Integrating Education 4.0 and Education 5.0 Policies: A Descriptive Policy Analysis of the Non-Recognition of Online PhDs in India

Dr. Rohit Kumar Pal, Dr. Prantosh Kumar Paul
Lincoln Global Postdoctoral and Research Associate
Field: Management Sciences (Education), Email: pdf.rohitpal@lincoln.edu.my

Department of Computer and Information Science, Raiganj University, Raiganj, West Bengal, India, Email: pkpaul.infotech@gmail.com

Abstract

Higher education is undergoing rapid transformation under Education 4.0 and Education 5.0 paradigms. While Education 4.0 emphasizes digitalization, artificial intelligence, and automation, Education 5.0 promotes inclusivity, sustainability, and ethical governance. In India, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 advocates digital universities and flexible learning pathways. However, UGC Regulations 2022 prohibit the recognition of PhDs obtained entirely through online modes, creating a contradiction within the digital transformation agenda.

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive research design combining policy document analysis, literature synthesis, and structured stakeholder feedback from students, working professionals, business leaders, college principals, academic administrators, and faculty members. Thematic analysis reveals regulatory inertia, quality assurance concerns, digital infrastructure disparities, and institutional trust deficits as key barriers. The study proposes a hybrid regulatory framework integrating Quality 4.0 technological safeguards and Education 5.0 ethical governance principles.

The findings suggest that controlled recognition models may better align doctoral governance with India's Education 4.0 and Education 5.0 objectives.

Keywords

Education 4.0; Education 5.0; Online PhD Recognition; UGC Regulations 2022; Digital Governance; Quality 4.0; Quality 5.0; Higher Education Reform; Stakeholder Analysis.

1. Introduction

Education 4.0 emerged as a response to Industry 4.0, integrating digital technologies into academic systems. It promotes smart classrooms, virtual research collaboration, AI-enabled supervision, and data-driven evaluation (Kaliraj & Devi, 2022). Education 5.0 extends this framework by emphasizing sustainability, ethics, inclusivity, and societal contribution (Saini & Garg, 2023). India's NEP 2020 supports digital transformation; however, UGC Regulations 2022 prohibit fully online doctoral degrees. This contradiction necessitates a structured policy examination.

2. Review of Literature

Author(s)	Year	Focus Area	Key Contribution	Relevance to Online PhD Recognition
Kaliraj & Devi	2022	Education 4.0 & Industry 4.0 tools	Integration of digital technologies in higher education curriculum	Supports feasibility of digital doctoral ecosystems
Gupta, Aggarwal & Sharma	2023	Education 4.0–Society 5.0 integration	Framework for digital-human synergy in learning	Aligns online PhDs with Education 4.0 philosophy
Kumar et al.	2025	Quality 4.0 in higher education	AI-driven quality assurance systems	Suggests mechanisms for digital doctoral governance
Panda et al.	2024	Metaverse in higher education	Immersive digital learning environments	Demonstrates viability of virtual supervision
Saini & Garg	2023	Industry 5.0 & sustainability	Human-centric transformation models	Supports inclusive online doctoral access
Sharma & Suvin	2026	AI in Indian education	Bibliometric growth of AI adoption	Indicates technological readiness
Varghese & Khare	2021	Indian higher education governance	Regulatory and expansion challenges	Identifies policy rigidity
Kumar et al.	2026	Quality 5.0 frameworks	Ethical and sustainability governance	Aligns with controlled recognition model
Chugh & Alan	2025	Open access & SDG 4	Democratization of knowledge	Supports equitable doctoral access
Bali et al.	2021	Industry 4.0 & institutional excellence	Digital competitiveness models	Reinforces modernization need
Sarkar & Manigram	2026	AI curriculum adaptation	Digital transformation in Indian HEIs	Reflects sector-wide digital shift

Literature Gap

Although extensive research exists on digital transformation and quality governance, limited empirical work addresses the regulatory non-recognition of online PhDs in India.

2.1 Knowledge Gap

Area	Knowledge Gap	Brief Description
Regulatory Clarity	Approval authority & standards	Lack of clear, consistent criteria and final authority for approving online PhDs in India.
Academic Quality	Supervision & assessment rigor	Limited evidence on maintaining research quality, integrity, and effective supervision in fully online formats.
Institutional Capacity	Infrastructure readiness	Uncertainty about universities' technological, faculty, and research infrastructure preparedness.
Recognition & Employability	Degree equivalence	Ambiguity regarding acceptance of online PhDs for jobs, promotions, and public sector recruitment.
Equity & Access	Digital divide impact	Insufficient research on whether online PhDs improve access or widen inequalities due to connectivity and resource gaps.

Table Reference (Used during online presentation)

2.2 Research Gaps

No.	Research Gap Area	Description
1	**Longitudinal Data**	Lack of long-term studies tracking career outcomes of online PhD holders over time.
2	**Comparative Quality Analysis**	Limited research comparing the quality of research outputs between online and traditional PhDs in India.
3	**Mixed Methods Research**	Insufficient use of mixed research approaches combining quantitative and qualitative data.
4	**Institutional Perspectives**	Limited understanding of Indian universities' attitudes, policies, and readiness toward online PhDs.
5	**Funding & Policy Guidance**	Lack of structured policy direction and research funding allocation to address these gaps.

Table Reference (Used during online presentation)

3. Objectives

- To examine alignment between Education 4.0/5.0 and online doctoral education.
- To analyze UGC Regulations 2022 regarding online PhD recognition.
- To evaluate stakeholder perspectives.
- To propose a hybrid regulatory framework.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

Qualitative descriptive policy research.

4.2 Data Sources

- UGC Regulations 2022
- NEP 2020
- Scholarly literature
- Structured stakeholder feedback

4.3 Experimental Methods

Method	How to Collect Data	Sample/Participants	Data Type	Purpose
Experimental Method	Compare career outcomes of online vs traditional PhD graduates using structured surveys and employment records. Control variables like discipline, years of experience, institution type.	Online PhD holders & Regular PhD holders	Quantitative (salary, promotions, publications, job level)	To measure outcome differences and identify recognition gaps.
Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)	Provide awareness intervention (e.g., policy brief about online PhD standards) to one group of employers; compare hiring attitudes with a control group.	Employers / HR managers / Academic recruiters	Quantitative + Survey responses	To test whether information changes perception and hiring decisions.
Quasi-Experimental Design	Compare institutions or states that recognize online PhDs with those that do not (natural policy differences).	Universities, Public Service Commissions, Institutions	Policy analysis + Statistical comparison	To assess real-world impact of recognition vs non-recognition.
A/B Testing	Send two versions of CVs (online PhD vs traditional PhD) to recruiters or academic panels and track responses.	Recruiters / Academic selection committees	Quantitative (callback rate)	To detect bias in selection decisions.
Institutional Survey / Interviews	Conduct structured interviews with university administrators, UGC officials, and faculty members.	Policy makers, University administrators	Qualitative (themes, opinions, policies)	To understand institutional attitudes and policy barriers.

Table Reference (Used during online presentation)

4.4. Data Gathering Strategies

No.	Strategy	How Data Will Be Collected	Purpose
1	Comparative Outcome Survey	Collect structured survey data from online and traditional PhD graduates on employment, salary, promotions, and publications.	To compare career outcomes and identify recognition gaps.
2	Employer Perception Study (RCT Approach)	Survey employers; provide policy information to one group and compare responses with a control group.	To measure how awareness influences hiring attitudes.
3	Policy & Document Analysis	Review UGC regulations, court cases, recruitment rules, and institutional policies.	To identify formal recognition barriers and regulatory gaps.
4	Quasi-Experimental Comparison	Compare states/institutions that recognize online PhDs with those that do not.	To assess impact of recognition policies in real settings.
5	A/B Resume Testing	Send equivalent CVs (online vs traditional PhD) to recruiters and track callback rates.	To detect hiring bias and practical discrimination.

Table Reference (Used during online presentation)

4.5 Data Analysis Method

Analysis Type	Data Source	How to Analyze	Tools/Techniques	Purpose
Quantitative Analysis	Survey data (graduates & employers)	Compare employment rates, salary levels, promotions, publication counts	Descriptive statistics (mean, %, SD)	To measure outcome differences
Quantitative Analysis	A/B resume testing results	Compare callback rates between online vs traditional PhD CVs	T-test / Chi-square test	To detect hiring bias
Quantitative Analysis	RCT intervention survey	Compare attitudes before and after awareness intervention	Regression analysis / ANOVA	To test impact of policy awareness
Qualitative Analysis	Interviews with employers & university administrators	Identify themes related to recognition barriers and perceptions	Thematic analysis	To understand institutional attitudes
Qualitative Analysis	Policy documents & court judgments	Interpret language, identify regulatory gaps and inconsistencies	Content analysis	To examine policy clarity and legal stance

Table Reference (Used during online presentation)

4.6 Target Groups & Primary Stakeholder Feedback

Stakeholder Group	Positive Perceptions	Key Concerns	Overall Position
Students (PG & Aspirants)	Flexibility, accessibility, cost-effectiveness	Recognition uncertainty, employability concerns	Strongly supportive if recognized
Working Professionals	Career advancement without job interruption	Academic credibility, workload balance	Highly supportive
Business Leaders / Industry Experts	Focus on competency over mode	Need for standardized evaluation	Conditionally supportive
College Principals	Institutional expansion opportunity	Quality monitoring challenges	Cautiously supportive
Academic Administrators (Deans/Registrars)	Digital modernization alignment	Regulatory compliance, infrastructure gaps	Mixed response
Faculty / Research Supervisors	Remote collaboration tools feasible	Supervision rigor, plagiarism risks	Divided opinion
Policy Experts	Supports NEP digital vision	Risk of commercialization	Recommend controlled framework

- **Major Thematic Findings**
  - ✓ **Flexibility Demand:** Strong support from students and professionals.
  - ✓ **Quality Assurance Gap:** Institutional leaders seek robust verification systems.
  - ✓ **Trust Deficit:** Concerns about degree credibility.
  - ✓ **Digital Divide:** Infrastructure inequality remains a barrier.

6. Discussion

Stakeholder responses align with Education 4.0 principles emphasizing digital accessibility and flexibility. However, concerns raised by academic administrators and principals highlight the need for structured Quality 4.0 mechanisms.

Education 5.0 principles demand inclusive and equitable access to doctoral education, especially for working professionals and geographically marginalized learners. Yet, policy inertia and absence of digital doctoral governance frameworks restrict reform.

7. Proposed Hybrid Regulatory Framework

To bridge the gap, the following measures are proposed:

- Mandatory hybrid doctoral defense panels
- Blockchain-based thesis authentication
- AI-driven plagiarism and authorship verification
- National Digital Doctoral Accreditation Board
- Supervisor digital certification programs
- Periodic digital quality audits

This integrates technological assurance (Education 4.0) with ethical governance (Education 5.0).

8. Conclusion

The non-recognition of online PhDs in India reflects a regulatory paradox within the country's Education 4.0 and Education 5.0 transformation agenda. While digital systems are widely adopted in undergraduate and postgraduate education, doctoral governance remains conservative.

Stakeholder feedback reveals significant demand for flexible doctoral pathways, particularly among working professionals and industry leaders. However, academic leadership emphasizes the need for rigorous quality assurance mechanisms.

A hybrid, controlled recognition model grounded in Quality 4.0 technological safeguards and Education 5.0 ethical principles may provide a balanced solution. Policy reform, rather than prohibition, appears necessary for aligning India's doctoral education governance with its broader modernization objectives.

References

Bali, S., Aggarwal, S., & Sharma, S. (2021). *Industry 4.0 technologies for business excellence*. CRC Press.

Chugh, M., & Alan, K. H. K. (2025). Open access in education: Unlocking quality learning for all to achieve SDG 4. Springer.

Gupta, A. K., Aggarwal, V., & Sharma, V. (2023). Framework to integrate Education 4.0 to enhance the e-learning model for Industry 4.0 and Society 5.0. CRC Press.

Kaliraj, P., & Devi, T. (2022). *Industry 4.0 technologies for education: Transformative technologies and applications*. CRC Press.

Kumar, V., Singh, A., Sharma, N. K., & Verma, P. (2025). Improving educational quality: The role of Quality 4.0 in higher education institutions. *The TQM Journal*.

Kumar, V., Singh, A., Sharma, N., & Verma, P. (2026). Integrating Quality 5.0 approaches for the future of quality management. *The TQM Journal*.

Panda, G., Arora, M., Ghoshal, I., & Garza-Reyes, J. A. (2024). Application of metaverse in higher education: A systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. *The TQM Journal*.

Saini, A., & Garg, V. (2023). Transformation for sustainable business and management practices: Exploring the spectrum of Industry 5.0. Emerald Publishing.

Sarkar, S., & Manigram, D. (2026). AI curriculum for media education: Insights from academic adaptability and industry relevance in West Bengal, India. *Journal of Media Practice and Education*.

Sharma, B., & Suvin, V. M. (2026). A descriptive bibliometric study of artificial intelligence in education in India. *Indian Journal of Educational Technology*.

Varghese, N. V., & Khare, M. (2021). *India higher education report 2020*. Routledge.