious consequences, they have not demonstrated the fortitude to demand a formal withdrawal of the policy. Consequently, this study provides a thorough examination of the initiation, reversal, and aftermath of the reversal of the quality policy, including the decision of decentralization, which has been predominantly associated with quality enhancement. In the context of the extant literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- Ho1: “Publish or perish” policy has succeeded in improving research quality.
- Ha1: “Publish or perish” policy has not succeeded in improving research quality.
- Ho2: Decentralized approach to controlling quality will not be effective.
- Ha2: Decentralized approach to controlling quality will be effective.

## 2. METHODS

The research questions posed for this study demanded substantial evidence and reasonable experience and expertise. A quantitative method was employed to collect the substantial opinion of the research fraternity on the issues involved. According to the All India Survey on Higher Education (n.d.), the annual report for the 2021-2022 period indicates that the number of doctoral research scholars in India is 213,000. According to the methods outlined by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the minimum sample size required for this population is 384, given a 95% confidence level and a 5% confidence interval. A questionnaire was developed using Google Forms and disseminated to approximately 800 research scholars throughout India. Contact information was obtained from the research centers. In March 2025, a total of 373 responses were received. The study indicated a response rate of 47%. In accordance with the hypotheses, the questionnaire was composed of two sections: (I) Impact of “publish or perish” quality policy and (II) the efficacy of a decentralized approach to the control of quality is a subject that merits close examination. A total of 10 statements were formulated under each of the two sections. The responses to the rating scale were collected using a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree). The questionnaire was subjected to a validity checklist developed by Brown *et al.* (2015), and the results were deemed satisfactory.

The reliability test of the questionnaire yielded Cronbach’s alpha scores of 0.87 for Section I, 0.88 for Section II, and 0.90 for the entire questionnaire. The questionnaire was deemed reliable, with scores exceeding 0.70. The 10 statements in each section are related to common underlying constructs. The mean score for each of the 10 statements was calculated by averaging the scores from both sections. In the course of this study, weights of 2 were assigned to the strong responses (strongly agree and strongly disagree) on the five-point Likert scale to differentiate them from the moderate responses (somewhat agree and somewhat disagree). The application of these

weights yielded an average percentage of agreement and disagreement for each section, calculated from the responses of 373 respondents. These means were subsequently averaged to calculate a single Likert scale aggregate agreement/disagreement percentage for the two sections. The maximum of the two for each section (agreement/disagreement) represented the samples' mean response, which was then compared with a hypothesized 50% agreement/disagreement percentage, connoting agreement/disagreement by chance. This was done to determine whether the overall agreement/disagreement was statistically significant (Khedkar *et al.*, 2022; Kumar *et al.*, 2022a, 2022b, 2023, 2025a, 2025b). A *t*-test, a popular tool for comparing means, was applied, given the unknown population standard deviation (if this were known, a *Z*-test would have been used instead). The testing was conducted at a 95% confidence level. The statements presented in Section I (impact of “publish or perish” quality policy), in conjunction with the referenced literature, are enumerated below:

1. The policy has failed to improve quality (Amutuhaire, 2022).
2. The policy has harmed the interest of researchers (Amutuhaire, 2022).
3. It has led to a sporadic rise in predatory journals (Demeter *et al.*, 2022).
4. It has negatively affected aspects such as creativity (De Rond & Miller, 2005).
5. Researchers somehow manage the publications without much care for quality (Kendall & Linacre, 2022).
6. Academic rigor and quality have been sacrificed (Tindall *et al.*, 2021).
7. The policy has become “pay to publish or perish” (Al-Khatib & Teixeira da Silva, 2017).
8. Authors are engaging in unethical practices (Kurambayev & Freedman, 2021).
9. Indian authors are among the top contributors to predatory publications (Demir, 2018).
10. Predatory journals charge low fees and offer quick publication (Simón, 2016).

The statements presented in Section II (effectiveness of a decentralized approach to controlling quality), in conjunction with the referenced literature, are enumerated below:

1. Decentralization has a positive impact on the quality of education (Uwakwe *et al.*, 2008).
2. Decentralization is good as it implies more trust in local universities (Akdemir *et al.*, 2017).
3. Decentralization, in general, has a positive impact on governance (Rondinelli, 2017).
4. Like other parts of the world, decentralization has been a successful strategy in India in the past as well (Derqui, 2010).
5. Researchers will respond positively to the appeal by UGC Chairman about quality publications and patents (Iftikhar, 2022).
6. Decentralization leads to better participation of locals (Uwakwe *et al.*, 2008).
7. Decentralization will relieve the central authority (UGC) of intensive monitoring (Akdemir *et al.*, 2017).
8. As the centralized approach has failed, the decentralized approach will succeed (Mok, 2004).
9. The local universities are powerful enough to ensure quality (Tran, 2014).
10. The local universities are better equipped technically to enhance quality (Tran, 2014).

A qualitative approach was selected for its capacity to facilitate in-depth probing, a level of investigation that might not be feasible with quantitative methods. Following the realization that a saturation point had been reached, a sample size of five was determined for interviews with experts. The sample size was based on the opinion of expert researcher Dworkin (2012), who said,

While some experts in qualitative research avoid the topic of ‘how many’ interviews are ‘enough’, there is indeed variability in what is suggested as a minimum. Many articles, chapters, and books recommend guidance and suggest anywhere from 5 to 50 participants as adequate. (p. 1319)

The five experts selected were senior academicians associated with various universities in India. The inclusion criterion stipulated a minimum work experience of 20 years. All of them had extensive experience in mentoring numerous research scholars. Their consent to participate was obtained via telephone. The experts were selected through the implementation of

purposive sampling, a technique that is generally applied in qualitative methodologies (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2024). The selection was guided by the criterion of sizable experience in guiding many research scholars. The number of five participants was deemed adequate in accordance with Dworkin's (2012) expert guidance on the sample size in qualitative research. Ethics committee approval was obtained from a local university. The following inquiries were posed to the five experts:

1. What was the rationale for adopting the “publish or perish” policy?
2. Why has the Indian apex body UGC decided to do away with this policy?
3. What should happen next after the UGC reverses the “publish or perish” policy?

The dataset and transcripts of the five interviews have been deposited in a repository and can be accessed from <https://www.openicpsr.org/openicpsr/project/226661/version/V1/view>. The standard steps involved in qualitative data analysis were employed to process the primary data received from the experts (De Hoyos & Barnes, 2012). Common themes were identified from the answers, which are presented and discussed in the subsequent section of the study.

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1. Survey data

##### 3.1.1. Profile information

The demographic composition of the sample is as follows: 175 respondents identified as male, constituting 47% of the total, while 198 respondents identified as female, constituting 53% of the total. The population was predominantly youthful, with 87 individuals (23%) being under 30 years of age. A significant proportion, 102 (27%), fell within the 30-39 age category, while an additional 102 (27%) were between 40 and 49 years of age. Notably, 82 individuals (22%) were at least 50 years of age. The geographical distribution of the respondents is as follows: 82 respondents (22%) hailed from the Northern region, 81 respondents (22%) were from the Eastern region, 142 respondents

(38%) were from the Western region, and 68 respondents (18%) were from the Southern region. A total of 186 respondents (representing 50% of the total sample) indicated that they had not published in the aforementioned journals. Meanwhile, 97 respondents (26% of the total sample) reported having published in one journal, 48 respondents (13% of the total sample) in two journals, and 42 respondents (11% of the total sample) in more than two journals.

##### 3.1.2. Sectional responses and hypotheses testing

The plain count of the responses to the two sections is given in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Tables 3 and 4 present the weighted count and the bifurcation into agreement and disagreement for the two sections, respectively.

The mean agreement and disagreement percentages for the 10 Section I responses were 83% and 17%, respectively. The mean agreement and disagreement percentages for the 10 Section II responses were 51% and 49%, respectively. Given that the agreement percentage had reached its maximum, a comparison was made between the two agreement percentages for Sections I and II (83% and 51%, respectively) and the hypothesized population mean of 50% agreement. This was done to determine whether the observed agreement could be attributed to chance. The two hypotheses were evaluated using a *t*-test at a 95% confidence level, and the results are presented in Table 5.

The initial null hypothesis, which posited that the “publish or perish” policy has been effective in enhancing research quality, was refuted. This was due to the substantial degree of consensus (83%) among respondents to the 10 negative statements presented in Section I, with a *p*-value < 0.0001, indicating a high level of statistical significance. However, the second null hypothesis, which states that a decentralized approach to controlling quality will not be effective, could not be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis, which states that a decentralized approach to controlling quality will be effective. This decision was made based on a very thin majority of average agreement (51%) to the 10 statements in Section II (*p* = 0.47).



Response	1*	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly agree	151	147	152	155	164	151	141	154	163	156
Somewhat agree	161	140	154	161	168	155	144	160	158	157
Neither agree nor disagree	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	1	3	5
Somewhat disagree	30	51	25	24	20	23	39	27	24	26
Strongly disagree	28	33	39	29	18	41	45	31	25	29

**Table 1.** Plain count of Section I (impact of “publish or perish” quality policy) responses. **Source.** Authors primary data. \* Statement 1 from Section I of the questionnaire.

Response	1*	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly agree	97	104	100	99	91	112	100	86	92	101
Somewhat agree	92	87	84	87	87	84	87	91	88	90
Neither agree nor disagree	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	1	3	5
Somewhat disagree	86	96	89	88	97	85	90	92	96	88
Strongly disagree	95	84	97	95	95	89	92	103	94	89

**Table 2.** Plain count of Section II (effectiveness of a decentralized approach to controlling quality) responses. **Source.** Authors primary data. \* Statement 1 from Section II of the questionnaire.

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Agreement (%)	84	79	82	85	90	81	77	84	87	85
Disagreement (%)	16	21	18	15	10	19	23	16	13	15

**Table 3.** Weighted agreement/disagreement for Section I responses. **Source.** Authors primary data.

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Agreement (%)	51	53	50	51	48	54	51	47	49	52
Disagreement (%)	49	47	50	49	52	46	49	53	51	48

**Table 4.** Weighted agreement/disagreement for Section II responses. **Source.** Authors primary data.

Parameter	H1	H2
Average agreement = Ho (sample mean)	83%	51%
SD (standard deviation)	1.22357	1.5913
H1 (hypothesized mean of population)	50%	50%
n (sample size)	373	373
t-value (Ho – H1) / ((SD) / √n)	5.26267	0.07263
p-value	<0.0001	0.4711
Decision	Reject null	Failed to reject null

**Table 5.** Testing of the two hypotheses. **Source.** Primary data calculations.

### 3.2. Expert interview data

#### 3.2.1. The rationale for the adoption of “publish or perish” policy

Common themes from the expert interviews are given below:

1. *Controlling the quality of the research output.* The introduction of higher pay scales (sixth pay scales) in HEIs in India has led to a mandate for the possession of a PhD qualification for academic progression. The apex agency, the UGC, instituted a PhD Entrance Test (PET) to ensure a certain minimum standard at the input stage. Furthermore, the institution has instituted a system of coursework and bimonthly progress reports to ensure the effective management of the process following admission. However, to ensure the rigor and integrity of research outcomes, the UGC mandated the publication of research works in select peer-reviewed journals. The objective of the study was to facilitate a review of the research by journal reviewers, with the aim of enhancing the quality of the work.
2. *The heightened accreditation initiative.* The accreditation process has also been implemented on a large scale over the last decade or so in the Indian HEIs. There was mounting pressure on HEIs to attain minimum quality standards by acquiring accreditation from agencies such as the National Accreditation and Assessment Council (NAAC) or the National Board of Accreditation (NBA). One of the primary evaluation criteria for accreditation was the faculty’s research publications. Consequently, HEIs have initiated initiatives to encourage their faculties to publish an increasing number of research papers, with the objective of enhancing their accreditation scores. Consequently, the accreditation environment emerged as a significant factor contributing to the pressure to publish.
3. *Increased competition for academic spaces.* In recent times, there has been a marked increase in the level of competition for academic spaces. Following the implementation of the sixth pay scales, a significant number of individuals have found themselves drawn to academic careers, as the new salaries have become sufficiently competitive.

Consequently, the academic work environment has undergone a significant transformation, with an increased emphasis on the performance of faculty members. The performance horizon has undergone significant expansion, with the publication of high-quality research papers serving as a pivotal performance metric. The prevailing paradigm is one of “publish or perish.” The level of competition is exceedingly high.

#### 3.2.2. Reasons for giving up the policy

In general, experts have identified two primary reasons for the reversal, which are discussed below.

1. *A negative perception of the researcher about compulsion.* The researchers’ response to the policy was one of negativity. The underlying motivations behind the policy remained ambiguous. This was regarded as a mandatory requirement that had to be met. The fundamental principles of the policy were either not comprehended or not endorsed. Researchers experienced a sense of obligation to comply with the publication requirement, stemming from their interpretation of the policy. From their perspective, the policy represented a challenge rather than a potential benefit. Consequently, they sought to identify avenues for expediency, thereby entering the journal industry with a proliferation of journals characterized as cloned, predatory, or of questionable integrity. These journals, motivated by financial gain, provided certificates of publication without undergoing the peer review process. The policy proved to be counterproductive. Ultimately, UGC has decided to discontinue the program.
2. *A step towards internalizing quality.* Another justification that has been provided for the withdrawal of the policy by the UGC is that it seeks to internalize the quality control of the research. This hypothesis appears to be both reasonable and well-supported. The entry-level and subsequent progress-related controls are administered by the local universities. The rationale behind the UGC’s intervention at the culmination of the research process warrants further examination. The responsibility is now being proposed to be delegated to the local universities.

### 3.2.3. Alternative mechanisms

Experts have suggested the following alternatives after the reversal of the policy:

1. *Sending the thesis to independent referees for evaluation.* This was a unanimous recommendation of the five experts. Presently, the supervisor submits the thesis for evaluation to a select group of acquaintances, who offer a “friendly” evaluation report in return. In essence, there is a paucity of evaluation of research output. To ensure the integrity of the process, it is imperative that the referees maintain their independence and maintain anonymity, ensuring that the researcher and the guide are unaware of their identity. The implementation of a double-blind review process, akin to that employed in conventional academic journals, is imperative.
2. *Support systems for problems in the English language.* A significant challenge faced by the majority of Indian researchers pertains to their proficiency in English language and written communication. While they may possess a strong aptitude for research, they often encounter difficulties in articulating their findings in a refined manner suitable for academic publication. Reputed journals should provide language services either free of cost or at a nominal charge to scholars through software such as Grammarly. Alternatively, academic institutions may consider offering language services to researchers free of charge.
3. *Special support from leading journal publishers.* It is incumbent upon leading publishing agencies to adhere to an inclusivity policy when selecting papers for publication. It is imperative that there is a concerted effort to provide support to writers from both developing and underdeveloped nations. There is no need for them to compromise their quality standards. Instead of outright rejection, the papers may be returned with requests for revision, based on the peer review.

## 4. DISCUSSION

The survey data indicate that research scholars have reached a consensus regarding the

adverse impact of the “publish or perish” policy, with an average agreement of 83% among respondents identifying the negative impact. The responses offer substantial evidence that the quality policy has resulted in numerous disadvantages, suggesting that its implementation has been detrimental. This finding aligns with the perspectives articulated by Amutuhair (2022), Demeter *et al.* (2022), De Rond and Miller (2005), Kendall and Linacre (2022), Tindall *et al.* (2021), Al-Khatib and Teixeira da Silva (2017), Kurambayev and Freedman (2021), Demir (2018), and Simón (2016). The failure of researchers to reject the second null hypothesis suggests apprehensions regarding the probable effectiveness of the decentralized quality control policy. A substantial divergence exists among the 10 statements that attest to the efficacy of the decentralized quality control policy. Despite the prevailing view that decentralization is a successful strategy, researchers have expressed skepticism regarding its efficacy (Akdemir *et al.*, 2017; Derqui, 2010; Iftikhar, 2022; Mok, 2004; Rondinelli, 2017; Tran, 2014; Uwakwe *et al.*, 2008).

The policy of “publish or perish” is a widespread phenomenon, as evidenced by the requirement of at least one peer-reviewed publication, in Poland and other European nations, for obtaining a PhD (Sorokowski *et al.*, 2017). However, compulsions have the potential to become counterproductive (Albertella *et al.*, 2019; De Haan *et al.*, 2013; Sinclair, 1997; van den Hout *et al.*, 2008). The policy’s negative perception of the compulsion element is a significant concern. Higher educational institutions endeavor to encourage their faculty to engage in continuous, high-quality research and to subsequently publish the results of their endeavors in reputable journals. This necessity has become increasingly imperative due to the emergence of quality initiatives, such as accreditation, which have heightened the importance of these standards. Nonetheless, the faculty’s response could have been more encouraging. It is evident that the majority of these individuals are required to produce and disseminate research papers of a commendable quality. The policy was enforced through the use of force and compulsion, with the objective of increasing their labor output. In an

ideal and theoretical setting, HEIs possess the prerogative to mandate publication requirements for faculty members. However, in practice, most faculty members should demonstrate a greater capacity to achieve publication in esteemed journals, such as those indexed in Scopus. It is an exercise in futility to anticipate that alterations will occur in the immediate future. Conversely, faculty members have identified an alternative strategy by leveraging the services of predatory and cloned journals. They adopted a firm stance in their pursuit of the stipulated number of publications, thereby ensuring compliance with the mandatory requirements. The primary rationale for conducting rigorous research was effectively disregarded, and the emphasis was redirected towards attaining the objective by any means necessary.

The faculty, confronted with the formidable challenge of producing high-quality academic publications, resorted to an illegitimate defense mechanism. The faculty members' practice of publishing their papers in journals characterized as cloned, predatory, or of questionable integrity has been interpreted as an indication that they are not adequately prepared to engage in authentic quality research and subsequently publish the results of that research in reputable publications (Jebaraj, 2019; Roy, 2022). The act of withdrawing the policy by the UGC can be interpreted as an acknowledgement of the limitation. After a period of sustained experimentation spanning six years, the initiative ultimately encountered a state of complete disarray, manifesting in the form of a substantial predatory journal industry. The decision to reverse the policy in question has served to expose the quality levels of the faculties in Indian HEIs. The process of conducting research and subsequently publishing a paper has been identified as a particularly onerous task. Despite the implementation of quality initiatives, such as accreditation, there have been minimal advancements in the field. If the apex Institution, the UGC, still needs to implement the policy, the expectation that local universities would be able to control quality at their level seems unrealistic. The intervention of the apex agency UGC was necessitated by the observation that quality controls at the local levels were found to be deficient. Presently,

the entry-level and subsequent progress-related controls are overseen by local universities. Consequently, it stands to reason that they limit their quality control procedures to the research output. However, the absence of a mandatory requirement to publish high-quality academic papers raises significant concerns regarding the implementation of effective controls. The proposal of subjecting the thesis to a review by independent experts is a well-founded suggestion. Presently, the evaluation of theses is suboptimal due to the nomination of referees by the supervisor, who often provides what is referred to as "friendly" evaluation reports. It is imperative that this practice cease immediately and that a thorough, independent evaluation of the research output be conducted. Additionally, there is a necessity for the implementation of initiatives designed to support and encourage faculty members in undertaking authentic research and subsequently publishing their findings in reputable journals. A significant concern within the realm of the English language demands attention. Many Indian authors stand to benefit from software such as Grammarly, which can assist in language refinement.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The policy of "publish or perish" in the Indian HEIs was justified on the grounds of controlling the quality of research output, the demands of the heightened accreditation initiative, and increased competition for academic spaces. However, the endeavor proved unsuccessful. The failure has prompted the UGC to reverse the policy after a six-year experiment (from 2016 to 2022). The reversal was attributed to a negative perception of the researcher among the subjects, stemming from their perceived compulsion. The decision to reverse the policy is a rational one, as its implementation has demonstrated a lack of efficacy in practice. It is imperative for research scholars to acknowledge the merits of the decentralized approach to quality control at the local university level. Their apprehensions are founded on a rudimentary logic: if a formidable and preeminent central agency (the UGC) is unable to effect substantial change, it is futile to anticipate tangible outcomes at the individual university

levels. The experts have expressed their opposition to the reinstatement of the “publish or perish” policy at the local university level. They have proposed that discretion in deciding on research publications be given to the relevant authorities. The prevailing sentiment among the scientific community is one of reluctance to replicate experiments that have historically fallen short of achieving positive results. Instead, the evaluation of the PhD theses by independent referees is strongly recommended. Furthermore, it is recommended that Indian researchers receive substantial support from academic institutions in addressing the challenges associated with English communication through software such as Grammarly. It is imperative to acknowledge the expectation of enhanced support from prominent academic journals in accommodating authors from India without compromising their stringent quality standards.

The imposition of quality standards on researchers may not be the most effective approach. It is imperative that they accept this fact independently. Researchers should recognize the value of research publications in quality journals. Furthermore, it is imperative to provide support to these individuals in order to assist them in overcoming the limitations that result from their inadequate English language proficiency. Due to their concerns about the “publish or perish” policy, they may choose to publish in journals that are clones of, or predatory towards, academic publishers. The government of India has decided to discontinue this practice. It remains uncertain whether other nations will adopt similar measures. This study posits that further investigation is merited into the potential efficacy of a policy shift from the prevailing “publish or perish” paradigm. A comprehensive examination of the ramifications of such a reversal and the availability of alternative mechanisms in various contextual settings is imperative. It is imperative to explore more innovative approaches to motivate faculty members to engage in genuine research and its publication in quality journals. The study employed a sampling method, and as such, the limitations of sampling are relevant to this study. The findings of this study carry two implications for local universities. Primarily, they should refrain from

implementing the “publish or perish” policy. This approach is not without precedent; it has been demonstrated to be a catalyst for unfavorable outcomes. Secondly, the establishment of alternative mechanisms is imperative, such as the dissemination of theses to independent evaluators to ensure the integrity of research methodologies. Concurrently, it is imperative that adequate support systems are established to assist researchers in producing articles of sufficient quality for publication in esteemed journals. It is incumbent upon policymakers from academia and other nations to reevaluate their countries’ “publish or perish” policies and give due consideration to the implementation of reforms in accordance with India’s example, as the enforcement of quality standards has proven to be a formidable challenge. The findings of this study imply that researchers should assume greater responsibility for producing research of a high standard. It is imperative that they comprehend the intense competitive nature of academic spaces in the contemporary world, wherein only the most accomplished individuals and institutions emerge victorious. In the absence of demonstrated improvement, the inevitable consequence will be the revocation of their participation in the system.

### **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest or competing interest of any sort with any individual or organization.

### **Funding statement**

No external funding was obtained for the purpose of this research.

### **Contribution statement**

Both authors have contributed equally to all aspects of the study.

### **Data availability statement**

The data used for the research have been deposited with a repository and can be accessed at <https://www.openicpsr.org/openicpsr/project/226661/version/V1/view>. ●

## REFERENCES

- AHMAD, M., & WILKINS, S. (2024). Purposive sampling in qualitative research: A framework for the entire journey. *Quality & Quantity*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-02022-5>
- AKDEMIR, N., LOMBARTS, K. M., PATERNOTTE, E., SCHREUDER, B., & SCHEELE, F. (2017). How changing quality management influenced PGME accreditation: A focus on decentralization and quality improvement. *BMC Medical Education*, 17(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-017-0937-9>
- ALBERTELLA, L., LE PELLEY, M. E., CHAMBERLAIN, S. R., WESTBROOK, F., FONTENELLE, L. F., SEGRAVE, R., LEE, R., PEARSON, D., & YÜCEL, M. (2019). Reward-related attentional capture is associated with severity of addictive and obsessive-compulsive behaviors. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 33(5), 495-502. <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000484>
- AL-KHATIB, A. (2016). Protecting authors from predatory journals and publishers. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 32(4), 281-285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-016-9474-3>
- AL-KHATIB, A., & TEIXEIRA DA SILVA, J. A. (2017). Threats to the survival of the author-pays-journal to publish model. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 33(1), 64-70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-016-9486-z>
- ALL INDIA SURVEY ON HIGHER EDUCATION (AISHE). (n.d.). *Annual Reports from 2013 to 2019-20*. <https://aishe.gov.in/aishe/home>
- AMUTUHAIRE, T. (2022). The reality of the “publish or perish” concept, perspectives from the global south. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38(2), 281-294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09879-0>
- BECKER, A., & LUKKA, K. (2022). Instrumentalism and the publish-or-perish regime. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 94, Article 102436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2022.102436>
- BRETAG, T. (2012). Chapter 2 publish or perish: Ramifications for online academic publishing. In L. A. Wankel & C. Wankel (Eds.), *Misbehavior online in higher education (cutting-edge technologies in higher education)*, Vol. 5, pp. 11-24). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S2044-9968\(2012\)0000005004](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2044-9968(2012)0000005004)
- BROWN, S. M., MCBRIDE, G., COLLINGRIDGE, D. S., BUTLER, J. M., KUTTLER, K. G., HIRSHBERG, E. L., JONES, J. P., HOPKINS, R. O., TALMOR, D., & ORME, J. (2015). Validation of the intermountain patient perception of quality (PPQ) survey among survivors of an intensive care unit admission: A retrospective validation study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0828-x>
- CALDWELL, B. J., & SPINKS, J. M. (1988). *The self-managing school*. The Falmer Press.
- CLUNE, W. H., & WITTE, J. F. (Eds.) (1990). *Choice and control in American education, Vol. 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring*. The Falmer Press.
- DANI, E. (2018). How “publish or perish” can become “publish and perish” in the age of objective assessment of scientific quality. *Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 16(4), 20-25.
- DE HAAN, S., RIETVELD, E., & DENYS, D. (2013). On the nature of obsessions and compulsions. *Anxiety Disorders*, 29, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000351929>
- DE HOYOS, M., & BARNES, S. (2012). *Analysing interview data, Warwick Institute for employment research*. [https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross\\_fac/esrcdtc/researchandtraining/ct201314/quals/analysing\\_interview\\_data\\_2014\\_wk3\\_for\\_web.pdf](https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/esrcdtc/researchandtraining/ct201314/quals/analysing_interview_data_2014_wk3_for_web.pdf)
- DE ROND, M., & MILLER, A. N. (2005). Publish or perish: Bane or boon of academic life? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(4), 321-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492605276850>
- DEMETER, M., PELLE, V., MIKULÁS, G., & GOYANES, M. (2022). Higher quantity, higher quality? Current publication trends of the most productive journal authors on the field of communication studies. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38(3), 445-464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09893-2>
- DEMIR, S. B. (2018). Predatory journals: Who publishes in them and why? *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(4), 1296-1311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.10.008>
- DERQUI, J. M. G. (2010). Educational decentralization policies in Argentina and Brazil: Exploring the new trends. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(6), 561-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930110087825>

- DWORKIN, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41, 1319-1320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6>
- ERTAŞ, M., & KOZAK, M. (2020). Publish or perish: The proportion of articles versus additional sections in tourism and hospitality journals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 149-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.03.001>
- ESHCHANOV, B., ABDURAIMOV, K., IBRAGIMOVA, M., & ESHCHANOV, R. (2021). Efficiency of “publish or perish” policy – Some considerations based on the Uzbekistan experience. *Publications*, 9(3), 33. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9030033>
- FISKE, E. B. (1996). *Decentralization of education: Politics and consensus*. The World Bank.
- HALL, C. M. (2011). Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.07.001>
- HANSON, E. M. (1997). *Educational decentralization: Issues and challenges*. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mark-Hanson-7/publication/44832286\\_Educational\\_Decentralization\\_Issues\\_and\\_Challenges/links/5575eacdo8aeb6d8c01ae79f/Educational-Decentralization-Issues-and-Challenges.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mark-Hanson-7/publication/44832286_Educational_Decentralization_Issues_and_Challenges/links/5575eacdo8aeb6d8c01ae79f/Educational-Decentralization-Issues-and-Challenges.pdf)
- HANSON, E. M. (1998). Strategies of educational decentralization: Key questions and core issues. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(2), 111-128. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810204345>
- HO, M. K. (2004). Beyond decentralization: Changing roles of the state in education. In *Centralization and decentralization* (pp. 203-218). Springer. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-0956-0\\_11](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-0956-0_11)
- IFTIKHAR, F. (2022). *UGC considers scrapping rule on publishing research for PhD*. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/ugc-considers-scrapping-rule-on-publishing-research-for-phd-101653503189014.html>
- JEBARAJ, P. (2019). *UGC to review quality of PhD theses over 10 years*. <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/ugc-to-review-quality-of-phd-theses-over-10-years/article27277915.ece>
- KENDALL, G. (2021). Case study: What happens to a journal after it accepts a spoof paper? *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 37(4), 600-611. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-021-09843-4>
- KENDALL, G., & LINACRE, S. (2022). Predatory journals: Revisiting Beall’s research. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38(3), 530-543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09888-z>
- KHEDKAR, E. B., KUMAR, A., INGLE, A., KHAIRE, R., PALIWAL, J. M., BAGUL, D., WARPADE, S., LONDHE, B. M., MALKAR, V., HUDDER, S. P., JAMBHEKAR, N. D., & RAIBAGKAR, S. S. (2022). Study of the causes and consequences of cloned journal publications. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38(3), 558-572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09907-z>
- KREJCIE, R. V., & MORGAN, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- KUMAR, A., BRAR, V., CHAUDHARI, C., & RAIBAGKAR, S. S. (2022a). Discrimination against private-school students under a special quota for the underprivileged: A case in India. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09815-z>
- KUMAR, A., GAWANDE, A., AGARWAL, A., KALE, S., BRAR, V., & RAIBAGKAR, S. (2023). Sealing the gaps: Enhancing quality control in business school dissertations. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 31(3), 469-484. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-12-2022-0207>
- KUMAR, A., GAWANDE, A., KALE, S. K., AGARWAL, A., BRAR, V., & RAIBAGKAR, S. (2025a). The impact of an effective academic audit on accreditation performance. *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-12-2024-0275>
- KUMAR, A., GAWANDE, A., PALIWAL, J., PENDSE, V., KALE, S., AGARWAL, A., BRAR, V., PALAV, M., NIMBALKAR, S., SAINI, A., RATHI, G., & RAIBAGKAR, S. (2025b). Barriers and need for dataset sharing in the publishing of research thesis. *Iberoamerican Journal of Science Measurement and Communication*, 5(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.47909/ijsmc.192>
- KUMAR, A., GAWANDE, A., & RAIBAGKAR, S. (2022b). Quality complacency in Indian higher education institutions between the second

- and third cycles of accreditation. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 30(4), 431-445. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-01-2022-0019>
- KURAMBAYEV, B., & FREEDMAN, E. (2021). Publish or perish? The steep, steep path for Central Asia journalism and mass communication faculty. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 76(2), 228-240. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077695820947259>
- KYRIACOU, A. P., & ROCA-SAGALÉS, O. (2011). Fiscal and political decentralization and government quality. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 29(2), 204-223. <https://doi.org/10.1068/c1016r>
- LAMBOVSKA, M., & TODOROVA, D. (2021). "Publish and flourish" instead of "publish or perish": A motivation model for top-quality publications. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(1(25)), 141-155. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11522>
- LEUNG, F. K. (2004). *Educational centralization and decentralization in East Asia*. In *APEC Educational Reform Summit* (p. 14). <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=1a894cd5ecf0e15c8b75edc4e0e54ba787985710>
- MADIKIZELA-MADIYA, N. (2022). Transforming higher education spaces through ethical research publication: A critique of the publish or perish aphorism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(1), 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048634>
- MITCHELL, T. (1997). To transfer power or to transfer responsibility: Educational decentralization in Venezuela. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 17(2): 145-162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(96\)00034-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(96)00034-X)
- MOK, K. H. (2004). Centralization and decentralization: Changing governance in education. In *Centralization and Decentralization* (pp. 3-17). Springer.
- NYAMNJOH, F. B. (2004). From publish or perish to publish and perish: What "Africa's 100 best books" tell us about publishing Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 39(5), 331-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0021909604051185>
- PANDITA, R., & SINGH, S. (2022). A study of distribution and growth of open access research journals across the world. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 38(1), 131-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09860-x>
- PATWARDHAN, B. (2019). Why India is striking back against predatory journals. *Nature*, 571(7763), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02023-7>
- PRAWDA, J. (1993). Educational decentralization in Latin America: Lessons learned. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 13(3), 253-264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0738-0593\(93\)90033-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0738-0593(93)90033-V)
- RONDINELLI, D. A. (2017). Decentralization and development. In *International development governance* (pp. 391-404). Routledge.
- ROY, S. (2022). *PhD, research and its upshot: How much quality do we produce?* <https://www.indiatoday.in/news-analysis/story/phd-research-and-upshot-how-much-quality-do-we-produce-1957277-2022-06-02>
- SIMÓN, A. (2016). Pitfalls of predatory journals: A personal account. *Comprehensive Psychology*, 5, 2165222816631691. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2165222816631691>
- SINCLAIR, D. (1997). Self-regulation versus command and control? Beyond false dichotomies. *Law & Policy*, 19(4), 529-559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9930.00037>
- SOROKOWSKI, P., KULCZYCKI, E., SOROKOWSKA, A., & PISANSKI, K. (2017). Predatory journals recruit fake editor. *Nature*, 543, 481-483. <https://doi.org/10.1038/543481a>
- TEIXEIRA DA SILVA, J. A. (2021). Assessing the ethics of stings, including from the prism of guidelines by ethics-promoting organizations (COPE, ICMJE, CSE). *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 37(1), 90-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-021-09784-y>
- TIE, Y., & WANG, Z. (2022). Publish or perish? A tale of academic publications in Chinese universities. *China Economic Review*, 73, Article 101769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2022.101769>
- TIMES NEWS NETWORK. (2022). *UGC likely to do away with compulsory research paper requirement for PhD submission*. <https://www.educationtimes.com/article/newsroom/91803606/ugc-likely-to-do-away-with-compulsory-research-paper-requirement-for-phd-submission>
- TINDALL, B., UHLIG, T., & PERDOMO-MORALES, R. (2021). The important distinction between peer-reviewed and predatory journals: A



- bacterial endotoxin test case. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 37(3), 399-406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-021-09818-5>
- TRAN, T. T. (2014). Governance in higher education in Vietnam – A move towards decentralization and its practical problems. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 7(1), 71-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2013.873341>
- UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION. (2016). *University grants commission (minimum standards and procedure for award of M.PHIL./PH.D degrees) regulations*. [https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/4952604\\_UGC-\(M.PHIL.-PH.D-DEGREES\)-REGULATIONS,-2016.pdf?\\_gl=1\\*\\_9lnumu\\*\\_ga\\*NDc1NTIxMzE0LjE2NTU3MDUzOTA.\\*\\_ga\\_FGHY-ECNLXB\\*MTY2MTc1NDMzOC42LjAuMTY2MTc1NDMzOC4wLjAuMA](https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/4952604_UGC-(M.PHIL.-PH.D-DEGREES)-REGULATIONS,-2016.pdf?_gl=1*_9lnumu*_ga*NDc1NTIxMzE0LjE2NTU3MDUzOTA.*_ga_FGHY-ECNLXB*MTY2MTc1NDMzOC42LjAuMTY2MTc1NDMzOC4wLjAuMA)
- UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION. (2018). *Consortium for academic and research ethics*. <https://ugccare.unipune.ac.in/apps1/home/index>
- UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION. (2022). *Ph.D. regulations 2022*. [https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/0909572\\_Minimum-Standards-and-Procedure-for-Award-of-PhD-Degree.pdf](https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/0909572_Minimum-Standards-and-Procedure-for-Award-of-PhD-Degree.pdf)
- UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION. (2025). *Consortium for academic and research ethics*. <https://ugccare.unipune.ac.in/Apps1/User/Web/CloneJournalsGroupIINew>
- UWAKWE, C. U., FALAYE, A. O., EMUNEMU, B. O., & ADELORÉ, O. (2008). Impact of decentralization and privatization on the quality of education in sub-Saharan Africa: The Nigerian experience. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 160-170.
- VAN DALEN, H. P. (2021). How the publish-or-perish principle divides a science: The case of economists. *Scientometrics*, 126(2), 1675-1694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03786-x>
- VAN DEN HOUT, M. A., ENGELHARD, I. M., DE BOER, C., DU BOIS, A., & DEK, E. (2008). Perseverative and compulsive-like staring causes uncertainty about perception. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 46(12), 1300-1304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2008.09.002>
- VARGHESE, N. V. (1996). Decentralization of educational planning in India: The case of the district primary education programme. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 16(4), 355-365. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(96\)00058-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(96)00058-2)
- VON SOLMS, R., & VON SOLMS, B. (2016). Publish or perish-but where? *South African Computer Journal*, 28(1), 44-58. <https://doi.org/10.18489/sacj.v28i1.394>
- WIENER, M., SAUNDERS, C., CHATTERJEE, S., DENNIS, A. R., GREGOR, S., MÄHRING, M., & MERTENS, P. (2018). Information systems research: Making an impact in a publish-or-perish world. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 43(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04326>
- YANKHOLMES, A. K. (2014). Publish or perish: African scholarship in the field of tourism and hospitality studies. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(1-2), 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1467358414536180>



