

# Review of: "Developing Engineering Education Universities in India"

Natanael Karjanto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sungkyunkwan University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Review manuscript ID: qeios-3W8PIP

URL: <https://doi.org/10.32388/3W8PIP>

Title: Developing Engineering Education Universities in India

Author: Thanikachalam Vedhathiri

Preprint: Qeios

Publisher: Qeios, London, England, UK

Date: 29 March 2024

The paper's emphasis on the development and success of Technical Teacher Training Institutes (TTTI) transitioning to National Institutes of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTRs) in India presents an insightful historical overview but suffers from several critical weaknesses in argumentation and evidence.

**Strengths:** The paper's historical account provides valuable insights into the evolution of technical education in India, which is a strong point. Highlighting the transition from TTIs to NITTTRs underscores the government's commitment to improving the quality of technical education. Moreover, the mention of contributions to international faculty development adds a global dimension to the institutes' achievements.

## Weaknesses and Invalidity in Arguments:

1. **Lack of Specific Evidence:** The paper fails to offer tangible evidence to back its claims about the impact of NITTTRs on improving engineering education in India. This shortcoming significantly weakens the argument as it relies on generalizations without data to demonstrate outcomes like enhanced student performance or successful industry partnerships. For instance, benchmarks showcasing student employability rates before and after the intervention of NITTTRs could substantiate claims of their effectiveness.

2. **Comparative Analysis Absence:** Claiming NITTTRs as a "milestone" in technical education without offering a comparative analysis with either past conditions or with similar institutions elsewhere leaves the assertion unfounded. Including a comparative study indicating specific areas of progress (e.g., research output, student satisfaction, industry collaboration cases) could provide the necessary context and validation for the claim.

3. **Inadequate Detail on Consultancy Services:** The discussion on consultancy services offered by NITTTRs is too vague to

be convincing. Concrete examples of consultancy projects, their impacts on the industry, and revenue generation details would lend credibility and indicate the practical value of these services beyond academic contributions.

4. Outdated and Non-Empirical References: Utilizing outdated or opinion-based references compromises the argument's credibility. For a robust argument, the inclusion of recent, empirical studies detailing the impact of NITTTR interventions on various stakeholders (students, faculty, industry partners) would be far more persuasive.

5. Organizational Issues: An overly lengthy introduction and conclusion dilute the focus of the paper. Moving detailed descriptions to an appendix and optimizing the text for clarity could make the argument more direct and compelling.

While the paper succeeds in documenting the historical development of technical teacher training in India, its arguments suffer from a lack of specificity, dated and non-empirical referencing, and organizational issues. By incorporating data-driven evidence, recent studies, and a clearer structure, the paper could significantly improve its argumentative strength and contribute meaningful insights into the role of NITTTRs in advancing engineering education in India.