

**EDUCATION FOR ALL: ACHIEVEMENTS AND FAILURES OF SARVA
SIKSHA ABHIYAN WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RAJASTHAN**

**Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of
MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

NAZNEEN AHMED



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

NEW DELHI – 110067

2012

DEDICATED TO MY TEACHER

FAMILY

AND

FRIENDS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In my efforts to complete this dissertation, I have benefitted from support, guidance and interaction with a lot of people whom I wish to acknowledge and thank. All types of interaction may not have any obvious academic significance but they nevertheless provided me an opportunity to develop and express some of thoughts included here. I hope those who may not be acknowledged individually, but have lent support in various ways during the period as a sincere appreciation of their gesture of goodwill.

I am extremely grateful to my esteemed supervisor Dr. Sachidanand Sinha whose able guidance, intellectual ingenuity and avid suggestions helped in completing this academic exercise. His immense patience to bear with all my shortcomings and enthusiastically correcting me whenever I went wrong has been of great help. I am thankful to all my teachers in CSRD for their guidance and intellectual support to complete this piece of work.

This work would not have been realized had there not been my family support. I pay my intense sincere thanks to my loving Papa, Mummy and sister for their love and emotional support.

I am thankful to my friends Bhavna, Mamta, Kamna, and Rajkumar for their cooperation, moral and emotional support.

Special thanks to Govind and Ali Akram Uncle for their timely help.

I would also like to acknowledge the helpful cooperation extended by the librarians of JNU, staff of CSRD office and documentation unit.

CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Maps

Chapter 1	Introduction	1-9
1.1	Parental Motivation towards Education	
1.2	Financial Constraints as a limiting Factor in Child's Education	
1.3	Quality of Education	
1.4	Incentives	
1.5	Inequality	
1.6	Caste, Religion and Region	
1.7	Socioeconomic status of parents	
Chapter 2	An Overview of Literature	10-23
2.1	Introduction	
2.2	Parental Motivation towards Education	
2.3	Financial Constraints as a limiting Factor in Child's Education	
2.4	Quality of Education	
2.5	Incentives	
2.6	Inequality	
2.7	Caste, Religion and Region	
2.8	Socioeconomic status of parents	

Chapter 3	Patterns and Trends of Enrolment in Elementary Education	24-50
3.1	Introduction	
3.2	Gross Attendance Ratio	
3.3	Net Attendance Ratio	
3.4	Out of School	
3.4.1	Never Enrolled	
3.4.2	Dropout	
3.5	Conclusion	
Chapter 4	Causes of Non Enrolment and Dropout	51-82
4.1	Introduction	
4.2	Causes of Non Enrolment	
4.3	Causes of Dropout	
4.4	Supply Side of Education	
4.4.1	Number of Schools per Thousand Population	
4.4.2	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools	
4.4.3	Single Classroom Schools	
4.4.4	Pupil Teacher Ratio	
4.4.5	Single Teacher Schools	
4.4.6	Drinking Water Facility	

4.4.7	Girls Toilet Facility	
4.5	Conclusion	
Chapter 5	Elementary Education and Sarva Siksha Abhiyan: A Case Study of Rajasthan	83-117
5.1	Introduction	
5.2	Status of Current Attendance in Rajasthan	
5.3	Gross Attendance Ratio	
5.4	Net Attendance Ratio	
5.5	Out of School	
5.5.1	Never Enrolled	
5.5.2	Dropout	
5.6	Reasons of Non Enrolment	
5.7	Reasons of Dropout	
5.8	Supply Side of Education	
5.8.1	Number of Schools per Thousand Population	
5.8.2	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools	
5.8.3	Single Classroom Schools	
5.8.4	Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR)	
5.8.5	Single Teacher Schools	
5.8.6	Girls Toilet Facility	
5.8.7	Drinking Water Facility	
5.9	Conclusion	
6	Conclusion	118-122
	Bibliography	

List of Tables

S.No.	Title	Page No.
3.1	State-wise Gross Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in rural and urban India	26
3.2	State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in age group 6 to 13 in rural and urban India	28
3.3	State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary age group 6 to 13 among Boys and Girls in India	29
3.4	State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Primary level in age group 6 to 13 among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)	31
3.5	State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Upper Primary level in age group 6 to 13 among Boys and Girls in India (2009-10)	32
3.6	State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in age group 6 to 13 among social groups in India	33
3.7	Percentage of Out of School Children in the age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India	35
3.8	Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India	37
3.9	Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among Boys and Girls in India (1999-2000)	38

3.10	Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among Boys and Girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)	39
3.11	Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among social groups in India	41
3.12	Distribution of Dropouts at elementary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among in rural and urban India	43
3.13	Distribution of Dropouts at elementary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in India	45
3.14	Distribution of Dropouts at primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)	46
3.15	Distribution of Dropouts at upper primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)	47
3.16	Distribution of Dropouts at primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among social groups in India	49
4.1	Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)	56
4.2	Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years among girls and boys in rural and urban India (2007-08)	57-58
4.3	Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)	59
4.4	Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years among girls and boys in rural and urban India (2007-08)	60-61
4.5 (a)	Statewise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban India (2006-07)	62-63
4.5(b)	Statewise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban India (2010-11)	63-64

4.6	Statewise Ratio of Primary schools to Upper Primary schools in rural and urban India	66
	State wise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in rural and urban India	
4.7(a)	(2006-07)	68-69
	State wise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in rural and urban India	
4.7(b)	(2010-11)	69-70
4.8	Statewise Pupil Teacher Ratio in rural and urban India	72
	Statewise Percentage of Single Teacher Schools in rural and urban areas in India	
4.9 (a)	(2006-07)	73-74
	Statewise Percentage of Single Teacher Schools in rural and urban areas in India	
4.9 (b)	(2010)	74-75
	Percentage of Elementary School with Drinking Water Facility in rural and urban	
4.10	India	77
4.11	Percentage of Elementary School with Girls Toilet Facility in rural and urban India	78
4.12	Coefficient of Correlation worked out	79
	Percentage distribution of persons (age 5-29 years) by status of attendance in	
5.1	Rajasthan	84
	Percentage distribution of persons age 5-29 years) according to religion by status of	
5.2	attendance in Rajasthan	85
	Percentage distribution of persons (age 5-29 years) according to religion by status of	
5.3	attendance in Rajasthan	86
5.4	Regionwise Gross Attendance Ratio at elementary level in Rajasthan	87
	Regionwise Net Attendance Ratio at elementary level in among boys and girls in rural	
5.5	and urban Rajasthan in age 6 to13 years	89

	Regionwise Net Attendance Ratio at elementary level in among social groups in	
5.6	Rajasthan in age 6 to13 years	91
5.7	Regionwise out of school children in Rajasthan	91
	Regionwise percentage of never enrolled children in in age 6 to 13 years in rural and	
5.8	urban Rajasthan	92
	Regionwise never enrolled children among social groups in age 6 to 13 years in	
5.9	Rajasthan	93
	Percentage distribution of dropouts (age 6 to 13 years) in rural and urban regions of	
5.10	Rajasthan	95
	Percentage distribution of dropouts (age 6 to 13 years) among social groups of	
5.11	Rajasthan	96
	Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban Rajasthan	
5.12(a)	(2007-08)	97
	(b) Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in	
5.12(b)	rural and urban Rajasthan(2007-08)	98
5.13(a)	Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)	99
	Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and	
5.13(b)	urban India (2007-08)	100
5.14	Districtwise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban Rajasthan	103
5.15	Districtwise Ratio of Primary schools to Upper Primary schools in Rajasthan	105
5.16	Districtwise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in Rajasthan	107
5.17	Districtwise Pupil Teacher Ratio in Rajasthan	108
5.18	Percentage distribution of Single Teacher Schools in Rajasthan	110

5.19	Percentage of elementary schools with Girls Toilet Facility in Rajasthan	113
5.20	Percentage of elementary schools with drinking water facility in Rajasthan	115
5.21	Coefficient of Correlation (Karl Pearson)	116

List of Maps

S.No.	Title	Page No.
3.1	Gross Attendance Ratio (1999-2000)	
3.2	Gross Attendance Ratio (2009-10)	
3.3	Net Attendance Ratio (1999-2000)	
3.4	Net Attendance Ratio (2009-10)	
3.5	Out of School Children (6 to 13 years) 1999-2000	
3.6	Out of School Children (6 to 13 years) 2009-10	
3.7	Never Enrolled (1999-2000)	
3.8	Never Enrolled (2009-10)	
3.9	Dropout Rate (1999-2000)	
3.10	Dropout Rate (2009-10)	
4.1	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools (Rural) 2006-07	
4.2	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools (Rural) 2010-11	
4.3	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools (Urban) 2006-07	
4.4	Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools (Urban) 2010-11	
4.5	Single Classroom Primary Schools (Rural) 2006-07	
4.6	Single Classroom Primary Schools (Urban) 2010-11	

- 4.7 Single Classroom Primary Schools (Urban) 2006-07
- 4.8 Single Classroom Primary Schools (Rural) 2010-11
- 4.9 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Rural Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.10 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Rural Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 4.11 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Urban Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.12 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Urban Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 4.13 Single Teacher Primary School (Rural) 2006-07
- 4.14 Single Teacher Primary School (Rural) 2010-11
- 4.15 Single Teacher Primary School (Urban) 2006-07
- 4.16 Single Teacher Primary School (Urban) 2010-11
- 4.17 Drinking Water facility in Rural Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.18 Drinking Water facility in Rural Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 4.19 Drinking Water facility in Urban Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.20 Drinking Water facility in Urban Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 4.21 Girls Toilet facility in Rural Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.22 Girls Toilet facility in Rural Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 4.23 Girls Toilet facility in Urban Elementary Schools (2006-07)
- 4.24 Girls Toilet facility in Urban Elementary Schools (2010-11)
- 5.1 NSSO Regions Rajasthan
- 5.2 Distribution of Single Classroom Primary Schools 2006-07
- 5.3 Distribution of Single Classroom Primary Schools 2010-11

- 5.4 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Elementary School 2006-07
- 5.5 Pupil Teacher Ratio in Elementary School 2010-11
- 5.6 Distribution of Single Teacher Primary Schools 2006-07
- 5.7 Distribution of Single Teacher Primary Schools 2010-11
- 5.8 Girls Toilet Facility 2006-07
- 5.9 Girls Toilet Facility 2010-11
- 5.10 Drinking Water Facility 2006-07
- 5.11 Drinking Water Facility 2010-11

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Elementary education is among the most important of all the education. The reason being that elementary education provides basis for higher education. A strong base provided at the elementary education level helps in facing the challenges at the higher level of education. It is the first step for achieving success in life. As we all know that in today's time education is among the key factor to have successful life. It removes the stigma of caste, class and gender to a significant extent.

Having known such benefits of education India did a lot to improve the enrolments in elementary education. For instance National Policy on Education of 1986, and revised National Policy on Education 1992 were started to improve the quality of school education. Similarly in 1994 DPEP was initiated in seven states (in 42 districts) to handle the problem of "access and retention, increase learning achievement and decrease dropout rate in a manner that social and gender inequalities are reduced to the minimum"¹. Despite of no. of attempts made by the government there are children that either have not enrolled or have dropout from school, particularly from certain class, region and social group. Vimla Ramachandran in her study based on NFHS-II data says that, "rural girls belonging to disadvantaged groups like SC and ST are perhaps worst off with a staggering 50 percent and 56 percent respectively having dropped out". As per 66th round of NSSO there are 7.9 % children in India in the age group of 6-13 who are out of school with the percentage as low as 0.2% in Tamil Nadu to a maximum of 10% in Delhi.

In 2002 Sarva Siksha Abhiyan was launched by the government to universalize free elementary education to all children between 6 to 14 years with a focus especially on girls and children with

¹ Aggarwal, Yash (2001), "Quality Concerns in Primary Education in India: Where is the Problem?" NIEPA, New Delhi.

challenged social and financial backgrounds, provide practical infrastructure and relevant source material and to ensure universal retention by 2010. The present study intends to make an assessment of the achievement and failures of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in terms of universal access and providing quality of education which affects dropout and enrolment respectively. Study area would be the state of Rajasthan. Reason for selecting Rajasthan is that education-wise it is one of the backward states in India. The dropout rate as per DISE 2007-08 is approximately 13 percent at the primary level which shows that there is a lot which needs to be improved in the state.

1.2 Theoretical Perspective

Emphasis on education was started soon after independence. In 1948 Radhakrishnan Commission was appointed on university education. As per the recommendations of this Commission in 1956 University Grants Commission was set up. It was in 1964 Kothari Commission was constituted which focused on improving access and quality of education. Recommendations of this commission was taken up by National Policy on Education 1968².

In the year 1986 National Policy on Education was established again to achieve the goal of universal elementary education, equitable access to quality education, reducing the disparities etc³. This policy too failed to meet the target. Again in 1992 revised National Policy on Education like its predecessors this policy too had ambitious goal of providing free and compulsory education of good quality to children up to 14 years of age till the beginning of twenty first century. However this policy again as its predecessors did not mentioned practical steps to attain the objective of universal elementary education of satisfactory quality⁴. Then came Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in the year 2002. This program was started by the government with the

² Dongaonkar, Dayanand,(2006), "Missing Links in Education System in India"

<http://www.dise.in/Downloads/Use%20of%20Dise%20Data/Prof%20Dayanand%20%20Dongaonkar.pdf>

³ Dongaonkar, Dayanand,(2006), "Missing Links in Education System in India"

<http://www.dise.in/Downloads/Use%20of%20Dise%20Data/Prof%20Dayanand%20%20Dongaonkar.pdf>

⁴ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), "India Economic Development and Social Opportunity" Oxford University Press New Delhi.

help of World Bank and was launched with the aim of achieving enrolment and retention of all children in the age group 6 to 14 by 2010, improving infrastructural facilities, quality of education to all children, bridging social category and gender gaps at elementary education by 2010⁵

Next section deals with the Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in detail.

Sarva Siksha Abhiyan

As already said that the programmes that came before Sarva Siksha Abhiyan were not able to attain the goal of universal enrolment and retention. The Abhiyan promised to have universal enrolment and retention in elementary education for all children in the age group 6 to 14 years. SSA focused on improving the quality of elementary education and narrowing down all gender and social category gaps. SSA was launched in the entire country in the year 2002 and was supposed to complete its period 2010.

Following were the main objectives of the SSA-

- 1) *“All children in school by 2003;*
- 2) *All children completing five years of primary schooling by 2007;*
- 3) *All children complete eight years of elementary schooling by 2010;*
- 4) *Elementary education of satisfactory quality with emphasis on education for life*
- 5) *Bridge all gender and social category gaps at primary stage by 2007 and elementary stage by 2010.*
- 6) *Universal retention by 2010.”*⁶

⁵ Mukherji and Mukherji (2009), “Do public funds increase the probability of a school being functional? A Study of 3 Districts in India” http://www.dise.in/use_of_dise_data.htm

⁶ <http://www.educationforallindia.com>

To implement the programme it was planned that there will be combined efforts of central, state and local government. The share of funds given by centre and state government was 85:15 during IX plan, which changed to 75:25 in X plan and further modified to 50:50 after the X plan. The funds under SSA were utilized for upgrading, repairing and for maintenance of schools. Essential components of the SSA included appointment of new teachers, training teachers, improving quality and establishment of resource centres for academic support at block as well as at cluster level.⁷

Strategies that were adopted by SSA to achieve its objective were improving mainstream educational administration, institutional capacity building, community ownership, sustainable financing, accountability to community, education of girls, focus on special groups etc. to name a few.⁸

Right to Education passed in 2009 which came into effect in 2010 planned to use the SSA to achieve its aim of universalizing elementary education. There has been revision in the existing norms of the SSA as per the norms of Right to Education. Some of the revised norms of SSA include opening of the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidhyalaya, facilities for schools, provision of classrooms, development of research, evaluation and monitoring etc. Funding is also revised under RTE norm with centre and state ratio has planned out to be 65:35 for all state/UT's except for north eastern states where the ratio was 90:10.⁹

1.3 Research Question

Has Sarva Siksha Abhiyan been successful in a) universalizing elementary education,
b) reducing gender and social gaps in terms of enrolment and

⁷ <http://www.educationforallindia.com>

⁸ <http://www.educationforallindia.com>

⁹ <http://www.educationforallindia.com>

c) providing elementary education of satisfactory quality so that children remain in the education system.

1.4 Objective

- 1) To examine the pattern of enrolment and out of school children in India with special reference to Rajasthan.
- 2) To find out reasons as to why children are not in the school system.
- 3) To see the supply side variables that is available in schools.
- 4) To find out the effect of improvement in supply side variables on enrolment and dropout.

1.5 Data Base

- 1) NSSO (National Sample Survey Organisation) Reports of 55th (June 1999- June 2000) and 66th (July 2009- June 2010) rounds published by Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation Government of India.
- 2) District Information System for Education published by NUEPA (National University of Education Planning and Administration) for 2006-07 and 2010-11.
- 3) Census of India 2001- c- series and
- 4) Census of India 2011 Provisional Population Totals paper 2 of 2011: India Series 1 and Provisional Population Totals paper 1 of 2011: Rajasthan

1.6 Methodology

Present study intends to see the changes made by SSA in elementary education. Therefore enrolment and out of school children in the age group 6 to 13 are taken into consideration for India with special reference to Rajasthan over the period of ten years. NSSO data of 55th and 66th rounds have been taken. NSSO 55th round does not had three states of Chattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand therefore for NSSO 66th round all the three states have been merged with their parent state of Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. There has been change in the regions

of Rajasthan in 66th round therefore the districts have been arranged in the regions as per the regions of NSSO 55th round.

Following indicators have been worked out to analyze the change in enrolment pattern and out of school children.

1. Out of school children are obtained by addition of children who have never enrolled and those who have dropped out

Percentage of out of school children

$$= \frac{\text{children who have never enrolled (6-13 years)} + \text{those who have dropped out (6-13 years)}}{\text{Total no. of Children in the age group (6-13 years)}} * 100$$

Total no. of Children in the age group (6-13 years)

Never enrolled and dropouts are further calculated to locate the problem.

2. Percentage of never enrolled children

$$= \frac{\text{children who have never enrolled (6-13 years)}}{\text{Total no. of children in the age group (6-13 years)}} * 100$$

Total no. of children in the age group (6-13 years)

3. Percentage of dropout

At elementary level

$$= \frac{\text{children who have dropout and discontinued in age group 6 to 13 years}}{\text{(Total no. of children in 6 to 13 year--never enrolled children in 6 to 13 years)}} * 100$$

(Total no. of children in 6 to 13 year--never enrolled children in 6 to 13 years)

At primary level

$$= \frac{\text{children who have dropout and discontinued in 6 to 10 years}}{\text{Total no. of children in 6 to 10 years}} * 100$$

(Total no. of children in 6 to 10 year--never enrolled children in 6 to 10 years)

Upper primary level

= children who have dropout and discontinued in 11 to 13 years *100

(Total no. of children in 11 to 13 year--never enrolled children in 11 to 13 years)

Enrolment at elementary level has been calculated using NSSO data which does not give enrolment but current attendance. Therefore both gross and net attendance ratios have been used to see the enrolment.

4. GAR (Gross Attendance Ratio) is calculated using following formula-

GAR at elementary level

= total no. of children enrolled in primary and upper primary*100

Population in age group 6 to 13

5. NAR (Net Attendance Ratio) is calculated using following formula-

NAR at elementary level

= total no. of children enrolled in classes (I –VIII) classes in the age group 6 to 13 years *100

Total Population in age group 6 to 13 years

NAR at primary level

= total no. of children enrolled in (I-V) classes the age group 6 to 10 years *100

Total Population in age group 6 to 10 years

NAR at upper primary level

= total no. of children enrolled in (VI-VIII) classes in the age group 11 to 13 years *100

Total Population in the age group 11 to 13 years

To see the role of SSA in improving the quality of elementary schools supply side variables have been selected. These are:-

- a) Number of schools available per thousand population
- b) Ratio of Primary Schools to Upper Primary Schools
- c) Percentage of Single Classroom Schools
- d) Percentage of Single Teacher Schools
- e) Percentage of Elementary Schools with girls toilet facility
- f) Percentage of Elementary Schools with drinking water facility

All these indicators have been analyzed for two time periods i.e., 2006-07 and 2010-1. Reason for selecting 2006-07 is that the DISE data prior to 2006 has very less coverage of schools.

- a) Number of schools available per thousand population

Elementary Schools = (total number of elementary schools in a state/district)*1000

Total Population in 7 to 14 years of age group

Primary Schools = (total number of primary schools in a state/district)*1000

Total Population in 7 to 11 years of age group

Upper Primary Schools

$$= \frac{\text{total number of Upper primary schools in a state/district}}{\text{Total Population in 12 to 14 years of age group}} * 1000$$

Total Population in 12 to 14 years of age group

For census 2011 estimation of the population has been made by considering the percentage share of age group 7 to 11, 12 to 14 and 7 to 14 years to the total

b) Pupil Teacher Ratio = $\frac{\text{total no. of children enrolled in elementary level}}{\text{Total number of teachers in elementary school}}$

Total number of teachers in elementary school

9) Calculations are done using SPSS software. Maps are drawn using GIS.

1.7 Organization of the Study

Present study tries to assess the achievements made by the Sarv Siksha Abhiyan in India in terms of universal enrolment, retention and improvement in the quality of education. Focus of the study is on the state of Rajasthan. The entire work is organized into six major chapters. First chapter is the introductory part which deals with statement of the problem, objectives, data base, and methodology. Second chapter gives an overview of literature studied. Third chapter discusses the pattern of enrolment out of school children in India at state level and change after the launch of SSA in the enrolment and out of school children over a period of ten years. Fourth chapter looks at the reasons of non enrolment and dropout. This chapter also studies the supply side variables and their role in influencing enrolment. Fifth chapter examine the changes in the trend of enrolment, and out of school children over the time period of ten years in Rajasthan. Discussion on the reason of non enrolment and dropout has been done. Changes in the supply side variables over the period of five years and its role in affecting enrolment have been seen. Last chapter gives concludes the major findings of the present research.

Chapter-2

An Overview of Literature

2.1 Introduction

For the present research literature concerning school education has been studied. Wide range of literature related to school education such as child labour, Sarv Siksha Abhiyan, incentive schemes etc. were selected. Literature published in the decade of 1990 and the past decade of 2000 has been referred. The literature which was important for the present study and came before 1990 was also taken.

Following themes came out after reading the literature-

2.2 Parental Motivation towards Education

There are still large number of children in the 6-13 years of age group who are not in schools. It is believed that lack of parental interest is the major cause for the aforesaid problem. Probe Report clearly denies the fact and says that it is a myth. As per the Probe Report parents are interested in sending their children to school because parents are aware about the importance of education. They know that in today's world education is essential to live a respectable life. However the motivation for education is entirely different for girls and boys¹. Boys are educated because they will earn money. Therefore, economic incentive is the main inspiration behind the education of boys². Added to economic returns to education which would lead to financial security, the other driving force is that education of boys would increase social status of parents³. However, motivation behind educating girls is entirely different. Probe report says that in North India upbringing of a girl is centered on her marriage. If in marriage market

¹ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press

² Bhatta, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 28 (Jul. 11-17, 1998), pp. 1858-1869.

³ Bhatta, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 28 (Jul. 11-17, 1998), pp. 1858-1869

there are boys who are not well educated then parents do not prefer education for their daughters as this would trouble them in finding a boy who is more educated than their daughter in their own community and a well educated boy would demand more dowry. But if a community has well educated boy then the education level of girls is also found to be high because well educated boys would prefer educated⁴. Therefore, investment in education of girls depends on marriage market. Added to this economic returns to the investment done in education are accrued by the in laws. The other motivation behind daughter's schooling is that a girl would be able to face a divorce or widowhood; this was reason especially in women headed households. Some parents wanted to be in touch with their daughters through letters after her marriage⁵. Therefore, parents desire some education for girls.

Now the question arises as to why children are out of school system? The answer given by Probe Report is that parents withdraw their children from school when they see no learning being done in schools⁶. To them education is too costly. Obviously the amount that parents spend on the education is not properly rewarded.

2.3 Financial Constraints as a limiting Factor in Child's Education

It is said that education in governmental schools is free and compulsory upto the age of 14. But again this is not the reality. Probe Report says that it is the admission fee which is not charged by the government, but the other costs such as cost of clothes, textbooks, other stationary items etc. and that too for number of children means a lot to the poor family. These are some of the direct costs only; there are indirect costs also such as time spent in making child ready for school. Children often are involved in household activities, helping parents on farm, collecting fuel etc. which saves parents time that they can invest in other income generating activities.

⁴ Bhatti, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 28 (Jul. 11-17, 1998), pp. 1858-1869

⁵ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press

⁶ Bhatti, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 28 (Jul. 11-17, 1998), pp. 1858-1869

Kiran Bhatta says that the poor parents has to incur both direct and indirect costs of educating a child and this is the reason why financing education of children and that too of a poor quality becomes the main factor that discourages parents to send their children to school.

2.4 Child Labour as a Reason of Dropout

A large number of children are out of school and it is generally said that child labour is one of the main reason. However, this is not the truth. Bhatta quotes Mehrotra study to make a point that majority of the dropouts takes in early grades. Children at this young age cannot contribute through their labour. It has been found that even if child work, then the economic returns of labour is very less. Probe Report says that mostly children are part time workers, not full time workers, and the schools are open for a few hours a day. Bhatta describes child labour as a default activity i.e. it is not that children dropout because they work but because children have dropped out from school due to number of other reasons, find some productive work as a default activity. There are many children who neither go to school nor work, these children are termed as 'no where children' by D.P. Chaudhri⁷. Even if children work as part time labourers, their time and labour is spent on household activities such working on family's farm, looking after younger sibling etc. The burden of household work is heavy especially for the eldest daughter in the family. Therefore, the opportunity cost of sending daughter to school is very high as she has to do household work which frees her mother to do income generating activities⁸. But this is reality only in areas where girl education holds no importance.

⁷ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), "*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*" Oxford University Press New Delhi.

⁸ Bhatta, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 27 (Jul. 4-10, 1998), pp. 1731-1740

From the discussion on parental motivation, financial constraints and child labour it is clear that there is a demand of education among people but it should have quality so that the time and efforts spent on children are rewarded properly.

2.5 Quality of Education

It is clear that there is a demand for quality of education. Though government has opened schools for all children but their quality is often looked upon with a question mark. Bhatta argues that most studies takes quality as constant whereas poverty as the main cause of lower achievements. She further adds that suggestions to increase the quantity of schools and giving number of incentives to attend schools are often given by research, but little emphasis is given on the demand of quality education by parents.

J.P. Naik considers quality as the soul of the education. He is of the view that no education is achieved without the quality of education. He suggests certain independent variables such as “*significance, relevance, capacity, standards and efficiency*”.⁹

Since independence no. of reports have been published on education that emphasizes on achieving quality education and consequently a no. of policies have been made to achieve the aim of accomplishing quality education to children. Whether National Policy on Education of 1968, 1986, 1992 or the most recent one Sarv Siksha Abhiyan all of them had target to provide quality of education.

Quality of education depends on two major factors - infrastructural facilities and teachers¹⁰. Bhatta adds one more to the list i.e. "The organisational and managerial factors that determine the effectiveness with which resources are utilized".

Infrastructural Facilities

⁹ Naik, J.P (1975), “*Equality, Quality and Quantity: the Elusive Triangle in Indian Education*” Allied Publishers, Bombay.

¹⁰ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), “*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*” Oxford University Press New Delhi.

Schools severely lack basic infrastructural facilities such as pucca building schools, separate classrooms for each grade, drinking water facilities, toilet facilities etc. Even if these facilities are present they are not in usable condition. The situation is even worse in rural areas, where there is a dearth of schools especially upper primary schools. Absence of schools will have effect on the continuation of studies of a child. Often a girl child suffers the most because of the lack of upper primary schools¹¹. Parents don't want to send their daughters too far for studies.¹² The schools that are available are often not pucca building schools, therefore, the extremities of weather condition affects the learning. Classrooms are not available in appropriate number and the existing classrooms are either not properly ventilated or are the ones that need major repairs. This again limits availability of instructional rooms. Probe Report states that the villages that were surveyed only 11% and 41% of schools surveyed in these villages had toilet and drinking water facilities respectively.

However it is not only the infrastructural facilities that influence quality of education but the learning process in classroom¹³. Mukherji and Mukherji are of the view that learning process in classroom depends on many factors such as no. of instructional days. Their research found that time spent in school is directly related to the outcomes such as wages earned in future. Another factor that influences the learning process is teaching standard in school.

Teachers

Teacher is the leader in classroom. Infrastructure creates suitable condition so that studies don't get adversely affected. However in the process of learning it is the teacher who plays the most important role. So, it is important to have motivated and competent teachers to impart quality education. Now the question arises that - Are the teachers motivated and competent?

¹¹ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press

¹² Bhatt, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 27 (Jul. 4-10, 1998), pp. 1731-1740

¹³ Pandey, S (2006), "Para Teacher Scheme and quality Education for all in India: Policy Perspectives and Challenges for School Effectiveness" *Journal of Education for Teaching*.

Probe Team in their field survey found out that still schools in many areas are run by single teacher. Probe Report says that a single teacher not only has the responsibility to teach but also loaded with non teaching duties. He/she has to handle five classes and to teach simultaneously, under such circumstances the effective teaching time gets reduced to a significant extent. Teachers, too, find themselves burdened and get demotivated. From the above discussion it is clear that there is lack of teachers in schools. Even in primary schools with three teachers, it becomes difficult to cope up with teaching and manage pupils. Again there is a difficulty in giving quality time to pupils. A government school teacher is loaded with other non teaching assignments such as "decennial census, the cattle census, anti poverty schemes, health programmes, literacy campaigns and vote counting"¹⁴. All such activities reduce the instructional days in schools thereby affecting learning process in schools.

Probe Report discusses the demotivation factor for teachers. Report says that village schools lack proper classrooms, there is a dearth of teaching aids, toilets do not have water supply and sometimes are not present at all. Teachers also find difficulty in dealing with parents of pupils. Another factor for demotivation among teachers as per the Probe Report is that teachers don't see enthusiasm in parents regarding education of their child as they never turn up for parent teacher meetings, parents don't send children to school and are not concerned with the progress of child in school. Because children in government schools and in rural areas are first generation learners, therefore, this again demands a lot of effort from teachers to make child understand small or trivial things. Most of the textbooks talks about the life in urban areas so pupils can't relate such things with their environment. Focus is given on completing the course and not on learning. All these factors discourage a teacher.

Now comes the question that is the teachers competent enough? In terms of qualification Probe Report says that most teachers in primary schools have education above secondary level and have received some type of training. Teachers have degrees of B.A., B.Ed., M.A. etc. but the report clearly says that B.Ed. is training for secondary school teaching, less focus is given as to how to teach in primary schools. If training is given by government then the methods taught in such trainings are hard to practice in

¹⁴ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press.

classroom because of the poor infrastructure facilities. Probe Report suggests that training should be provided by the experienced teachers which would solve the problems faced by the teachers.

As already discussed that in rural areas there is a dearth of teachers, therefore, government has started appointing low cost option i.e. para teachers. Pandey, S. points that these teachers are less qualified than the regular teachers. He further explains that though para teachers are sometimes from the same community, the social distance between teacher and student is not so much and they are said to be as effective as regular teachers but this is only because of the accountability factor. Lower teaching standard is also a result of lack of accountability of school teachers. Government school teachers are accountable to only to the inspectors of Education Department and not to the village community which have strong personal interest in the functioning of school¹⁵. Parents of children in government schools belong to the disadvantaged community which is neither influential nor powerful. In case of private schools teachers are accountable to the parents as they are more influential and powerful.

Probe Report suggests accountability as a measure to increase the motivation and competence teachers. Present systems of accountability are ineffective. Promotions are based on the seniority. Transfers are again politically motivated. Because of the lack of work culture, there is not sufficient peer pressure. Teachers are accountable to only administration and not to the parents therefore again the community accountability fails¹⁶.

Teachers in government schools are generally from urban areas, economically better off than the pupils studying in government schools and are usually of upper caste. This social distance leads to lack of commitment from teachers (Probe Report, 1999). Therefore the need of the hour is to impart quality of education to all so that the disadvantaged could really learn and come out of the vicious circle of poverty. PROBE Report 1999 has rightly said that, “*the right to education is has to be understood as a right to*

¹⁵ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), “*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*” Oxford University Press New Delhi.

¹⁶ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press.

education of a certain quality. Who would aspire to the right to get crushed, bored, humiliated or punished day after day¹⁷?”

Quality of education is one thing that everyone demands but the point that Dongaonkar puts it as “ *it is always debated, as to whose responsibility it is to maintain the quality of education whether policy makers, administration, universities, teachers, society or students. I consider it a joint responsibility of all stakeholders, which needs coordinated efforts and definite commitments to improve the system*”¹⁸. Therefore to achieve the quality of education everyone has to stand and contribute the way one can.

Community Participation

The community in which one individual lives plays a significant role in influencing important decisions. A community in which education holds no importance then an individual even if he wants his children to go school would not do so and on the other hand in a community where every child goes to school then an individual is compelled to send his children to school. Community influences almost all aspects of education whether it is enrolment in a school, educating girls, continuing education beyond certain age or demanding quality of education. PROBE Report gives an example of a Gujjar woman who has never seen any educated women in her life therefore she does not feel the importance of education for her daughter. On the hand there is an example of parents in Kerala when they were asked about what is the motivation behind sending their children to school, they answered that going to school is the obvious thing for a child to do.

The progress of school education in Himachal Pradesh as it is popularly termed as ‘School Revolution’ happened due to government efforts and most importantly due to community efforts¹⁹. Egalitarian social structure is responsible for strong community participation. Dreze and Sen explains the the role of community as the most important factor that contributed to the success of the Himachal Pradesh. Community made conducive atmosphere for education which has led to parental motivation for sending children to school. Educating children has become a social norm in the state. Strong

¹⁷ PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press

¹⁸ Dongaonkar, Dayanand,(2006), “Missing Links in Education System in India”

<http://www.dise.in/Downloads/Use%20of%20Dise%20Data/Prof%20Dayanand%20%20Dongaonkar.pdf>

¹⁹ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), “*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*” Oxford University Press New Delhi.

community participation has led to proper functioning of school as the teachers are accountable to the parents. The close relation of community with school has enabled them to monitor and supervise the school²⁰. Dreze and Sen says that there is no taboo over women working outside the home, as a result there are number of female teachers in school which encourages girls enrolment in school. Another state that has improved its school system is Karnataka. The commitment of community towards education is so strong that it the community not only provides money, infrastructure but in the absence or vacancy of school teacher volunteers come and teach children in school²¹. In her study in Tirthahalli taluk of Shimoga district in Karnataka, Mythili quotes a teacher posted in the taluk- *“How can we escape from doing our duty when there is such a constant vigil over us? If we donot work regularly, we will be humiliated in their eyes. We cannot afford to face such a humiliation in these small villages where education is given high importance irrespective of caste, gender and class differences”*²²

In a similar way Sunita Chugh found that in the state of Mizoram the community has opened upper primary school wherever there were students who have completed primary education but upper primary school was not present. Added to this appointment of teachers with the payment of salary till the schools are not aided by the government. On the other hand Dreze and Sen gives an example of village in Uttar Pradesh where a school remained non functional for ten years. This explains that if a community is not concerned for education nothing could be achieved. They compared this example of U.P with Kerala where such things are not neglected.

2.6 Incentives

India is a developing country; there is a lot to be done to improve access to education. We have a large no. of people who live below poverty line. These are the people who cannot afford education, therefore our government started no. of schemes to give

²⁰ Chugh,Sunita ,(), “Progress in Literacy and Elementary Education: The Study of Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Mizoram”
http://www.dise.in/Downloads/Use%20of%20Dise%20Data/Sunita%20Chugh_Progress%20in%20Literacy.pdf

²¹ Mythili, N (2001), “Cost-mix for Achieving Higher Quality Schooling”, *Perspectives in Education* July 155?164.

²² Mythili, N (2001), “Cost-mix for Achieving Higher Quality Schooling”, *Perspectives in Education* July 155?164

incentive to the disadvantaged section of the society so that they can have access to education. Incentives are given in various forms such as providing mid day meal, free textbooks, free uniforms etc. In 1990s with the help of national and international resources efforts were made to improve access to primary and upper primary school as a result there was significant increase in the enrolment but it failed to reach all children²³. Ramachandran, Mehrotara and Jandhyala in their research work argues that sponsored committees focused on child but from the turn of the century focused shifted to community development programmes as it would influence overall environment of children. But the focus again shifted on child as poorest of the children were left out. In the field study Ramachandran, Mehrotara and Jandhyala found that those who need the incentive the most donot get it because those who are in power avail the opportunities. Therefore they suggest that conscious selection of the most deprived should be made to reach to the most deprived. Research on urban slums done by Sunita Chugh also tells the same story. The research come up with a point that the major sources of data which are the basis for the several incentive schemes donot include urban slums and those living on the footpath and this is the reason why policies are not framed keeping these children in mind.

The study by Ramachandran, Mehrotara and Jandhyala came up with a point that the parallel school system started by NGO's donot help much as these schools are only upto primary level and once the children complete their primary they are given scholarships to continue in other school. These programmes do not benefit all the children. It was also found that there was a gender bias among parents as far as individual incentive schemes are concerned. Many parents take the incentive given to the girl child and transfer it to the boy child. Therefore they have suggested that it is important that instead of creating parallel system of education focus should be to strengthen mainstream schools so that poorest of the poor can have access to education. This research says that for effective functioning of schools there should be harmonious relationship between the community, children and the school because community creates accountability in the system.

²³ Ramachandran, Vimla, Rishi Mehrotra and Kamaeshwari Jandhyala (2007): " Incentives in Elementary Education. Do they make a difference?" Journal of Education Planning and Administration Vol. XXI Number2, April, 2007.

Sarv Siksha Abhiyan was launched to improve the access to education to all the children of 6 to 14 years of age. Number of incentives was given under this programme to attract children to school. One of the incentives was mid day meal programme. Under this programme children were given meal during the lunch time. This was done so that children of the deprived sections would attend the school but instead it was found that the school attendance was high only during the lunch hours when the meal was being served²⁴. Another incentive that was given to school was funds to improve the infrastructure and purchase teacher learning materials. Mukherji and Mukherji in their research found out that Sarva Siksha Abhiyan funds allocations takes place in a complicated manner than what the policy has documented it. They suggest that it is not only important know the allocations of resources but it is also important to know the expenditure.

2.7 Inequality

Education since independence is becoming more and more unequal as far as quality of education is concerned. Right after independence there was only one type of school i.e., government schools where everybody used to go. With time different types of schools started mushrooming. It was in nineties that private schools started growing in good percentage. The common school system enabled the rich and the poor to be in the same place of learning, however with springing up of private schools the elite children went to these schools. Now there was a clear line between the school of the rich (private) and the school of the poor (government) with the quality of education declining in government schools because now they are not accountable to powerful and influential parents²⁵. Though now access to primary education has increased a lot due government effort but the quality of education still remains a big question mark. Children though are enrolled in the school but they are not retained into the school and soon dropout from

²⁴ Dongaonkar, Dayanand,(2006), "Missing Links in Education System in India"
<http://www.dise.in/Downloads/Use%20of%20Dise%20Data/Prof%20Dayanand%20%20Dongaonkar.pdf>

²⁵ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), "*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*" Oxford University Press New Delhi.

the school. Incentive schemes are launched by the government but then the powerful people snatch these incentives and the one that are in real need never get benefitted²⁶. If the school environment of public and private school is taken into consideration then it is found that in public schools the authority i.e., the teacher and the head master usually belong to either higher caste as compared to the parents of the pupils or they are economically better, therefore the gap between parents and school authorities is much wide which decreases the accountability of the teachers (Dreze and Sen 2010). In private schools children from the disadvantaged community cannot study as they cannot afford high tuition fees. Mohan, P says that the Right to Education Bill 2009 which came into effect from April 2010 stood for reservation of 25% of the seats in private schools for economically deprived sections of the society. Though this attempt was good but this step was not taken up by private schools and those pupils who had a seat in these private schools were not able to take the benefit because they were not able to relate themselves with the school.

Velaskar,P explains that how school creates inequality in society. He states that the curriculum taught in school represents the values, knowledge, norms etc., of the middle and upper classes not of the lower classes. By this way school shows the superiority of the culture of middle and upper classes over the lower classes. The curriculum gives importance to the knowledge that serves capitalist economy. Schools are arranged in the manner of different quality so that the division of class, caste and gender is maintained. Probe Report says that the schooling system acts as a ‘filtering process’ in which the privileged gets the opportunity to have good schooling but the deprived should not have any so that the opportunity of elite is not in danger.

2.8 Caste, Religion and Region

Karuna Chanana says that the schedule caste, schedule tribe and minorities are have been deprived of the education historically. Schedule caste occupies the lowest standing in the caste system of Hindus. The distribution of scarce resources namely income,

²⁶ Ramachandran, Vimla, Rishi Mehrotra and Kamaeshwari Jandhyala (2007): “ Incentives in Elementary Education. Do they make a difference?” Journal of Education Planning and Administration Vol. XXI Number2, April, 2007.

health and education in earlier times were determined on the caste. Therefore lower castes had little or no access to these resources.

Chanana discussing on tribes says that Schedule tribes in India are mostly distributed in central India and north and north eastern states. Tribes are generally geographically isolated and have low economic status but still they are different in many ways. She explains that tribes of central India are the most deprived they were the ones that faced exploitative interference from the mainstream. Their condition was further deteriorated during colonial times when their land, forests and other resources were snatched from them the process continues till the date. On the other hand tribes of north eastern states had long exposure to missionary activity, they were also not oppressed by the mainstream and were not exposed to the hierarchal structures therefore they were not deprived as tribes of central India. However, they need special efforts to mainstream them in society.

Among all religions in India it is Islam that is educationally most backward. Chanana explains the reason of their backwardness relate to their occupation. Majority of muslims in India were “artisans, skilled workers, craftsmen”²⁷ and the modern education did not improved their skills. They also preferred religious instruction in madrasa and maktabas where modern education was not taught so they remained backward as far as modern education is concerned.

Region is also an important medium in which caste, religion and gender gets modified.²⁸ Backward region would have educational achievements less than the other regions and in such regions schedule population, women and muslims perform worse than their counterparts in other regions.

2.9 Socioeconomic status of parents

Socioeconomic status of parents which includes parental education, income and occupation play significant role in influencing children education. Generally children of

²⁷ Chanana, Karuna (1993), “Accessing higher education: the dilemma of schooling women, minorities, Scheduled Castes and scheduled Tribes in contemporary India” *Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Perspectives on Higher Education in India (Jul.,1003), pp.69-92.

²⁸ Chanana, Karuna (1993), “Accessing higher education: the dilemma of schooling women, minorities, Scheduled Castes and scheduled Tribes in contemporary India” *Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Perspectives on Higher Education in India (Jul.,1003), pp.69-92.

educated parents have very less chances to dropout as compared to those whose parents are illiterate. Mother's education has more impact on child's education as compared to the father's education²⁹. Bhatta says that the chances of daughter's education increases to a significant extent in women headed households.

There was negative relationship of income of parents has with dropout. With the increasing income the chances of education of child increases. Occupation of parents is another factor that influences the education of child. Parents occupation in economically preferred sectors have positive relationship with the retention of child in studies. Income does not have statistical significance with the performance of child in studies³⁰ but it does have an impact on survival of child in school. Higher dropouts are likely to occur in poor families because of the financial constraints. While, in economically better off families a child has to continue his/her education whether he/she wants or not.

²⁹ Desai, Uday (1991): "Determinants of Educational Performance in India: Role of Home and Family", *International Review of Education* Vol. 37, No. 2 (1991): 245?265.

³⁰ Desai, Uday (1991): "Determinants of Educational Performance in India: Role of Home and Family", *International Review of Education* Vol. 37, No. 2 (1991): 245?265.

CHAPTER 3

PATTERNS AND TRENDS OF ENROLMENT IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

Elementary education is the base of education. Stronger the base stronger would be the building i.e. a sound base of elementary education prepares and encourages child for higher education. In our country to receive the benefits of education one has to complete higher education. Higher education is important because a well educated, trained person fetches a high salaried job which is one the important factors for growth and development. If the one reaches to the higher level of education then not only an individual is benefitted but also the nation. India is a developing country and needs skilled workforce for development. If children either never enrolled or dropout from school then not only these children and their families but the whole country is at loss. Therefore education base should be strong so that an individual can sustain up to higher levels of education. Other than the economic returns of basic education there are other benefits of basic education Dreze and Sen¹ regard basic education as a catalyst of social change. They gave example of Kerala where spread of education lead to decrease in inequalities of caste, class and gender. Therefore, basic education plays a significant role in social justice and equity. It also helps in improving well being of an individual because an individual can have first hand access to written word which connects him/her to the outside world.

Given the importance of basic education a number programmes and policies were launched by government of India to provide basic education to the masses. In the same line Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) was launched in 2001 with the objectives of improving access, quality, reducing inequalities and universal retention in elementary education by

¹ Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), "*India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*" Oxford University Press New Delhi.

2010.

Present chapter tries to look whether Sarv Siksha Abhiyan was successful in its objectives of improving enrolment, retention and reducing inequalities in elementary education. To see whether Sarv Siksha Abhiyan made significant progress in terms of enrollment, and retention in elementary education, the present chapter focus on two aspects:

- (A) Enrolment of children - which is studied under Gross Attendance Ratio (GAR) and Net Attendance Ratio (NAR).
- (B) Out of School children – which comprises of never enrolled and dropped out children.

Gross Attendance Ratio

NSSO defines Gross Attendance Ratio as “the ratio of the number of persons in the class – group to the number persons in the corresponding official age group”.² For the present study class group I –VIII was selected and the corresponding official age group was 6 to 13 years was taken. Values of gross attendance ratio could be greater than “100” because in the numerator no. of persons studying in elementary education could be greater than the denominator specified age group 6 to 13 i.e., there can be children studying in class I of age less than 6 years and there can be children enrolled in class VII or VIII of age more than 13 years. This is the reason why this ratio is called “gross”.

Table 3.1 gives gross attendance ratio for 55th and 66th rounds. Urban areas have higher gross attendance ratio as compared to rural areas. There has been increase in the gross attendance ratio for India as a whole from 75.8% in 1999-2000 to 95.7% in 2009-10. This implies that the children studying in elementary education has increased to 20% approximately. There has been increase in gross attendance ratio but the trend that was

² NSSO 64th Round (July 2007-June 08), “Education in India : 2007-08, Participation and Expenditure” Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Government of India.

observed in 55th round was the same in 66th round as well i.e., those states that had lesser or higher gross attendance ratio were the same. Lower values of gross attendance ratio was recorded for the state of Bihar, Orissa, Arunachal Pradesh in both the rounds. On the other side states and UT's like Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep, Sikkim continues to have GAR above 100% in both the rounds. The no. of states and UT's having gross attendance ratio higher than 100 has increased in no. from 8 to 14 with the entry of states like Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan.

Table 3.1 State-wise Gross Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in rural and urban India

GAR	1999-2000			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A & N Islands	102.6	102.8	102.6	99.7	107.7	102.3
Andhra Pradesh	72.0	82.1	75.0	91.8	87.7	90.6
Arunachal Pradesh	65.3	67.3	65.5	73.1	78.6	74.3
Assam	80.6	94.8	82.0	98.1	99.5	98.3
Bihar	43.2	62.4	45.6	86.9	90.4	87.5
Chandigarh	88.5	97.8	96.6	84.0	97.8	94.4
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	75.4	99.3	77.2	71.1	99.3	76.5
Daman & Diu	106.1	99.1	103.1	88.0	96.2	92.7
Delhi	125.7	76.8	88.7	69.9	91.9	90.0
Goa	85.1	67.1	77.8	95.2	120.3	102.7
Gujarat	81.2	94.5	85.1	83.2	87.4	84.7
Haryana	89.1	86.2	88.4	112.5	100.9	108.9
Himachal Pradesh	101.7	106.3	102.2	111.4	106.6	111.0
Jammu & Kashmir	98.3	81.2	95.1	107.6	105.2	107.1
Karnataka	74.3	83.9	76.5	91.3	92.8	91.8
Kerala	90.9	87.6	90.1	91.7	88.6	90.9
Lakshadweep	101.0	105.8	103.8	100.9	100.6	100.8
Madhya Pradesh	70.6	86.0	73.8	101.1	100.2	101.0
Maharashtra	86.5	95.4	89.7	93.9	96.1	94.7
Manipur	85.0	85.3	85.1	86.7	89.2	87.3
Meghalaya	90.4	88.7	90.1	109.2	81.2	104.0
Mizoram	105.2	105.2	105.2	102.7	94.5	99.0
Nagaland	100.9	93.3	98.5	115.5	92.2	109.1
Orissa	61.9	68.9	63.1	91.6	85.4	90.8
Pondicherry	103.2	92.1	96.8	97.3	103.0	100.8
Punjab	80.3	82.6	81.0	108.4	102.4	106.4
Rajasthan	73.4	87.5	76.2	101.9	97.3	100.9
Sikkim	111.9	90.9	110.2	121.6	111.8	120.6
Tamil Nadu	98.2	94.1	96.7	98.6	99.8	99.1
Tripura	100.4	101.6	100.5	112.6	113.8	112.8
Uttar Pradesh	74.2	72.0	73.8	104.4	103.7	104.3
West Bengal	77.4	86.0	78.9	96.5	108.4	98.9
India	73.4	83.5	75.8	95.8	95.6	95.7

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

However, for Mizoram gross attendance ratio has actually declined from 105.2% in 55th round to 99.0% in 66th round.

As said earlier that gross attendance ratio covers both the under age and over age factor and usually it is the over age factor that predominates. Therefore, gross attendance ratio shows the inefficiency in the system means that either these children have enrolled late or they are repeaters, both conditions reveals inefficiency in the system. Gross attendance ratio presents the short coming in the system on the other hand NAR i.e., net attendance ratio gives clear picture about what is happening in the particular age group. It gives an idea as to how many children in the particular age group are attending school. The next section deals with the net attendance ratio in 6 to 13 years of age group.

Net Attendance Ratio

NSSO defines net attendance ratio as, the ratio of the member of persons in the official age-group attending a particular class-group to the total no persons in the age group. For the present study net attendance ratio is calculated for the official age group of 6-13 years of class I to VIII to the total population of 6-13 years of age.

Net attendance ratio has increased from 63.1% in 1999-2000 to 82.9% in 2009-10 (Table 3.2). The pattern that was observed in 55th round persists in 66th round .i.e though there is an increase in net attendance ratio but the state's and UT's that had higher percentage in 55th had higher percentage in 66th round also, on the contrary those performed less than the national average in 55th round continues to have lower net attendance ratio in 66th round with some exceptions. Lakshadweep, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Mizoram, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu had higher net attendance ratio in 55th round had higher net attendance ratio in 66th round too with the entry of Sikkim, Tripura, Pondicherry into the group in 66th round. Bihar had lowest percentage as low as 36.8% in 55th round though the state improved this ratio making it 72.6% in 66th round but the state occupies 3rd last position among Indian states. Arunachal Pradesh had lowest NAR in both the rounds, along with Arunachal Pradesh, Orissa, Manipur, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan had NAR values lesser than the national average. It is interesting to note that

for 2009-10 Uttar Pradesh and higher NAR than Kerala, however the difference very small, but as we have seen that dropout rate of Kerala was just 0.6% whereas for Uttar Pradesh it was

Table 3.2 State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in age group 6 to 13 in rural and urban India

State/UT's	1999-2000			2010-11		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A & N Islands	86.4	84.5	86.0	95.0	94.1	94.7
Andhra Pradesh	61.8	70.9	64.5	83.6	80.3	82.6
Arunachal Pradesh	47.7	58.6	48.9	59.4	67.7	61.2
Assam	68.9	82.1	70.2	85.0	85.7	85.0
Bihar	34.9	49.7	36.8	72.0	77.2	72.6
Chandigarh	77.6	81.5	81.0	81.9	82.7	82.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	67.2	88.2	68.8	63.4	90.5	68.7
Daman & Diu	87.9	88.3	88.1	84.3	90.8	88.0
Delhi	78.3	60.9	65.1	60.0	82.9	80.9
Goa	78.9	64.9	73.2	89.7	95.2	91.3
Gujarat	71.5	80.6	74.2	74.8	80.5	76.7
Haryana	71.2	66.6	70.1	92.7	87.1	90.9
Himachal Pradesh	81.8	86.6	82.2	93.2	86.9	92.7
Jammu & Kashmir	70.8	67.0	70.1	90.8	88.2	90.3
Karnataka	66.3	76.1	68.6	85.1	86.1	85.4
Kerala	81.4	78.6	80.7	85.7	82.4	84.9
Lakshdweep	96.9	91.2	93.6	100.0	84.9	91.7
Madhya Pradesh	57.7	70.7	60.4	82.7	82.0	82.6
Maharashtra	77.3	83.3	79.5	87.0	86.2	86.7
Manipur	56.3	62.8	58.0	77.7	81.3	78.7
Meghalaya	71.3	75.8	72.1	81.5	69.7	79.3
Mizoram	82.1	85.4	83.4	92.1	88.6	90.5
Nagaland	69.4	72.8	70.5	89.8	81.6	87.6
Orissa	54.1	61.1	55.3	81.7	77.9	81.2
Pondicherry	85.2	76.8	80.4	96.5	90.5	92.8
Punjab	63.2	68.3	64.7	88.0	85.5	87.2
Rajasthan	59.3	71.3	61.7	82.7	78.7	81.8
Sikkim	76.5	66.9	75.7	95.3	94.9	95.2
Tamil Nadu	80.5	82.4	81.2	89.8	89.8	89.8
Tripura	73.3	69.8	72.9	93.9	94.5	94.0
Uttar Pradesh	60.9	57.1	60.2	85.4	83.6	85.1
West Bengal	61.1	68.1	62.2	84.5	93.1	86.2
India	61.0	70.1	63.1	82.6	83.9	82.9

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Table 3.3 State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary age group 6 to 13 among Boys and Girls in India

	1999-2000			2009-10		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	85.6	86.5	86.0	92.3	98.1	94.7
Andhra Pradesh	68.4	60.3	64.5	84.2	80.8	82.6
Arunachal Pradesh	45.6	52.7	48.9	61.7	60.7	61.2
Assam	74.5	65.3	70.2	85.3	84.7	85.0
Bihar	41.5	31.0	36.8	74.2	70.6	72.6
Chandigarh	81.4	80.4	81.0	84.3	80.7	82.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	75.0	62.9	68.8	72.9	61.9	68.7
Daman & Diu	90.0	86.2	88.1	96.7	76.0	88.0
Delhi	69.8	60.4	65.1	83.7	77.0	80.9
Goa	76.8	68.4	73.2	99.1	83.4	91.3
Gujarat	78.2	69.5	74.2	78.9	73.7	76.7
Haryana	71.9	68.1	70.1	92.0	89.6	90.9
Himachal Pradesh	81.6	82.9	82.2	91.5	94.1	92.7
Jammu & Kashmir	77.6	62.2	70.1	89.9	90.7	90.3
Karnataka	69.5	67.7	68.6	82.2	88.9	85.4
Kerala	83.1	78.2	80.7	87.0	82.9	84.9
Lakshdweep	93.4	93.9	93.6	89.6	94.1	91.7
Madhya Pradesh	65.2	55.1	60.4	82.8	82.4	82.6
Maharashtra	80.5	78.4	79.5	86.0	87.4	86.7
Manipur	59.2	56.5	58.0	78.8	78.5	78.7
Meghalaya	70.7	73.5	72.1	84.3	74.2	79.3
Mizoram	85.0	81.8	83.4	92.6	88.1	90.5
Nagaland	73.1	67.4	70.5	85.9	89.3	87.6
Orissa	58.4	52.0	55.3	79.8	82.7	81.2
Pondicherry	83.3	77.6	80.4	93.2	92.5	92.8
Punjab	65.8	63.4	64.7	87.2	87.2	87.2
Rajasthan	71.4	50.6	61.7	84.5	78.8	81.8
Sikkim	77.2	74.1	75.7	96.1	94.4	95.2
Tamil Nadu	82.2	80.1	81.2	90.5	88.9	89.8
Tripura	74.3	71.1	72.9	96.4	91.4	94.0
Uttar Pradesh	65.6	53.9	60.2	86.2	83.8	85.1
West Bengal	65.2	59.1	62.2	86.2	86.2	86.2
India	66.9	58.9	63.1	83.7	82.0	82.9

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

2.5% which means that merely improving enrolment is not enough, efforts should be made to retain child in school.

Rural area had lower net attendance ratio than urban area in both the rounds, however the gap between rural-urban has decreased to a considerable extent, infact in 2009-10 in many states net attendance ratio for rural areas was greater than their urban counterparts such as Rajasthan, Orissa, Mizoram, Lakshadweep, Sikkim etc. to name a few but here again the rural areas have higher dropouts than urban areas. Lakshadweep in 66th round had net attendance ratio of 100% in rural area which is an ideal condition that each and every state/ UT should achieve. Among girls and boys, girls had lower net attendance ratio in 55th as well as 66th round (Table 3.3). Though the state's and UT's where the net attendance ratio is low for boys, girls attendance is also observed to be low. In case of Bihar, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi attendance is low both for boys and girls and the gap in attendance is also wide.

There is a drop in attendance as one enters upper primary section, therefore to have clear view, net attendance ratio was calculated for primary and upper primary sections for 66th round, it was found that net attendance ratio declined as one moved from primary to upper primary (table 3.4 and table 3.5). Rural areas had lower attendance; especially in case of rural girls, they had lowest attendance. Those states/UT's that had higher net attendance ratio at primary level had higher attendance upper primary level also these states/ UT's include Tripura, Andaman & Nicobar, Islands, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh etc. whereas Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Bihar, Delhi had lower NAR in both primary and upper primary. Kerala had lower net attendance ratio than Uttar Pradesh in rural as well as in urban areas but at upper primary level, the NAR Uttar Pradesh drops from 82.7% to 49.1% in rural areas and 79% to 52.5% in urban areas, whereas Kerala showed more consistent performance, where the state had 72.4% attendance in primary level and 66.2% at upper primary level for rural Kerala, and 75.3% at primary level to 59.1% at upper primary level.

Net attendance ratio among different social groups is shown in table 3.6, schedule tribe has the lowest NAR, they are followed by schedule caste. “Non scheduled” had higher net attendance ratio in 1999-2000 as well as in 2009-10 schedule tribes of south India and Himalayas

Table 3.4 State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Primary level in age group 6 to 13 among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)

Primary State/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	91.9	93.5	92.7	94.9	95.1	95.0
Andhra Pradesh	85.1	82.8	84.0	79.8	77.3	78.6
Arunachal Pradesh	43.3	45.3	44.3	52.3	51	51.7
Assam	75	79.6	77.3	78.4	79.5	79.0
Bihar	64.4	61.2	62.8	71.7	68.6	70.1
Chandigarh	91.9	77.2	84.6	71.7	80.6	76.2
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	61.3	42.7	52.0	83	69.8	76.4
Daman & Diu	72.1	29.9	51.0	81.6	98	89.8
Delhi	60.2	42.6	51.4	72.3	78	75.2
Goa	86.4	80	83.2	68.1	94.7	81.4
Gujrat	71.9	75	73.5	78.4	72.4	75.4
Haryana	87.6	83.8	85.7	85.3	87.4	86.4
Himachal Pradesh	87	87.2	87.1	86.1	85.3	85.7
Jammu & Kashmir	89	90.6	89.8	76	81.6	78.8
Karnataka	83.4	83.7	83.6	85.4	80.7	83.1
Kerala	74.6	70.1	72.4	77.3	73.2	75.3
Lakshadweep	92.5	100	96.3	69.7	78.6	74.2
Madhya Pradesh	77.6	77.4	77.5	77.4	73.0	75.2
Maharastra	85.4	79	82.2	77.8	79.1	78.5
Manipur	58.1	56.2	57.2	67.9	58.7	63.3
Meghalaya	61.8	47.6	54.7	66.5	43.4	55.0
Mizoram	89.2	82.4	85.8	73.9	81.2	77.6
Nagaland	77.1	82.4	79.8	62.1	63.7	62.9
Orissa	84.2	85.2	84.7	84.3	83	83.7
Pondicherry	84.2	72.6	78.4	84	81.4	82.7
Punjab	85.1	86.7	85.9	83.3	76	79.7
Rajasthan	82.6	77.9	80.3	78.6	73.4	76.0
Sikkim	95.1	87.6	91.4	87.3	98.8	93.1
Tamil Nadu	87.6	86.4	87.0	86.9	83.6	85.3
Tripura	96.6	94.9	95.8	97.3	91.7	94.5
Uttar Pradesh	83.6	81.7	82.7	78.7	79.3	79.0
West Bengal	75.3	75.7	75.5	80.5	80.4	80.5
India	78.6	76.9	77.8	79.2	77.6	78.4

(Source: NSSO 66th Round)

Table 3.5 State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Upper Primary level in age group 6 to 13 among Boys and Girls in India (2009-10)

Upper Primary State/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	61.9	81.6	71.8	67.4	78.8	73.1
Andhra Pradesh	57.9	53.4	55.7	55.8	47.4	51.6
Arunachal Pradesh	33.7	34.4	34.1	47.7	53.4	50.6
Assam	61.9	67.1	64.5	53.7	64.4	59.1
Bihar	37.3	38.1	37.7	41.6	44.4	43.0
Chandigarh	73.6	50.7	62.2	60	58.6	59.3
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	80.3	62.1	71.2	77	95.8	86.4
Daman & Diu	91.8	100	95.9	93.4	54	73.7
Delhi	43.6	36.6	40.1	64.3	50.4	57.4
Goa	100	52.9	76.5	68.9	57.8	63.4
Gujrat	56.9	44.4	50.7	63.1	57.7	60.4
Haryana	61.5	59.1	60.3	53.7	44.9	49.3
Himachal Pradesh	80.9	70.5	75.7	36.9	73.2	55.1
Jammu & Kashmir	58.1	62.7	60.4	63.7	57.2	60.5
Karnataka	59.5	69.5	64.5	58.4	68.4	63.4
Kerala	71	61.3	66.2	55.7	62.8	59.3
Lakshadweep	100	85.7	92.9	68.1	57.6	62.9
Madhya Pradesh	57.0	60.7	58.9	53.5	66.6	60.0
Maharashtra	60.7	69.9	65.3	62.7	70.1	66.4
Manipur	54.6	52.7	53.7	60.9	57.3	59.1
Meghalaya	56.1	61.6	58.9	62.4	56.3	59.4
Mizoram	69.3	64.7	67.0	71.8	72.2	72.0
Nagaland	56.2	58.4	57.3	62.7	65.7	64.2
Orissa	47.9	60.2	54.1	53.3	44.6	49.0
Pondicherry	94.7	90	92.4	80.8	70.9	75.9
Punjab	58.4	59.4	58.9	57.7	63.4	60.6
Rajasthan	56.1	48.1	52.1	52.5	48.1	50.3
Sikkim	47.3	62.4	54.9	74.6	57.1	65.9
Tamil Nadu	76.2	74.1	75.2	73.8	71.5	72.7
Tripura	70.7	50.1	60.4	60.2	79.3	69.8
Uttar Pradesh	49.0	49.2	49.1	54.7	50.3	52.5
West Bengal	65.3	69.6	67.5	80.6	81.2	80.9
India	54.7	55.9	55.3	59.7	59.3	59.5

(Source: NSSO 66th Round)

Table 3.6 State-wise Net Attendance Ratio at Elementary level in age group 6 to 13 among social groups in India

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
A & N Islands	87.7	57.2	88.4	86.0	97.0		94.5	94.7
Andhra Pradesh	44.7	62.1	67.3	64.5	77.4	83.5	82.8	82.6
Arunachal Pradesh	45.9	38.1	57.9	48.9	59.5	29.7	67.5	61.2
Assam	77.0	69.9	68.9	70.2	83.8	91.4	84.3	85.0
Bihar	41.7	24.0	39.8	36.8	72.5	63.9	75.3	72.6
Chandigarh	93.1	76.2	82.0	81.0		90.4	77.8	82.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	66.0	92.7	82.3	68.8	63.6	66.2	95.4	68.7
Daman & Diu	86.0	98.2	87.9	88.1	98.7	100.0	82.4	88.0
Delhi	40.4	53.5	68.7	65.1	3.1	90.6	79.3	80.9
Goa	50.0	86.1	72.7	73.2	100.0	100.0	89.8	91.3
Gujarat	66.7	68.5	77.3	74.2	70.5	73.3	78.8	76.7
Haryana	19.1	63.9	73.1	70.1	28.0	90.2	91.7	90.9
Himachal Pradesh	78.8	80.8	82.9	82.2	91.6	94.2	92.2	92.7
Jammu & Kashmir	34.9	44.4	75.2	70.1	78.0	92.4	90.5	90.3
Karnataka	62.1	63.5	71.0	68.6	83.0	84.8	85.8	85.4
Kerala	69.4	80.8	80.8	80.7	58.5	86.3	85.3	84.9
Lakshdweep	93.6		97.4	93.6	91.5	100.0		91.7
Madhya Pradesh	49.4	57.8	66.0	60.4	78.9	84.9	83.6	82.6
Maharashtra	70.0	78.0	81.6	79.5	83.0	85.1	87.5	86.7
Manipur	57.2	37.6	60.0	58.0	73.8	95.3	80.5	78.7
Meghalaya	72.3	85.0	68.3	72.1	78.5	100.0	85.5	79.3
Mizoram	84.1	97.1	67.5	83.4	90.5	99.0	81.0	90.5
Nagaland	70.2	76.3	73.2	70.5	87.9		84.8	87.6
Orissa	40.3	54.1	63.0	55.3	83.5	81.3	80.3	81.2
Pondicherry	100.0	89.6	78.2	80.4		92.8	92.8	92.8
Punjab	60.5	55.5	71.8	64.7	83.7	86.0	88.1	87.2
Rajasthan	49.6	53.4	67.0	61.7	77.3	80.5	83.3	81.8
Sikkim	78.2	84.3	73.5	75.7	94.6	91.5	95.9	95.2
Tamil Nadu	76.9	81.7	81.1	81.2	90.2	91.1	89.4	89.8
Tripura	77.6	73.7	72.1	72.9	94.3	97.1	92.0	94.0
Uttar Pradesh	60.0	57.8	60.9	60.2	78.6	86.7	84.6	85.1
West Bengal	49.1	60.4	63.9	62.2	87.2	89.4	84.9	86.2
India	54.8	58.2	65.7	63.1	78.4	82.8	83.5	82.9

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

except for Jammu & Kashmir performed better than those of the Central India. The ratio was even 100% in Goa in 66th round. Schedule caste performed better than schedule tribe. Arunachal Pradesh and Bihar continues to have lowest NAR in 55th as well as 66th round, whereas SC's of Goa, Daman Diu, Meghalaya and Mizoram have cent percent attendance in 66th round.

Attendance ratios both gross and net tell us that SSA has been successful in bringing children to school. But are the children retain in the schools or do they dropout? Next section discusses out of school children in India.

Out of school

Sarv Siksha Abhiyan aimed for universal enrolment i.e., all children in schools till 2003. But the NSSO data of 66th round suggests that there are approximately 8 % of the children in 6 to 13 years of age group that are out of school. Table 3.7 indicates that there has been a sharp decline in out of school children in India from 22.6 % in 1999-2000 to 7.9% in 2009-10. The decline in out of school children can be seen in almost all the states and UTs except for Chandigarh and Delhi where there has been increase in out of school children over the period of ten years. This increase in metro cities of India makes us think as to why there has increase in out of school children in the developed urban areas of India. The answer to this question would be discussed later in next chapter.

Table 3.7 suggests that there has been decline in out of school children over a period of ten years. Urban areas have lesser out of school children as compared to rural areas. However, the states and UTs that performed well and those that performed worst in 1999-2000 are the same in year 2009-10. A number of state and UTs have shown improvement in ten years in reducing out of school children these include Daman & Diu, Goa, Tamil Nadu, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Nagaland. On a whole most of the north-eastern states had lower percentage of out of school children in both the NSSO rounds. On the other extreme, the states of Bihar, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh had higher percentage of out of school children in the both years. Bihar had the highest percentage of out of school in both the years, though a significant decline was recorded from 1999-2000 to 2009-10, but still 15.1% children in

Bihar are not the part of school system. On the brighter side, are the states of Orissa, West Bengal and Dadra & Nagar Havelli where there is a significant decrease in out of school children over the period of ten years.

Table 3.7 Percentage of Out of School Children in the age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India

	1999-2000			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A & N Islands	7.4	2.7	6.3	1.3	0	0.8
Andhra Pradesh	23.9	14.1	20.9	4.5	3.8	4.2
Arunachal Pradesh	25.6	15.3	24.8	11.3	8.2	10.6
Assam	20.4	9.5	19.2	7.2	2.7	6.8
Bihar	48.2	27.3	44.8	14.1	7.35	12.0
Chandigarh	4.1	6.9	6.5	8.6	9.3	9.2
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	27.1	6.9	25.7	1.4	0.8	1.5
Daman & Diu	7	3.3	5.4	0	0	0.0
Delhi	1.2	12.2	9.5	33.3	8.8	10.8
Goa	11.4	4.9	8.1	0	0	0.0
Gujarat	20.4	11.1	17.4	11.3	4.3	8.4
Haryana	14	12.9	13.5	5.1	7.7	5.8
Himachal Pradesh	3.6	1.3	3.4	2.6	3.9	2.7
Jammu & Kashmir	18.1	12.2	17.0	3.2	2.6	3.0
Karnataka	20.7	8.6	17.9	4.6	1.9	3.7
Kerala	1.8	1.3	1.7	1.3	0.3	1.0
Lakshdweep	0.3	2.7	1.7	0	0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	30.2	12.9	26.4	8.3	6.65	7.9
Maharashtra	12.5	5.5	9.8	3.4	2.7	3.2
Manipur	10.8	1.6	8.3	2.9	0.8	2.4
Meghalaya	11.4	3.7	10.1	2	3.7	2.3
Mizoram	10.9	3.9	7.9	1	1.3	1.1
Nagaland	9.6	4.4	7.8	0	2.9	0.8
Orissa	27.7	16.7	25.8	5	9	5.5
Pondicherry	2.1	6.1	4.6	0.8	1.1	1.1
Punjab	12.6	10.5	12.0	6	8.3	6.6
Rajasthan	31.1	13.9	26.9	11.1	11.5	10.9
Sikkim	4.1	14.3	4.9	1.5	0	1.4
Tamil Nadu	8.7	6	7.6	0.8	0.5	0.7
Tripura	8.2	9.9	8.1	3.5	0.7	3.1
Uttar Pradesh	27.9	21.1	26.1	6.45	8.25	7.0
West Bengal	24.3	17.2	23.0	7.9	2.7	7.0
India	25.8	13.2	22.6	8.8	5.6	7.9

(Source: 55th and 66th NSSO Rounds)

Out of school children comprises of those who have never been to school and those who once were in school but dropped out from school. To have better understanding of the problem as to why children are not in school it becomes important to examine never enrolled and dropout separately.

Never Enrolled

NSSO defines never attended/enrolled as a person who had never been enrolled in any educational institution and in that sense had not entered the education system of the country.³

NSSO data of 55th and 66th round shows that for India as a whole never enrolled children has decreased from 19.2% in 1999-2000 to 5.6% in 2009-10, which means that there has been an improvement but still in 2009-10, 5.6% children of 6 to 13 years of age have never been to school (table 3.8). In the states of Bihar, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, the percentages of never enrolled children was recorded higher than national average in both the rounds, but it is important to note that there has been a decline in the percentage of children who have never been to school in 2009-10. Secondly, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and Lakshadweep continues to have the least percentage of near enrolled. Added to this, in the year 2009-10, the no. of states/UT's having less than one percentage children who have never attended school has increased. In this regard, the new entries are Goa, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Mizoram and Delhi. Orissa and West Bengal also showed a significant improvement, though these states are not among the best performers but both the states have reduced never enrolled children to a considerable extent.

In general, rural areas lag behind urban areas as far as school level infrastructural facilities are concerned, and therefore, these areas have more no. of never enrolled children. This was also found in the present study. Table 3.8 reveals the fact that rural areas had more never enrolled children as compared to urban areas in both the rounds.

³ NSSO 64th Round (July 2007-June 08), "Education in India : 2007-08, Participation and Expenditure" Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Government of India.

From 55th to 66th round there has been a decrease in never attended school children, but the decline has been greater for rural

Table 3.8 Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India

State/UT's	1999-2000			2010-11		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A & N Islands	2.6	0.0	2.1	0.4	0.0	0.3
Andhra Pradesh	16.4	7.3	13.7	2.6	1.5	2.2
Arunachal Pradesh	24.6	16.4	23.7	7.8	4.4	7.1
Assam	16.9	7.3	16.0	4.8	1.1	4.5
Bihar	45.4	23.8	42.7	14.0	7.1	13.2
Chandigarh	3.2	5.6	5.3	8.7	2.8	4.3
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	22.1	5.1	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	7.0	0.4	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	1.2	7.1	5.7	0.0	1.0	0.9
Goa	4.3	2.3	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujarat	14.5	7.6	12.4	5.9	2.3	4.7
Haryana	9.6	11.0	10.0	1.6	5.2	2.7
Himachal Pradesh	1.8	0.9	1.7	0.4	1.4	0.5
Jammu & Kashmir	17.4	11.1	16.2	2.0	2.2	2.1
Karnataka	16.1	5.4	13.6	4.1	1.0	3.2
Kerala	1.3	0.6	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.4
Lakshdweep	0.3	2.1	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	25.6	10.5	22.5	5.3	2.8	4.8
Maharashtra	8.2	3.1	6.4	1.5	1.2	1.3
Manipur	9.5	0.4	7.0	2.2	0.5	1.7
Meghalaya	8.7	2.4	7.6	0.7	0.6	0.7
Mizoram	7.9	1.3	5.2	0.8	0.4	0.6
Nagaland	9.0	3.1	7.1	0.0	0.9	0.3
Orissa	23.0	13.4	21.4	2.9	2.6	2.8
Pondicherry	1.1	2.8	2.1	1.1	1.2	1.1
Punjab	9.2	7.9	8.8	3.3	5.0	3.9
Rajasthan	26.7	10.7	23.5	8.2	7.9	8.1
Sikkim	3.1	7.3	3.4	1.5	0.0	1.3
Tamil Nadu	3.6	2.5	3.2	0.8	0.2	0.5
Tripura	6.9	8.3	7.1	1.1	0.7	1.1
Uttar Pradesh	25.3	18.3	23.9	7.8	8.0	7.9
West Bengal	20.5	11.8	19.0	4.1	1.7	3.6
India	21.9	9.9	19.2	6.3	3.4	5.6

(Source: 55th and 66th NSSO Rounds)

areas. Those states which recorded higher percentage of never enrolled children in rural areas also had higher percentage in urban areas. These states are Bihar with non enrolment as high as

Table 3.9 Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among Boys and Girls in India (1999-2000)

1999-2000 State/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	2.2	3.2	2.6	0	0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	13.1	20	16.4	5.6	9.3	7.3
Arunachal Pradesh	28.2	20.7	24.6	20.8	8.3	16.4
Assam	14.4	19.8	16.9	2.1	13.1	7.3
Bihar	38.6	53.7	45.4	20.8	27.7	23.8
Chandigarh	3.6	2.3	3.2	3.4	8	5.6
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	14.9	29	22.1	3.4	6.3	5.1
Daman & Diu	7	7	7.0	0.8	0	0.4
Delhi	1.5	0.9	1.2	4.9	9.4	7.1
Goa	3.6	5.3	4.3	3.1	1.4	2.3
Gujarat	10	19.5	14.5	6.8	8.6	7.6
Haryana	6.1	13.7	9.6	8.5	13.6	11.0
Himachal Pradesh	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.4	0.6	0.9
Jammu & Kashmir	7.9	26.9	17.4	9.8	12.7	11.1
Karnataka	13.9	18.3	16.1	5.5	5.4	5.4
Kerala	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.6
Lakshdweep	0.6	0	0.3	1.1	3.2	2.1
Madhya Pradesh	21	30.8	25.6	7.5	13.8	10.5
Maharashtra	6.6	10.1	8.2	2.5	3.7	3.1
Manipur	9	10.2	9.5	0.6	0.2	0.4
Meghalaya	8.7	8.6	8.7	2.5	2.3	2.4
Mizoram	5.8	10.3	7.9	1.1	1.5	1.3
Nagaland	7.7	10.6	9.0	1.2	5.5	3.1
Orissa	18.5	27.6	23.0	9.5	17.8	13.4
Pondicherry	1	1.2	1.1	1.8	3.6	2.8
Punjab	8.7	9.7	9.2	7	9	7.9
Rajasthan	15	40.1	26.7	8.4	13.5	10.7
Sikkim	2.3	3.9	3.1	2.9	11.3	7.3
Tamil Nadu	3	4.2	3.6	1.7	3.3	2.5
Tripura	5.4	9	6.9	3.8	13.5	8.3
Uttar Pradesh	18.6	33.2	25.3	15.6	21.2	18.3
West Bengal	16.8	24.4	20.5	10.4	13.3	11.8
India	17.3	27.1	21.9	8.1	11.7	9.9

(Source: NSSO 55th Round)

Table 3.10 Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among Boys and Girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)

2009-10	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	1.9	3.3	2.6	1.4	1.5	1.5
Arunachal Pradesh	7.9	7.8	7.8	4.8	4.0	4.4
Assam	4.5	5.3	4.8	0.9	1.2	1.1
Bihar	11.7	16.8	14.0	6.6	7.7	7.1
Chandigarh	2.5	14.6	8.7	0.4	5.1	2.8
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.2	1.0
Goa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujrat	6.1	5.7	5.9	1.7	3.1	2.3
Haryana	0.4	3.2	1.6	7.0	3.4	5.2
Himachal Pradesh	0.5	0.3	0.4	1.3	1.4	1.4
Jammu & Kashmir	1.5	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.2
Karnataka	3.4	4.9	4.1	1.7	0.3	1.0
Kerala	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	4.8	5.8	5.3	1.6	4.4	2.8
Maharashtra	0.8	2.1	1.5	1.4	0.9	1.2
Manipur	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.4	0.7	0.5
Meghalaya	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.3	0.6
Mizoram	0.0	1.7	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.4
Nagaland	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.4	0.9
Orissa	2.7	3.0	2.9	1.7	3.7	2.6
Pondicherry	0.0	1.7	1.1	2.3	0.0	1.2
Punjab	3.9	2.4	3.3	4.0	6.2	5.0
Rajasthan	6.0	10.7	8.2	5.2	10.9	7.9
Sikkim	1.6	1.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	1.1	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.2
Tripura	0.6	1.7	1.1	1.4	0.1	0.7
Uttar Pradesh	6.5	9.4	7.8	7.1	8.9	8.0
West Bengal	4.4	3.7	4.1	1.5	2.1	1.7
India	5.4	7.4	6.3	3.0	3.9	3.4

(Source: NSSO 66th Round)

45.4% in rural area and 23.8% in urban area, followed by Rajasthan (26.7% rural, 10.7% urban), Madhya Pradesh (25.6% rural, 10.5% urban), Uttar Pradesh (25.3% rural and 18.3% urban) and Arunachal Pradesh (24.6% rural, 16.4% urban) respectively.

Among girls and boys, it is a girl child who has less chances to go to school and this fact was recorded in both the rounds of NSSO (Table 3.9). National average of both the years shows that girls have higher percentage of non enrolment than boys. Over a period of time there has been a fall in the percentage of never enrolled population for girls and boys and also, the gap has decreased from 1999-2000 to 2009-10. If gender and region is taken into consideration then it is noticed that a rural girl of an under developed state has high percentage of non enrolment than a girl of an urban area of developed state. For example in 55th round 53.7% of rural girls of Bihar never went to school whereas this percentage was only 0.1% for urban girl in Kerala. Broadly speaking, north Indian states of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan had huge gap between boys and girls, strong patriarchy in these states could be the reason for not sending girls to school.

Among the social groups usually it is the scheduled population which lags behind the indicators of development such as health and education. Scheduled population had higher non enrolment as compared to non-scheduled population.

Table 3.11 shows that for India non scheduled had least percentages (16.2%) of children who have never been to school. They are followed by schedule caste (24.2%). Schedule Tribe (30%) had highest percentage of never enrolled population among all social groups in the year 1999-2000. The same trend was repeated in 2009-10, non scheduled had 4.9% never enrolled children, followed by scheduled caste with 7.1% and in last schedule tribe (83%) having highest non enrolment.

The pattern observed in both the rounds was that the among schedule tribes, the tribes of Himalayas except for Jammu & Kashmir and Arunachal Pradesh had less non enrolment whereas the tribes of Central India had highest non enrolment. In case of schedule caste, Bihar has highest non enrolment in both the years. Schedule Caste of Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh too continues to perform below the national average in both

the years. The non scheduled population showed better performance in developed states like, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and Tamil Nadu in both

Table 3.11 Percentage of Never Enrolled in the age group 6 to 13 years among social groups in India

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
A & N Islands	6.0	0.0	1.5	2.1	0.0		0.3	0.3
Andhra Pradesh	32.4	13.7	11.9	13.7	9.7	1.2	1.9	2.2
Arunachal Pradesh	27.8	0.0	11.5	23.7	7.2	2.7	7.3	7.1
Assam	11.9	14.2	17.1	16.0	2.2	3.9	5.0	4.5
Bihar	43.5	59.5	38.0	42.7	10.7	21.4	10.9	13.2
Chandigarh	0.0	9.1	4.4	5.3		5.0	3.9	4.3
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	23.3	0.0	8.1	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	8.2	0.0	2.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	10.1	14.2	3.5	5.7	9.3	0.0	1.1	0.9
Goa	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujarat	22.9	13.8	9.5	12.4	13.0	5.3	2.3	4.7
Haryana	49.6	16.8	7.0	10.0	63.8	3.7	1.9	2.7
Himachal Pradesh	0.5	2.0	1.7	1.7	4.7	0.4	0.2	0.5
Jammu & Kashmir	53.0	42.6	11.0	13.6	19.5	0.9	1.6	3.2
Karnataka	23.4	18.8	10.8	1.1	6.9	5.8	2.0	0.4
Kerala	16.0	1.6	0.9	1.3	16.6	0.0	0.1	0.0
Lakshdweep	1.4		0.0	22.5	0.0	0.0		4.8
Madhya Pradesh	37.6	24.1	15.4	6.4	8.2	3.9	3.5	1.3
Maharashtra	19.1	7.2	3.8	7.0	6.0	0.5	0.9	1.7
Manipur	16.6	11.9	1.7	7.6	2.5	0.0	1.4	0.7
Meghalaya	7.5	10.0	7.8	5.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mizoram	5.1	0.0	9.5	7.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.3
Nagaland	6.9	9.2	9.0	21.4	0.3		0.0	2.8
Orissa	38.0	24.1	12.3	2.1	5.9	3.5	1.4	1.1
Pondicherry	0.0	1.2	2.3	8.8		2.8	0.6	3.9
Punjab	15.1	15.2	3.8	23.5	16.3	6.1	2.0	8.1
Rajasthan	34.4	33.2	18.1	3.4	11.0	11.8	6.2	1.3
Sikkim	3.8	1.8	3.5	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.4	0.5
Tamil Nadu	9.9	4.9	2.5	7.1	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.1
Tripura	9.3	5.1	7.4	23.9	0.7	1.4	1.2	7.9
Uttar Pradesh	23.1	27.9	22.7	19.0	4.0	7.4	8.0	3.6
West Bengal	34.9	20.5	17.3	19.2	8.8	1.8	3.9	5.6
India	30.0	24.2	16.2	16.2	8.3	7.1	4.9	2.1

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

rounds, whereas the non scheduled of less developed states such as Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan had higher non-enrolment in the country.

From above discussion it can be said that there has been decline in children who have never been to school from 1999-2000 to 2009-10, this means that Sarv Siksha Abhiyan have been successful to some extent to bring children to school.

This is only one part of the story that there has been decline in never enrolled children. This means that children have started coming to school after Sarv siksha came into effect. However, merely bringing children to school would not help, a child needs to be in school system for considerable period of time to culminate learning. It is important to examine whether SSA has been able to keep children in schools or it is that the children have come to school but dropout from school. Dropout among the children of elementary school going age i.e. 6 to 13 years is discussed in next section.

Dropout:

NSSO defines dropout, a condition in which a person enrolls in a class but does not complete it. It is different from discontinuation in which a person completes a desired level but does not enroll for the next higher level⁴. For the present study dropout and discontinuance are taken together because NSSO though distinguishes between dropout and discontinuance but does not provide data for both these categories separately.

Table 3.12 gives percentage of those children in the age group 6-13 years of age who have either dropout or discontinued from studies. From the year 1999-2000 to 2009-10 dropout rates have shown a decline from 3.5% to 2.4%. But this decrease is not much as expected. The pattern of dropout varies across the state/UT's of the country but for 55th and 66th round the pattern is not same. In 55th round Andhra Pradesh had highest dropout rate followed by Gujrat (5.0%). Those states which had higher percentage of

⁴ NSSO 64th Round (July 2007-June 08), "Education in India : 2007-08, Participation and Expenditure" Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Government of India.

never enrolled children such as Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan had dropouts less than the national average in both the years.

Table 3.12 Distribution of Dropouts at elementary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among in rural and urban India

State/UT's	1999-2000			2010-11		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A & N Islands	4.8	2.7	4.2	0.8	0.0	0.5
Andhra Pradesh	8.7	7.2	7.1	1.9	2.3	2.0
Arunachal Pradesh	1.5	0.9	1.1	3.7	3.9	3.8
Assam	4.0	2.0	3.1	2.4	1.7	2.4
Bihar	3.6	4.1	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
Chandigarh	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0	6.8	5.2
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6.6	1.9	4.9	1.7	0.5	1.5
Daman & Diu	0.0	2.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	0.1	5.4	3.8	33.5	7.7	10.0
Goa	6.3	2.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujarat	6.6	3.6	5.0	5.1	1.7	3.9
Haryana	4.5	2.1	3.5	3.3	2.6	3.1
Himachal Pradesh	1.8	0.3	1.6	2.2	2.5	2.2
Jammu & Kashmir	0.9	1.1	3.5	1.1	0.3	2.4
Karnataka	5.5	3.3	0.8	0.4	0.9	1.0
Kerala	0.6	0.7	4.2	0.7	0.3	0.6
Lakshdweep	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6
Madhya Pradesh	5.7	2.5	0.3	3.2	3.3	0.0
Maharashtra	4.4	2.5	3.9	2.0	1.7	3.2
Manipur	1.4	1.3	3.5	0.8	0.3	1.9
Meghalaya	3.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.9	0.6
Mizoram	3.0	2.7	2.5	0.2	0.9	1.6
Nagaland	0.5	1.1	2.7	0.0	2.1	0.5
Orissa	6.0	3.6	0.7	2.2	6.5	0.6
Pondicherry	0.9	3.7	4.4	0.0	0.0	2.7
Punjab	3.8	2.6	2.5	2.7	3.2	0.0
Rajasthan	4.8	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.7	2.8
Sikkim	1.0	7.9	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.1
Tamil Nadu	5.2	3.6	1.5	0.1	0.3	0.0
Tripura	1.1	1.3	4.5	2.3	0.0	0.2
Uttar Pradesh	2.7	3.3	1.0	2.5	2.4	2.0
West Bengal	4.7	6.1	2.1	4.2	1.0	2.5
India	4.5	3.6	4.0	2.5	2.2	3.5

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

In the 66th round Delhi (10%) had highest dropout rates. There has been an increase in the dropout rates for Delhi over the period of ten years. On the brighter side in the year 2009-10, there are twelve state and UT's that have dropout rates below one percent. These states are, from north east Mizoram, Nagaland, Manipur, and rest from south India namely Goa, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Karnataka and Kerala.

Dropout rates are higher for girls as compares to boys in both the rounds, and especially the rates are higher for rural girls (Table 3.13). To have a clear picture of dropouts in 2009-10 the percentage are calculated for primary and upper primary level.

Table 3.14 shows dropout rate in year 2009-10. From the table it can be said that at primary level dropouts are more in rural area, however, the gap between rural and urban areas is of 0.1% only. Rural Delhi had exceptionally higher dropout rate. Approximately 40% of the rural Delhi boys dropout out. In urban areas too Delhi had highest dropout rates for boys as well as for girls. Arunachal Pradesh recorded the highest dropout rate for urban girls in India with the percentage going as high as 7.5%, the reason behind such high percentage cannot be explained,

As one moves from Primary to upper primary the dropout rate increase from 1.4% to 4.5% in rural areas and from 1.3% to 3.7% in urban areas (Table 3.14 and Table 3.15). Like primary, in upper primary too the dropout rates tend to be high in rural area and that too for rural girls. Delhi (44.5%) again has the highest dropout rates with 63.4% rural girls dropping out at upper primary level Even Gujrat had more than 20% of the girls dropping at upper Primary level.

In year 2009-10 among rural boys Delhi (27.1%) has the highest dropout followed by West Bengal (9.7%) and Arunachal Pradesh (7.5%). In urban India, Chandigarh recorded the highest dropout rates and that too for girls with the percentages as high as 17.3%. Urban girls in Orissa (16.4%) had the next highest dropout rates. At the upper primary level urban boys of Meghalaya (14.5%) and Himachal Pradesh (14.5%) had highest dropout rates among boys. Reasons for such high dropout rates among urban

Himachal boys cannot be explained. For the states/ UT's Delhi, Gujarat, Rajasthan, and Punjab there was a wide gender gap in dropout rates, the reason could be strong patriarchy prevailing in these areas.

Table 3.13 Distribution of Dropouts at elementary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in India

	1999-2000			2009-10		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	3.9	4.6	4.2	0.0	1.3	0.5
Andhra Pradesh	5.6	8.8	7.1	1.8	2.4	2.0
Arunachal Pradesh	0.9	1.4	1.1	4.0	3.5	3.8
Assam	3.0	3.4	3.1	2.6	2.1	2.4
Bihar	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2
Chandigarh	1.0	1.3	1.2	4.9	5.5	5.2
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.8	4.1	4.9	2.2	0.3	1.5
Daman & Diu	0.1	2.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	2.1	5.6	3.8	8.6	11.8	10.0
Goa	1.7	8.4	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujarat	4.1	5.9	5.0	1.8	6.9	3.9
Haryana	3.3	3.8	3.5	2.7	3.6	3.1
Himachal Pradesh	1.0	2.3	1.6	2.5	1.9	2.2
Jammu & Kashmir	0.5	1.0	0.8	0.2	1.8	1.0
Karnataka	4.2	4.3	4.2	0.9	0.2	0.6
Kerala	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.6
Lakshdweep	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	3.1	4.7	3.9	3.1	3.3	3.2
Maharashtra	2.9	4.0	3.5	2.4	1.3	1.9
Manipur	1.5	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.6	0.6
Meghalaya	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.8	1.4	1.6
Mizoram	1.9	3.5	2.7	0.5	0.4	0.5
Nagaland	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.6
Orissa	4.2	4.6	4.4	2.6	2.9	2.7
Pondicherry	0.0	4.9	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Punjab	2.8	3.5	3.1	1.7	4.5	2.8
Rajasthan	2.4	4.6	3.4	1.9	4.5	3.1
Sikkim	1.2	1.7	1.5	0.0	0.1	0.0
Tamil Nadu	4.0	4.9	4.5	0.2	0.1	0.2
Tripura	1.2	0.8	1.0	2.1	1.9	2.0
Uttar Pradesh	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.6	2.5
West Bengal	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	2.8	3.5
India	3.0	4.0	3.5	2.3	2.6	2.4

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Table 3.14 Distribution of Dropouts at primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)

Primary State/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	1.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	2.4	1.7
Arunachal Pradesh	2.1	3.5	2.8	4.9	7.5	6.0
Assam	0.8	1.3	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.2
Bihar	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.8	0.6	1.7
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.8	1.6
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	39.8	18.7	25.2	8.4	6.5	7.7
Goa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujrat	0.3	0.7	0.5	0.4	2.1	1.0
Haryana	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.5	2.4	2.0
Himachal Pradesh	1.3	1.1	1.2	0.6	0.8	0.7
Jammu & Kashmir	0.0	2.4	1.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
Karnataka	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Kerala	0.5	1.0	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	1.8	2.1	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.3
Maharastra	1.3	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.3	0.6
Manipur	0.5	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.4
Meghalaya	1.2	0.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mizoram	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.9	1.0	0.9
Nagaland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orissa	0.8	0.4	0.6	3.7	0.6	2.2
Pondicherry	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Punjab	1.4	2.5	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8
Rajasthan	1.1	2.0	1.5	1.7	0.3	1.1
Sikkim	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
Tripura	1.8	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Uttar Pradesh	1.0	1.7	1.4	1.9	0.5	1.2
West Bengal	1.6	2.0	1.8	0.5	0.5	0.5
India	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.3

(Source: NSSO 66th Rounds)

Table 3.15 Distribution of Dropouts at upper primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2009-10)

Upper Primary State/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
A & N Islands	0.0	5.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.3
Arunachal Pradesh	7.5	2.8	5.2	1.1	1.4	1.3
Assam	6.6	3.9	5.3	5.3	2.4	4.0
Bihar	2.1	3.0	2.5	3.7	2.0	2.8
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	17.3	15.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6.8	0.0	3.9	0.0	3.4	1.5
Daman & Diu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	27.1	63.4	44.5	4.1	11.7	7.7
Goa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujrat	6.1	22.2	13.2	1.8	4.1	2.8
Haryana	5.1	7.7	6.2	3.9	3.3	3.6
Himachal Pradesh	3.7	3.5	3.6	14.5	0.0	5.6
Jammu & Kashmir	0.5	1.6	1.0	0.0	0.9	0.4
Karnataka	1.2	0.6	0.9	3.6	0.4	2.2
Kerala	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.4	0.0	0.6
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	4.8	6.1	5.5	6.1	2.8	4.5
Maharashtra	3.9	3.0	3.4	4.8	1.6	3.4
Manipur	1.4	0.4	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Meghalaya	0.5	2.6	1.7	14.5	1.3	7.7
Mizoram	0.4	0.0	0.2	1.3	0.0	0.7
Nagaland	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	6.7	4.8
Orissa	4.1	5.2	4.7	9.6	16.4	12.5
Pondicherry	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Punjab	1.9	7.2	4.1	1.9	8.2	5.1
Rajasthan	2.4	9.5	5.4	5.0	11.3	7.8
Sikkim	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.6
Tripura	3.2	5.4	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Uttar Pradesh	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.5
West Bengal	9.7	5.6	7.9	2.2	1.0	1.7
India	4.0	5.1	4.5	3.7	3.6	3.7

(Source: NSSO 66th Rounds)

While on the other hand, some of the states of north east India and south India had the least dropouts in Primary and upper Primary in both urban and rural areas.

From 55th round to 66th round (table 3.16) there has been decline in dropouts for all social groups but drop out was recorded highest for scheduled tribe followed by schedule caste, “non scheduled” dropout the least among all social group. Schedule tribe of central India have higher dropout rates [Andhra Pradesh (12.5%), Madhya Pradesh (9.2%), Orissa (9.0%), Rajasthan (7.8%), Gujarat (9.7%), Bihar (6.2%)] than the tribes of Himalayas which includes north east India, north Indian states except for Jammu & Kashmir (8.1%). In urban areas same trend was observed, tribes of north east and north India had dropout less than 2% except for Assam whereas the tribes of central India had dropouts greater than 3%, though the gap between tribes of Himalayas and central Indian tribes is not significant. Delhi had highest dropout among schedule tribes and the percentages are as high as 96.6% which is the highest value in both the rounds. Haryana (12.2%) too had the second highest dropouts among ST’s. For schedule caste’s no set pattern was observed however, scheduled caste of north eastern states and south Indian states had less school dropouts except for Andhra Pradesh. The state of Andhra Pradesh in 55th round had high dropout rates among SC’s. In 66th round Rajasthan (4.2%) and Arunachal Pradesh (5%) recorded highest dropout rates Non scheduled had lower dropouts from school as compared to scheduled population Andhra Pradesh (7.4%), Orissa and Karnataka had higher dropouts in 55th rounds whereas in 66th round it was Delhi (10.6%) and Chandigarh (6.4%) that had higher percentage of dropouts. Those states that performed well were mostly from north east and south India except for Andhra Pradesh that had higher dropout rates for both the years.

Conclusion

Discussion on non enrolment, dropout and attendance ratios reveals the fact that the goals of the Sarv Siksha Abhiyan of universal enrolment, universal retention and reducing all gender and social category gaps at primary and upper primary stage was not achieved in totality but there are positive improvements. Effect of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan varies across the different states of the country. States/UT’s that were earlier better off

before the launch of Abhiyan in enrolment and had lower out of school children such as Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Nagaland, Mizoram, Tripura etc performed well after the launch of Sarva Shiksha

Table 3.16 Distribution of Dropouts at primary level in the age group 6 to 13 years among social groups in India

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
A & N Islands	2.5	16.4	3.5	4.2	0.0		0.6	0.5
Andhra Pradesh	12.5	10.0	7.4	7.1	6.2	2.3	1.7	2.0
Arunachal Pradesh	1.9	0.0	0.4	1.1	4.3	5.0	2.2	3.8
Assam	2.3	4.1	4.0	3.1	5.2	1.5	2.0	2.4
Bihar	6.2	6.5	3.0	2.1	1.9	3.7	1.8	2.2
Chandigarh	0.0	3.3	0.7	1.2		3.1	6.4	5.2
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	7.4	0.0	1.0	4.9	1.7	0.0	0.7	1.5
Daman & Diu	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	4.1	3.5	4.2	3.8	96.6	3.8	10.6	10.0
Goa	0.0	0.0	4.9	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gujarat	9.7	6.7	4.6	5.0	6.1	3.1	3.5	3.9
Haryana	10.9	6.7	3.1	3.5	12.2	3.1	3.1	3.1
Himachal Pradesh	0.9	1.4	1.8	1.6	0	0.8	3.0	2.2
Jammu & Kashmir	8.1	3.5	0.6	0.8	0	0.0	1.1	1.0
Karnataka	3.1	5.8	4.9	4.2	0.1	0.8	0.6	0.6
Kerala	0.0	1.2	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
Lakshdweep	0.3		0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0		0.0
Madhya Pradesh	9.2	5.5	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.2
Maharashtra	2.6	3.9	3.8	3.5	6.0	3.1	1.1	1.9
Manipur	3.4	0.0	0.5	1.3	1.5	0.3	0.2	0.6
Meghalaya	2.8	5.5	1.0	2.5	1.8	0.0	0.1	1.6
Mizoram	3.0	1.1	0.0	2.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Nagaland	0.5	3.0	3.0	0.7	0.2		3.3	0.6
Orissa	9.0	4.0	4.9	4.4	3.1	2.4	2.7	2.7
Pondicherry	0.0	0.5	3.0	2.5		0.0	0.0	0.0
Punjab	4.5	4.1	3.0	3.1	0	3.7	2.2	2.8
Rajasthan	7.8	3.3	4.0	3.4	4.6	4.2	2.3	3.1
Sikkim	1.4	4.2	1.2	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Tamil Nadu	1.3	4.1	4.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Tripura	0.0	3.3	0.6	1.0	1.5	0.1	3.5	2.0
Uttar Pradesh	3.6	2.9	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.0	2.7	2.5
West Bengal	5.8	6.6	4.2	4.0	2.7	3.8	3.4	3.5
India	6.6	5.0	3.8	3.5	3.7	2.7	2.2	2.4

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Abhiyan and those states which earlier had lower enrolment, high non enrolment and dropout rates performed better after investment of Sarv Siksha Abhiyan, these states like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan etc have shown positive improvement and the gap between educationally forward state's /UT's and educationally backward states have come down to some extent.

If gender and social category gaps are taken into consideration then it could be said that there has been improvement in girls enrolment and decrease in out of school girls in 6-13 years of age group. Though the gap between boys and girls have reduced but still girls have lesser enrolment, higher dropouts and greater non enrolment than boys especially in north Indian states. Rural urban difference has also reduced from 1999-2000 to 2009-10, however, urban areas continues to perform better than their rural counterparts. As far as social category gaps are concerned then there has been decline between scheduled and non scheduled population in terms of enrolment and out of school children, although scheduled population and that too schedule tribe lag behind non scheduled to a significant extent.

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan has been successful to some extent because Abhiyan has brought the children to school but the dropout rates continues to be high. Added to this there are approximately 6% of children who have never been to school. For social justice and equity it is important that a person has atleast basic education. Efforts should be made to bring all children to school and have cent percent retention for them. To bring children to school and to retain them in education system it is required to know that where the problem lies. Therefore, next chapter discusses about the reasons behind out of school children.

Chapter 4

CAUSES OF NON ENROLMENT AND DROPOUT

Introduction

Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan launched in 2001 had objective of universal enrolment (by 2003) and retention (by 2010). In the last chapter it was observed that Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan proved fruitful to some extent in increasing enrolment and decreasing dropout rates but still a large section of children in the age group 6-13 years of age are out of school. Therefore, it is important to know why children are out of school? The present chapter discusses about reasons for non enrolment and dropout of the children of elementary school going age (6-13 years as per NSSO). Next section of the chapter deals with the supply side variables of elementary schools. The role of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in changing the supply side variables over the period of five years and the effect of these variables on enrolment.

Some of the obvious reasons given are that elementary is free and easily available but parents are not interested to educate their children, child is sent to work and earn etc. But these assumptions are not true. Probe Report says that assumptions such as child labour, disinterest of parents towards child education and availability of free elementary education are not more than a myth.

Probe survey came up with a point that parents know about the importance of education. They have desire to educate their children because they consider education necessary in today's modern world. At least parents stand for the compulsory education. They don't hesitate to enroll their children in private school if the government schools are non functional (Probe Report, 1999).

However, the motivation for educating boys and girls are totally different. For boys one of the major factor is the income or earning. Boys are educated because it increases their employment opportunity and hence increases family's income (Probe Report, 1999). Another economic motivation was that education of boys not only increases the economic security of family but also the increases the financial security of parents in their old age (Kiran Bhatta, 1998). With economic security comes income to improve the social status of the family (Kiran Bhatta, 1998). Some parents also value the benefits other than economic benefits such as education develops self confidence, self esteem and increases awareness (Probe Report, 1999). Marriage is seen as the main aim of girls upbringing. So, therefore, the education level of a girl is decided by marriage market. If the community in which a girl lives does not have educated boys then her education would not be encouraged as it will increase the dowry contrary to this in a society where boys are well educated then they would prefer educated bride, therefore, in such societies, desired level of education for a girl by her parents is often more (Probe Report, 1999). Some parents also prefer their girl child to educate as she can be in touch with her parents by writing letters. There is also a point of view that if a girl is educated then she can face divorce or widowhood

(Probe Report, 1999).

Now the question arises that if parents know benefits of education then why don't they educate their children? The answer is that when parents don't see any learning done by children in school, they have no option but to take out children from school. It is the quality of education that is the problem. If education of appropriate quality is provided then parents don't mind to sending their children to school.

Probe Report says that if people see role models they get motivated to send their children to school. Role models are generally those who get a good job after completing studies. Other parents also get encouraged to educate their children after witnessing benefits of education. Another motivational factor for parents behind education of children education is the society in which they live. If the society is well educated in which every child goes to school then it is obvious to send children to school, however, on the contrary if society does not value education and it is not a trend to send children to school then it becomes very difficult to send children to school. There are societies where education is not considered necessary. This is because school never teaches the skill they want and therefore alienates child from the society.

It is said that education is free but education is not free. Parents had to bear the cost of uniforms, textbooks, bags and many other items. Though in some schools there are available as incentives but in most of the schools such incentives are not available. Though mid day meal programme was started to attract more and more

children to school but it was found that attendance in school was high only during those hours when meal was served. Added to this parents usually can support food for their children but can't support other things such as uniforms, textbooks etc., therefore studies recommend such incentives given to poor rather than serving meals (Kiran Bhatta). The problem of financial constraints is more pronounced for girls because parents don't consider to invest in girls education as she will go to her in-laws and investing in her education is like watering plant in neighbours home (Kiran Bhatta).

Child Labour

It has been found that child labour is blamed for not sending children to school but the story is different. Because parents see no learning in school they don't send their child to school and therefore as the child is free he/she is sent to do some work. Added to this most of the children are only part time workers and not full time, therefore if they want they can go to school. Studies have come up with a point that if at all child contributes to the family income then its amount is much less. For substantial contribution children of age above 15 years are required. Children of 6 to 11 years are too small to do work (Kiran Bhatta). However, child labour is required in economically poor families and it is in the form such as to look after younger siblings, to do other domestic chores, helping in household enterprises etc.

To find out why children are still out of school after the launch of Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan, let us focus on the reasons of non enrolment, dropout and

discontinuation by the 64th round of Nation Sample Survey. Causes of non enrolment and dropout have been worked out separately to have a clear view.

A. Causes of Non Enrolment

Table 4.1 gives reasons of non enrolment for India as a whole and for rural and urban areas, separately for girls and boys. One of the major reason for non enrolment is disinterest of parents. Around 32% of the non enrolment is because parents are not interested. The problem is much pronounced in rural area (34.2%) than urban area (22.3%). Parental disinterest is more for girls in both urban and rural India. One of the causes for parental indifference for studies has been discussed earlier that no development in learning of child that demotivate parents. Secondly for girls this percentage is high because an educated girl is difficult to marry if the boys in the community are not educated. Added to this after her puberty parents don't want to send their daughters if the school is not in the near vicinity (Probe Report, 1999).

Financial constraints is biggest reason for non enrolment and more for boys as compared to girls. Problem of financial resource is much bigger in urban area than in rural area.

There are two costs borne by parents, first is direct cost i.e. cost of uniform/clothes, text books and stationary, travel and other expenditure etc. are not less for parents and these expenses are not on a single but more than one child. Therefore, direct costs for sending a child to a school are much. Secondly in urban

areas owing to the high cost of living these expenditure on schooling becomes much higher, therefore nearly 40% people find financial constraints as a reason for non enrolment in urban area. The other cost is indirect cost i.e. opportunity cost. Labour required to prepare child for school, time needed to make Tiffin for him/her and to drop and pick up child from school. Child may be needed in fields or do some other household chores. Therefore it is both direct and indirect cost that parents invest in educating their child but when they see no progress in child then they are discouraged to send other children to school (Probe Report, 1999, Kiran Bhatta, 1998).

Table 4.1 Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)

Reasons for Non Enrolment	Rural	Urban	Total
parent not interested in studies	34.2	22.3	32.5
inadequate number of teachers	0.2	0.2	0.2
school is far off	1.4	0.1	1.2
to work for wage/salary	0.2	0.2	0.2
for participating in other economic activities	0.6	0.9	0.7
to look after younger siblings	1.2	0.6	1.1
to attend other domestic chores	0.8	0.4	0.7
financial constraints	22.1	42.7	25.2
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.1	0.0	0.1
for helping in household enterprises	0.7	0.5	0.7
Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.2	0.0	0.2
No tradition in the community	4.6	2.4	4.3
education not considered necessary	17.0	14.4	16.6
non-availability of lady teacher	0.0	0.2	0.0
non-availability of ladies toilet	0.1	0.0	0.0
others	13.3	11.1	12.9

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

Next important reason for non enrolment is education not considered necessary.

Generally in society or area where people see no positive outcome of education (in terms of economic returns) there people don't find education necessary for their children. Approximately 16% children are not enrolled because education is not considered necessary and this reason is more for rural regions.

No tradition in community (4.3%) is fourth major reason. In some communities such as artisans etc. education is not important as it does not herald their manual skills. The children in such communities are a helping hand and they are ought to continue family occupation. But this condition is applicable for boys only. For girls in some areas especially in rural parts there are no girls and women who are educated. Probe Report gives example of a Gujjar women in Rajasthan who says that she has not seen any educated women in her lifetime.

Table 4.2 Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years among girls and boys in rural and urban India (2007-08)

Reasons of Non Enrolment	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
parent not interested in studies	33.0	35.2	34.2	19.3	25.2	32.5
inadequate number of teachers	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2
school is far off	1.5	1.3	1.4	0.0	0.2	1.2
to work for wage/salary	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
for participating in other economic activities	0.7	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.4	0.7
to look after younger siblings	0.9	1.4	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.1
to attend other domestic chores	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.7
financial constraints	24.0	20.5	22.1	44.5	41.0	25.2
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
for helping in household enterprises	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.7
Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2

No tradition in the community	3.3	5.6	4.6	2.5	2.4	4.3
education not considered necessary	15.6	18.1	17.0	15.1	13.8	16.6
non-availability of lady teacher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
non-availability of ladies toilet	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	15.1	11.8	13.3	10.9	11.2	12.9

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

Causes of Dropout/Discontinuance

Lack of interest of children in studies (33.2%) is one of the main reasons of dropout (Refer Table 4.3). This means that now a day's schooling is given a chance (Probe Report, 1999). But when child does not find comfort, he/she refuses to go. Strict punishments given by teachers, not able to understand classroom discussion, discomfort with peers is some of the reasons which saps the interest of child from studies (Probe Report, 1999). So, again to a significant extent it is the quality of education that a child expects i.e., friendly environment but gets something different and this discourages child from going to school.

Financial constraints (23.4%) is the next major reason of dropping out from school and more for urban regions owing to the high cost of living in urban area. As said earlier that the cost that is invested by parents for studies of their children is not rewarded appropriately. Financial constraints as a reason for dropout is reported slightly high for boys than girls.

Third reason is disinterest of parents in studies (12.7%). Poor quality of education, mounting expenditure, demotivates parents to send their children to school. This factor is more important for girls than boys. Two things should be noted that for parents marriage of their daughter is a big concern, higher the education level of a

daughter, higher would be the dowry, therefore, education of girl is discouraged. It is futile for parents to invest in girls education as the benefit of education in terms of income goes to her in laws. If the upper primary schools are not available in the village than parents do not prefer to send their daughters especially after her menarchy (Probe Report, 1999).

Table 4.3 Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)

Reasons for Dropout	Rural	Urban	Total
parent not interested in studies	14.0	7.1	12.7
inadequate number of teachers	0.1	0.0	0.1
school is far off	2.7	0.2	2.2
to work for wage/salary	1.3	0.7	1.2
for participating in other economic activities	2.4	1.5	2.3
to look after younger siblings	1.1	0.3	0.9
to attend other domestic chores	4.2	4.2	4.2
financial constraints	20.9	33.8	23.4
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.0	0.0	0.0
for helping in household enterprises	1.2	0.3	1.0
Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.4	0.0	0.3
child not interested in studies	34.4	28.3	33.2
unable to cope up or failure in studies	4.7	6.1	5.0
unfriendly atmosphere at school	0.4	0.4	0.4
completed desired level/class	0.9	1.4	1.0
non-availability of lady teacher	0.1	0.0	0.1
non-availability of ladies toilet	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	4.8	7.6	5.3

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

The other thing to be noted is that because parents are not interested for the continuation of the daughter's education, therefore, there is a large gap in percentage of girls which are not interested in studies. Girls are also burdened to attend other

domestic chores. Usually it is the eldest daughter in the family who takes care of home and younger siblings and lessen the burden of mother so that she can go out and earn (Probe Report). Studies have found out that boy contribute to the family by earning outside the home whereas girls contribute through her labour in the home (Divya Vaid).

From the above discussion on reasons of non enrolment and dropout it can be said that the two set of reasons are related to each other. Parents send their children to school investing the direct and indirect cost in child's studies. But when they find that child has not shown any progress in studies and his/her interest towards schools has decreased, they get discouraged. This discouragement not only demotivates children of the same family to go to school but also affects others in the community. Therefore the need of the

Table 4.4 Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years among girls and boys in rural and urban India (2007-08)

Reasons for Dropout	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
parent not interested in studies	10.8	18.4	14.0	7.5	7.8	7.1
inadequate number of teachers	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
school is far off	1.7	3.9	2.7	0.2	0.1	0.2
to work for wage/salary	2.1	0.7	1.3	1.0	0.4	0.7
for participating in other economic activities	3.0	2.2	2.4	2.3	0.7	1.5
to look after younger siblings	0.2	2.0	1.1	0.1	0.7	0.3
to attend other domestic chores	1.9	6.8	4.2	1.8	7.9	4.2
financial constraints	23.0	21.2	20.9	37.2	35.1	33.8
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
for helping in household enterprises	1.6	0.9	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.3

Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
child not interested in studies	42.3	30.7	34.4	32.9	27.2	28.3
unable to cope up or failure in studies	5.3	4.8	4.7	7.9	4.9	6.1
unfriendly atmosphere at school	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.4
completed desired level/class	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.5	1.4
non-availability of lady teacher	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
non-availability of ladies toilet	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	4.9	5.2	4.8	5.4	11.4	7.6

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

hour is increase the learning activity in schools. Sarv Sikhsa promised to improve the quality of elementary education in the country. Next section of the chapter focuses on the quality of elementary education in the country.

4.4 Supply Side of Elementary Education

Schools are the providers of education, so quality of education can be seen by considering quality of schools. The quality of schools broadly depends on two aspects- a) the school or the availability of physical infrastructure and b) school teachers.

To have basic education it is required that the schools as well as teachers are present in appropriate number. Along with schools and teachers it is necessary to have some basic facilities such as water for drinking and lavatory. If these basic things are not arranged then there is a high probability that the child may leave school.

To determine the efforts done by Sarv Siksha Abhiyan to improve the quality of schools following indicators were selected- 1) number of schools per thousand population, 2) ratio of primary to upper primary schools, 3) single classroom schools, 4) pupil teacher ratio, 5) single teacher schools, 6) drinking water facility, and 7)

toilet facilities for girls. All these indicators reveal the supply side of education in India.

Though Sarv Siksha Abhiyan funds only government schools having primary and upper primary sections but present study includes private schools too, this is because private school percentage share to the total schools is not much significant.

4.4.1 Number of Schools Per Thousand Population :

Availability of school is the most important factor for a child to go to school. Number of schools in a state/district does not indicate anything. Availability can be seen

Table 4.5(a) Statewise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban India (2006-07)

2006-07 States/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	11.8	7.3	10.0	2.5	4.0	3.1
Andhra Pradesh	10.7	6.9	9.4	5.3	6.3	5.7
Arunachal Pradesh	26.0	9.5	20.2	6.2	6.0	6.1
Assam	15.7	7.4	12.7	7.5	4.6	6.3
Bihar	4.6	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.4	2.8
Chandigarh	3.6	4.4	3.9	1.6	2.5	1.9
Chhattisgarh	15.5	12.0	14.2	5.6	6.4	5.9
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	12.3	8.8	11.1	4.3	5.9	4.9
Daman & Diu	4.1	4.6	4.3	2.9	4.2	3.4
Delhi	7.7	7.1	7.4	2.2	2.2	2.2
Goa	19.3	9.3	15.3	3.7	3.0	3.4
Gujarat	8.5	10.2	9.1	2.9	3.8	3.2
Haryana	6.1	5.1	5.7	1.9	2.0	2.0
Himachal Pradesh	19.8	12.0	16.8	10.3	11.2	10.7
Jammu & Kashmir	17.1	11.4	15.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Jharkhand	12.7	6.0	10.4	2.6	2.3	2.5
Karnataka	11.0	7.8	9.7	5.4	6.0	5.6
Kerala	4.3	3.2	3.8	2.1	2.0	2.1

Lakshadweep	5.9	4.9	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	14.7	8.7	12.6	6.9	8.1	7.4
Maharashtra	8.6	8.5	8.6	3.1	4.6	3.7
Manipur	16.8	8.7	13.6	10.4	8.7	9.7
Meghalaya	27.2	12.7	21.9	7.9	7.9	7.9
Mizoram	23.2	21.5	22.5	12.7	15.2	13.7
Nagaland	8.3	4.9	7.0	6.9	7.7	7.2
Orissa	11.7	7.3	10.1	5.5	4.3	5.0
Puducherry	9.8	9.2	9.6	4.6	5.1	4.8
Punjab	7.4	5.3	6.6	2.3	2.3	2.3
Rajasthan	13.8	10.0	12.5	7.6	8.7	8.0
Sikkim	19.1	8.1	14.8	8.9	5.8	7.5
Tamil Nadu	10.7	6.4	9.1	2.6	2.9	2.7
Tripura	10.1	6.9	8.8	4.5	4.6	4.5
Uttar Pradesh	6.1	4.1	5.4	2.9	2.0	2.6
Uttarakhand	16.5	9.6	13.9	4.0	3.1	3.6
West Bengal	6.5	1.8	4.8	4.1	2.0	3.2
All States	9.3	6.2	8.2	4.0	4.1	4.1

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07)

Table 4.5 (b) Statewise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban India (2010-11)

2010-11 States/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	10.1	8.7	9.5	1.5	6.7	3.5
Andhra Pradesh	10.9	7.0	9.5	4.5	5.0	4.7
Arunachal Pradesh	26.8	12.3	21.7	7.7	7.9	7.8
Assam	12.9	8.5	11.3	4.5	5.2	4.8
Bihar	4.9	3.9	4.5	2.5	1.7	2.2
Chandigarh	10.8	17.3	13.0	1.4	2.2	1.7
Chhattisgarh	13.5	10.1	12.3	5.2	5.9	5.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	12.8	9.0	11.5	1.6	2.5	1.9
Daman & Diu	9.0	12.1	10.1	1.5	1.7	1.6
Delhi	20.1	18.8	19.6	1.8	1.8	1.8
Goa	23.6	12.1	19.0	2.9	2.4	2.7
Gujarat	8.1	10.4	8.9	2.6	3.6	3.0
Haryana	5.9	6.5	6.2	2.7	3.4	3.0
Himachal Pradesh	18.1	12.7	16.0	9.6	11.6	10.3
Jammu & Kashmir	18.6	13.9	16.8	7.8	8.7	8.1

Jharkhand	11.3	8.5	10.3	2.8	3.1	2.9
Karnataka	10.6	8.6	9.8	5.0	6.2	5.4
Kerala	6.1	4.9	5.6	1.2	1.2	1.2
Lakshadweep	22.0	20.8	21.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	12.7	8.7	11.3	6.5	7.8	7.0
Maharashtra	9.1	7.8	8.6	2.6	4.2	3.2
Manipur	14.4	8.3	12.0	6.5	6.0	6.3
Meghalaya	25.8	16.3	22.3	6.5	7.0	6.7
Mizoram	20.1	22.2	20.9	9.3	12.4	10.5
Nagaland	10.3	6.6	8.9	5.3	6.0	5.6
Orissa	12.1	11.0	11.7	5.1	5.1	5.1
Puducherry	8.6	8.4	8.5	3.8	4.4	4.0
Punjab	9.3	8.9	9.2	4.9	5.9	5.3
Rajasthan	11.9	11.8	11.8	6.3	8.6	7.1
Sikkim	19.5	10.7	16.0	4.6	3.5	4.1
Tamil Nadu	10.1	6.6	8.8	3.6	3.2	3.5
Tripura	11.8	8.5	10.5	3.2	3.1	3.2
Uttar Pradesh	5.7	5.2	5.5	2.6	2.0	2.3
Uttarakhand	16.8	11.2	14.7	4.2	4.0	4.1
West Bengal	8.5	2.5	6.3	3.4	1.8	2.8
All States	9.2	7.2	8.5	3.6	4.0	3.8

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2010-11)

in the context of the area served or the population served. Present research studies availability of school in terms of population served. Population of 7 to 14 years is selected and data is taken from census of India. For the year 2011 population of age group 7 to 14 years is worked out considering the share of population of 7 to 14 years in census, 2001.

Availability of schools in terms of number of schools per thousand population for the 2006-07 and 2010-11 is shown in table 4.5(a) and (b). For India, the availability of schools is more for rural regions than urban areas. Primary schools have greater availability than upper primary in rural areas, whereas in urban areas both primary and upper primary are more or less on same footage. From 2006-07 to 2010-11 there has been slight decline in the availability of primary schools and an increase in upper primary schools in rural areas, but for urban areas there has been a decline in both primary and upper primary schools. There has been a interstate

pattern in the availability of schools, i.e. states and UTs that had higher or lesser number of schools per thousand population in 2006-07 continue to have the same trend. Kerala, Chandigarh, Bihar and Daman and Diu in rural region have less than 5 schools per thousand population, similarly Lakshadweep, Chandigarh, Haryana, Kerala, Delhi, Punjab, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Bihar has less than 3 schools per thousand population in urban area in year 2006-07. Same trend was found in 2010-11. Some improvement in Punjab and Tamil Nadu in urban region. Availability is better for northern states of Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, north eastern states of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram (has 22.5 schools per thousand population in rural part for 2006-07 which was highest in country) had more than 15 schools per thousand elementary school going age in 2006-07. Urban areas of Himachal Pradesh and Mizoram had more than 10 schools per thousand population highest for the urban areas in the country. This trend is continued in 2010-11.

Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Chandigarh have almost same availability in terms of number of schools available per thousand population, but from previous chapter

we have learnt that Kerala has lesser out of school children and higher attendance ratio, this shows that with similar availability of schools the educational outcomes can be different.

4.4.2 Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools

In Chapter 3 it was discussed that the dropout rate increases as one moves from primary to upper primary section. One of the important reasons behind these dropouts is that the primary schools are easily available and accessible but upper primary schools are not easily accessible and also still short in number. Probe Report says that most of the girls dropout after completing primary because of the absence of upper primary schools (table 4.6).

While number of schools per thousand population tells about the availability of number of schools, the ratio of primary to upper primary schools provide

Table 4.6 Statewise Ratio of Primary schools to Upper Primary schools in rural and urban India

States/UT's	2006-07		2010-11	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	2.4	1.0	1.7	0.4
Andhra Pradesh	2.8	1.3	2.8	1.4
Arunachal Pradesh	5.0	1.7	4.0	1.6
Assam	3.7	2.5	2.7	1.3
Bihar	3.0	2.1	2.5	2.4
Chandigarh	1.5	1.0	1.2	1.1
Chhattisgarh	2.3	1.4	2.4	1.4
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	2.5	1.4	2.6	1.3
Daman & Diu	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.5
Delhi	1.9	1.7	1.9	1.7
Goa	3.1	2.0	2.9	1.9
Gujarat	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.2
Haryana	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.3
Himachal Pradesh	2.6	1.4	2.2	1.3
Jammu & Kashmir	2.5	1.5	2.2	1.4
Jharkhand	4.0	1.7	2.5	1.4
Karnataka	2.2	1.4	2.0	1.3
Kerala	1.9	1.5	1.7	1.4
Lakshadweep	1.8	N.A.	1.6	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	3.1	1.4	2.7	1.4
Maharashtra	1.6	1.1	1.9	1.0
Manipur	3.1	1.7	2.7	1.6
Meghalaya	3.8	1.5	2.8	1.4
Mizoram	1.8	1.3	1.5	1.2
Nagaland	2.6	1.3	2.4	1.3
Orissa	2.8	2.0	1.9	1.5
Puducherry	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.3
Punjab	2.3	1.6	1.8	1.3
Rajasthan	2.6	1.5	1.9	1.2
Sikkim	3.7	2.0	2.8	1.8
Tamil Nadu	2.8	1.4	2.5	1.8
Tripura	2.2	1.3	2.1	1.4
Uttar Pradesh	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.1
Uttarakhand	2.9	2.0	2.5	1.7
West Bengal	6.3	3.1	5.7	2.9
All States	2.7	1.5	2.3	1.4

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07, 2010-11)

information about the availability of upper primary schools. On primary school, higher the ratio lower would be the availability of upper primary schools. If the ratio is one this means that the region has same number of primary and upper primary schools value less than one means that upper primary schools are greater in number as compared to primary schools.

Ratio of primary to upper primary schools was worked out for 2006-07 and 2010-11 and it was found that as compared to urban areas, rural areas have lower availability of middle schools through in a period of five years availability has increased but the rate of positive change is slow. Uttrakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Manipur, Goa, Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim, Assam, Meghalaya Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh and West Bengal had the ratio approximately 3 or more than 3 in rural regions. Infact, West Bengal and Arunachal Pradesh had ratio more than 4, whereas in urban areas most of the states had ratio below 1:5. Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Assam and West Bengal had high value of ratio among all Indian states in urban area in 2006-07. The trend remained same in 2010-11 with a slight improvement in availability of middle schools in 2010-11.

4.4.3 Single Classroom Schools

Single classroom shows the shortage of infrastructure in the system. It is obvious that in a single classroom five or eight different grades cannot taught at one point of time. It creates an environment of mismanagement of different classes. Therefore, learning in such schools cannot be brought upto the appropriate level. Under such circumstances children do not take interest in their studies and it is more likely to dropout from studies. So, it is essential for effective learning in the schools, focus should be given for improving number of instructional classrooms. Therefore, more attention should be given on those states which have higher percentage of single classroom schools.

4.4.4 Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR)

Pupil Teacher Ratio tells about the availability of teachers. Higher the ratio, less is the availability of teacher and consequently, the period of availability of

teacher would be reduced to each student. As per norms of the government, pupil teacher ratio should not exceed 30 for a primary class and 35 for an upper primary class. This means that a teacher teaching a primary class can teach 30 or below 30 students in his class and an upper primary teacher should have a upper limit of 35 students at a time. However, in practice this does not happen and usually a teacher handles more students than a prescribed norm. This practice reduces the attention and period of availability of teacher on each student. Problem of higher pupil teacher ratio is more pronounced in rural areas than urban areas.

Table 4.7(a) State wise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in rural and urban India (2006-07)

2006-07 States/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Total Schools	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	3.5	0.8	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	33.4	2.3	25.3	8.0	0.6	4.9
Arunachal Pradesh	18.6	0.8	15.6	2.2	0.0	1.4
Assam	64.5	15.4	54.1	44.7	5.0	33.3
Bihar	8.7	2.4	7.1	11.7	4.5	9.3
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chhattisgarh	6.5	2.3	5.3	3.0	1.5	2.4
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	14.9	2.1	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	2.7	0.0	1.7	6.2	0.0	3.4
Delhi	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1
Goa	22.2	1.5	17.2	6.1	0.9	4.3
Gujarat	4.3	1.5	3.2	1.3	0.5	1.0
Haryana	3.3	1.4	2.7	4.9	1.7	3.6
Himachal Pradesh	4.1	4.4	4.2	2.7	0.2	1.7
Jammu & Kashmir	11.2	2.6	8.7	7.0	0.8	4.5
Jharkhand	4.4	1.8	3.8	3.6	1.2	2.7
Karnataka	11.1	0.8	7.9	2.9	0.4	1.9
Kerala	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.3
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	11.2	6.7	10.1	7.7	5.9	7.0
Maharashtra	9.4	1.4	6.4	1.7	0.6	1.2
Manipur	2.1	0.1	1.6	2.3	0.2	1.5
Meghalaya	24.5	5.0	20.4	9.4	0.7	5.9

Mizoram	2.7	0.5	1.9	0.5	0.6	0.6
Nagaland	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
Orissa	3.7	1.1	3.0	2.8	1.1	2.2
Puducherry	2.9	0.5	2.0	0.4	0.2	0.3
Punjab	3.7	1.6	3.0	3.3	1.0	2.4
Rajasthan	4.6	0.5	3.5	4.8	0.6	3.1
Sikkim	1.8	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tripura	6.8	1.2	5.1	2.8	0.6	1.8
Uttar Pradesh	0.5	0.3	0.5	3.8	0.7	2.9
Uttarakhand	2.6	0.5	2.0	2.7	1.0	2.1
West Bengal	12.7	0.2	11.0	8.9	0.4	6.8
All States	11.7	2.3	9.1	5.4	1.3	3.8

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07)

Table 4.7 (b) State wise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in rural and urban India (2010-11)

2010-11 States/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	3.2	1.4	2.5	0.0	1.8	1.3
Andhra Pradesh	30.0	1.6	22.5	7.4	0.7	4.7
Arunachal Pradesh	28.9	0.6	23.2	12.4	0.5	7.9
Assam	35.2	4.9	26.9	8.8	2.1	5.9
Bihar	4.0	1.6	3.3	6.7	2.3	5.4
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chhattisgarh	3.7	1.0	2.9	2.5	1.6	2.1
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	2.6	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Daman & Diu	2.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delhi	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Goa	21.3	0.6	16.0	9.3	0.8	6.4
Gujarat	2.3	1.0	1.8	1.1	0.4	0.8
Haryana	2.1	1.1	1.7	1.8	0.5	1.2
Himachal Pradesh	4.0	4.1	4.1	1.9	1.4	1.7
Jammu & Kashmir	13.9	2.0	10.2	9.1	0.4	5.4
Jharkhand	1.0	0.4	0.9	2.3	0.4	1.5
Karnataka	6.2	0.2	4.2	1.9	0.4	1.2
Kerala	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.5
Lakshadweep	2.8	0.0	1.7	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	4.6	1.4	3.7	1.5	0.5	1.1
Maharashtra	6.1	1.2	4.4	1.4	0.8	1.1
Manipur	1.3	0.1	1.0	1.5	0.0	0.9
Meghalaya	23.2	4.3	18.2	3.6	1.2	2.6

Mizoram	1.7	0.2	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.1
Nagaland	0.2	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Orissa	6.1	1.3	4.4	4.4	1.2	3.1
Puducherry	4.9	0.0	3.0	1.4	0.0	0.8
Punjab	2.2	0.6	1.6	2.5	0.4	1.6
Rajasthan	2.4	0.5	1.7	3.5	0.6	2.2
Sikkim	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tripura	1.5	0.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Uttar Pradesh	0.6	1.0	0.8	3.4	0.9	2.6
Uttarakhand	2.4	0.4	1.8	3.1	0.5	2.1
West Bengal	15.0	4.6	13.5	7.7	0.8	5.9
All States	8.1	1.3	6.0	3.2	0.6	2.2

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2010-11)

For the present study, pupil teacher ratio is calculated by dividing total number of children enrolled in class I to VIII by the total number of teachers teaching in class I to VIII. Table 4.8 presents pupil teacher ratio across the Indian states, separately for rural as well as urban areas for the year 2006-07 and 2010-11. On an average rural areas have higher pupil teacher ratio as compared to urban areas. Over the period of five years, PTR has reduced to some extent and for India, the gap between rural and urban areas has been reduced, but there are number of states where rural areas have better PTR than urban areas. Sikkim, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Uttrakhand, Goa, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Nagaland, Andaman and Nicobar Islands etc. are the few states that have favourable PTR in rural areas with a significant rural-urban gap in both the years. Chandigarh too has high rural-urban gap with favourable PTR for urban area in both the years.

There are large interstate variations in PTR. Andaman and Sikkim in rural areas and Mizoram in urban areas had PTR below 15 in 2006-07. In this group Jammu and Kashmir and Lakshdweep were new entry in 2010-11. Though only a few states had PTR below 15. On the other side, states with PTR above 30 and 40 also got reduced but this decline is not pronounced in all the state. Bihar and Uttar

Pradesh continued to have higher PTR values in both the years for rural and urban areas. Though in five years, there has been a decrease in the load of student per teacher, but it still remains above 50 for rural and urban Bihar.

It is important fact to note that PTR has been decreased, but not to a significant extent in all the states of India. Northeastern, northern and southern states had favourable PTR in both the years, whereas the states of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand continues to have higher PTR.

4.4.5 Single Teacher Schools

Teachers are the most important component of education system. Knowledge of the pupils is transmitted only through the efforts of a teacher. So, it is very important to note that the pupils are motivated through good teaching. Probe report reveals that most of the teachers in government schools are demotivated and there are various reasons of demotivation, but one of the major reason of demotivation is that a teacher is burdened with excess workload. In single teacher schools, a teacher is burdened with teaching of atleast five classes, monitor all the children and simultaneously devote time for non teaching activities, i.e. keeping records, working as an agent of government in pulse polio duties, explaining new policies implemented by the government etc. Under such conditions motivation of a teacher towards teaching gets reduced as he/she has to devote time to other activities. Therefore, quality of education gets adversely affected in single teacher schools. Besides the quality of teaching, single teacher schools points out about the shortage of teachers in the system. Percentage of single teacher schools is given in table 4.6, which reveals that percentage of single teacher schools is high in rural areas. Primary schools have higher share of single teacher schools than the upper primary schools, therefore, present research focus on primary schools. There has been a decline in single teacher schools after the implementation of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, except for rural areas of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Goa, Mizoram, Orissa and urban parts of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Manipur etc.

Table 4.8 Statewise Pupil Teacher Ratio in rural and urban India

States/UT's	2006-07		2010-11	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	13.6	19.1	9.7	11.1
Andhra Pradesh	21.7	23.2	18.4	23.0
Arunachal Pradesh	21.8	20.3	17.8	18.7
Assam	24.8	21.9	21.8	18.6
Bihar	63.6	65.1	58.4	51.1
Chandigarh	33.9	21.6	33.7	22.6
Chhattisgarh	27.4	24.5	23.6	28.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	43.5	50.9	39.6	42.1
Daman & Diu	32.6	29.8	28.8	31.1
Delhi	28.8	24.1	38.7	35.1
Goa	22.0	28.7	21.2	28.3
Gujarat	34.3	36.5	29.3	37.3
Haryana	31.6	33.7	25.7	27.8
Himachal Pradesh	17.9	23.1	15.5	23.3
Jammu & Kashmir	16.1	15.5	13.7	12.0
Jharkhand	49.0	42.1	41.1	40.8
Karnataka	30.4	34.5	23.9	29.7
Kerala	26.4	27.8	21.1	21.2
Lakshadweep	19.5	N.A.	14.1	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	39.4	34.1	36.3	33.3
Maharashtra	25.7	31.5	26.4	37.1
Manipur	20.9	18.8	18.1	20.6
Meghalaya	17.2	24.4	15.7	21.0
Mizoram	15.1	13.0	14.4	14.3
Nagaland	20.5	28.7	18.5	24.8
Orissa	32.2	37.5	26.3	26.4
Puducherry	22.6	24.4	16.1	15.2
Punjab	30.7	36.6	19.0	20.1
Rajasthan	32.6	26.7	26.5	24.4
Sikkim	11.7	28.5	11.6	15.4
Tamil Nadu	27.6	26.1	28.1	31.4
Tripura	22.7	21.4	18.3	24.7
Uttar Pradesh	53.2	50.1	43.6	46.9
Uttarakhand	25.2	29.2	21.2	30.7
West Bengal	51.0	46.5	31.5	25.0
All States	35.3	31.1	30.2	30.1

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07, 2010-11)

where the increase in such schools is between 2 to 5%. This increase further questions the government promises and efforts to improve supply of elementary schools.

On the positive side, states like Assam, Jharkhand, Punjab, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, rural Chattisgarh etc. where the decline in single teacher schools have been more than 6 percent. If distribution of single teacher schools is taken into consideration then it can be seen from the map that Kerala, Sikkim, Tripura and UTs of Chandigarh, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshdweep had less than 2% single teacher schools in rural areas. Less than 2% single teacher schools are widespread in urban areas. Therefore, northeastern states of Nagaland, Mizoram, Tripura, Sikkim, Northern states of Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, southern state of Kerala and Gujarat and Maharashtra of western India have less than 2% single teacher schools. On the contrary

Table 4.9 (a) Statewise Percentage of Single Teacher Schools in rural and urban areas in India (2006-07)

2006-07	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Total Schools	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	3.1	0.8	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Andhra Pradesh	10.2	0.4	7.6	3.8	0.4	4.1
Arunachal Pradesh	51.6	1.3	43.2	4.9	0.9	5.8
Assam	36.4	1.8	29.0	35.9	3.4	39.3
Bihar	4.6	1.6	3.9	12.4	2.9	15.3
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chhattisgarh	16.1	7.6	13.5	3.9	1.6	5.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	32.6	3.1	24.3	5.0	0.0	5.0
Daman & Diu	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	6.2
Delhi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Goa	32.9	2.1	25.4	8.4	0.0	8.4
Gujarat	5.1	2.1	3.9	1.2	0.4	1.6
Haryana	10.7	4.1	8.5	4.1	2.5	6.7
Himachal Pradesh	9.4	1.7	7.3	1.4	0.5	1.9
Jammu & Kashmir	5.3	0.2	3.9	1.5	0.0	1.5
Jharkhand	18.2	2.8	15.1	5.9	1.3	7.2

Karnataka	14.1	2.2	10.4	6.8	4.5	11.3
Kerala	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	26.9	11.3	23.1	6.5	4.6	11.1
Maharashtra	7.1	0.9	4.8	1.8	0.6	2.3
Manipur	14.4	0.8	11.0	4.0	0.3	4.3
Meghalaya	14.3	0.9	11.5	5.5	0.3	5.9
Mizoram	4.1	1.8	3.2	0.2	0.0	0.2
Nagaland	3.3	0.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orissa	12.2	10.5	11.8	10.9	12.3	23.1
Puducherry	2.3	0.0	1.4	0.8	0.0	0.8
Punjab	13.6	3.4	10.5	10.8	3.1	13.9
Rajasthan	29.6	1.9	21.8	12.4	1.5	13.9
Sikkim	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tamil Nadu	3.0	0.4	2.3	2.2	0.2	2.5
Tripura	1.1	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.0	0.5
Uttar Pradesh	1.8	13.9	4.9	6.0	1.6	7.6
Uttarakhand	19.3	6.4	16.0	6.0	1.4	7.4
West Bengal	3.0	0.1	2.6	3.4	0.3	3.8
All States	13.6	4.6	11.2	6.0	1.9	7.9

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07)

Table 4.9 (b) Statewise Percentage of Single Teacher Schools in rural and urban areas in India (2010)

2010-11 States/UT's	Rural			Urban		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	7.5	0.0	4.8	0	5.5	4.1
Andhra Pradesh	15.5	0.2	11.5	4.8	0.6	3.1
Arunachal Pradesh	48.4	2.3	39.1	13.1	0.5	8.2
Assam	20.7	0.3	15.1	3.9	0.5	2.4
Bihar	4.4	1.6	3.6	6.3	1.9	5
Chandigarh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
Chhattisgarh	8.7	5.9	7.9	7	0.8	4.5
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	24.4	0.0	17.5	0	0	0
Daman & Diu	2.0	0.0	1.2	3.8	0	2.3
Delhi	0.5	1.3	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.4
Goa	35.4	1.1	26.6	10.6	0	7
Gujarat	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.6
Haryana	5.9	2.3	4.5	1.7	0.4	1.2
Himachal Pradesh	7.2	1.1	5.3	0.5	0	0.3
Jammu & Kashmir	10.1	0.2	7.0	1.3	0	0.8
Jharkhand	10.4	1.6	7.9	4.7	1	3.2

Karnataka	7.9	0.6	5.4	2	0.5	1.3
Kerala	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0.1
Lakshadweep	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Madhya Pradesh	16.6	13.3	15.7	4.7	3.1	4
Maharashtra	4.3	0.4	3.0	1.7	0.6	1.2
Manipur	11.6	0.7	8.7	6.2	0.6	4
Meghalaya	13.2	0.4	9.8	3.2	0	1.9
Mizoram	6.7	1.9	4.8	2.1	0.2	1.2
Nagaland	4.1	0.9	3.2	0	0	0
Orissa	15.6	2.1	10.9	6.6	5.1	6
Puducherry	1.2	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.6
Punjab	5.7	1.1	4.0	3.4	0.2	2
Rajasthan	17.7	1.9	12.3	5.5	0.5	3.3
Sikkim	1.8	0.0	1.3	0	0	0
Tamil Nadu	3.2	0.5	2.5	1.4	0.6	1.1
Tripura	1.0	0.1	0.7	0.4	0	0.2
Uttar Pradesh	2.8	21.6	8.7	4.2	3.7	4
Uttarakhand	19.3	3.6	14.8	6.8	1.2	4.7
West Bengal	3.0	1.1	2.8	3.6	0.7	2.9
All States	9.7	5.1	8.3	3.5	1.2	2.6

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2010-11)

BIMARU states had such schools more than 24% in rural areas, though the highest being in Arunachal Pradesh, where 51% of primary schools had a single teacher in 2006-07. After five years there has been decline in single teacher schools in both rural and urban areas, but still the picture is gloomy for rural and urban areas of Arunachal Pradesh and Goa. Educationally Goa is a better state but still it had higher percentage of single teacher schools in both the years.

On an average single teacher schools have been decreased but their percentages are still higher in some of the states. Urban areas have lower percentage of schools with single teacher than rural areas. Lastly for few states and UTs single teacher schools have actually increased from 2006-07 to 2010-11, this increase questions, the promises and efforts of government.

4.4.6 Drinking Water Facility

Water is the prime need of an institution. Schools should have facility of drinking water so that children do not go back to home for drinking water. Once a

child goes to home, then the chances to come back to school are very less. Therefore, to ensure child stays in school, availability of potable water is indispensable.

As far as the infrastructural facilities of schools are concerned, SSA has played an important role for providing infrastructural facilities like drinking water, furniture, toilet, blackboard along with modern teaching aids, equipments and computers etc. Consequently, there has been a positive change in drinking water facility in school after implementation of “Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan”. Data analysis (Table 4.10) indicates that there been a drastic increase in the percentage of schools having drinking water facility from 2006-07 to 2010-11. In 2010-11, most of the states schools (90%) were having the drinking water facility. However, schools in Meghalaya, Nagaland, Assam continues to have dearth of drinking water facility. Infact, Meghalaya is one of the rain sufficient states in India but still the state lags behind in the availability of drinking water in school premises. About 57.2% rural schools in Meghalaya have this facility. The states that have poor water facility are those where an annual average rainfall is sufficient and there is no means of storage and conservation of rain water.

4.4.7 Girls Toilet Facility

Probe Team in their field study points out that the enrolment of girls gets adversely affected where schools do not have separate toilet facility for girls. Parents don't want their daughters to relieve in open spaces. To ensure girls enrolment and their stay in schools, separate toilet facility is essential.

Improvement in girls enrolment was one of the objectives of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. Table 4.11 shows that there has been an increase in those schools having . Percentage of Elementary School with Drinking Water Facility in rural and urban areas

Table 4.10 Percentage of Elementary School with Drinking Water Facility in rural and urban India

States/UT's	2006-07		2010-11	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	85.9	100.0	95.3	98.5
Andhra Pradesh	77.7	91.3	89.6	94.8
Arunachal Pradesh	71.3	90.6	77.3	88.8
Assam	89.5	69.4	75.4	89.4
Bihar	90.8	82.1	92.0	90.1
Chandigarh	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Chhattisgarh	85.0	90.1	93.5	94.9
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	93.0	95.0	96.0	100.0
Daman & Diu	92.5	92.0	100.0	100.0
Delhi	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
Goa	95.7	97.5	98.9	99.7
Gujarat	84.0	94.8	97.6	99.3
Haryana	94.4	96.3	98.9	99.6
Himachal Pradesh	92.9	95.4	97.5	99.6
Jammu & Kashmir	66.3	88.0	85.7	97.0
Jharkhand	69.0	79.8	87.5	85.5
Karnataka	77.9	88.8	94.1	97.2
Kerala	97.1	97.9	99.4	99.5
Lakshadweep	92.9	0.0	100.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	87.8	90.9	90.5	95.7
Maharashtra	82.2	94.9	90.7	98.1
Manipur	72.8	79.5	87.9	96.5
Meghalaya	41.6	67.7	57.2	80.0
Mizoram	74.1	91.3	82.0	96.0
Nagaland	66.5	80.8	73.7	82.8
Orissa	84.1	72.4	88.6	88.7
Puducherry	98.6	96.7	100.0	100.0
Punjab	97.9	98.4	99.8	99.7
Rajasthan	81.7	89.0	94.3	97.0
Sikkim	82.9	98.1	98.1	100.0
Tamil Nadu	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Tripura	76.0	83.5	81.3	97.7
Uttar Pradesh	97.7	97.9	98.1	99.3
Uttarakhand	83.5	91.4	92.5	98.0
West Bengal	81.6	70.0	95.1	97.2
All States	84.3	90.1	92.1	96.7

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07, 2010-11)

Percentage of Elementary School with Drinking Water Facility in rural and urban areas separate girls toilet facility, but again the rural schools lack this facility.

Table4.11 Percentage of Elementary School with Girls Toilet Facility in rural and urban India

States/UT's	2006-07		2010-11	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	62.5	94.1	72.9	79.1
Andhra Pradesh	36.4	72.6	55.3	78.5
Arunachal Pradesh	9.6	56.3	28.6	64.7
Assam	9.3	21.6	38.9	55.6
Bihar	15.7	23.1	37.6	35.5
Chandigarh	94.3	93.7	87.5	96.7
Chhattisgarh	11.3	39.9	34.0	42.3
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	25.1	50.0	51.7	91.7
Daman & Diu	38.9	48.0	88.0	68.6
Delhi	85.1	90.1	80.4	80.2
Goa	39.0	58.7	66.9	72.4
Gujarat	58.4	78.3	71.5	80.5
Haryana	76.5	79.1	85.2	90.5
Himachal Pradesh	35.2	65.6	65.9	78.1
Jammu & Kashmir	15.9	50.3	22.4	52.6
Jharkhand	14.1	40.5	59.8	63.8
Karnataka	42.1	65.3	73.4	82.7
Kerala	77.0	79.2	77.5	76.2
Lakshadweep	58.6	0.0	63.0	0.0
Madhya Pradesh	21.6	59.1	34.8	63.6
Maharashtra	46.5	78.2	68.9	82.0
Manipur	13.9	37.1	23.2	44.4
Meghalaya	7.2	31.0	22.8	42.5
Mizoram	14.5	36.6	58.3	72.3
Nagaland	26.3	60.6	67.2	81.8
Orissa	28.4	22.0	38.1	39.0
Puducherry	87.9	82.7	93.5	87.3
Punjab	80.5	84.0	90.2	87.9
Rajasthan	38.7	58.6	91.8	93.5
Sikkim	35.7	49.1	75.2	78.9
Tamil Nadu	55.8	80.6	67.3	85.6
Tripura	19.3	48.3	42.0	63.1
Uttar Pradesh	77.7	83.0	76.0	79.0
Uttarakhand	50.2	75.2	50.9	64.5
West Bengal	31.6	33.5	47.8	55.9
All States	39.5	64.1	58.2	74.1

(Source: Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? 2006-07, 2010-11)

Coefficient of Correlation

To see the effect and relationship of the following discussed indicators on enrolment, correlation was worked out between the following indicators as independent variable and net attendance ratio as a dependent variable. Following result was obtained- a) there was found to be significant negative relationship between net attendance ratio and Pupil teacher ratio. This means higher the pupil teacher ratio lower would be the attendance. With time its significance has decreased in urban areas but in rural areas the relationship was worked out to be stronger over the period of five years (table4.12).

Single teacher schools also have a significant (up to 95% confidence level) negative relationship with attendance ratio. The more the number of single teacher schools the less would be attendance. From 2006-07 to 2010-11 the significance has increased for rural areas than urban counterparts. Drinking water facility had strong positive relationship with net attendance ratio in 2010-11 for urban areas. This means in urban schools attendance increases with the increase in drinking water facility. Rest of the indicators did not show significant relationship.

Table 4.12 Coefficient of Correlation worked out

Independent Variables	2006-07		2010-11	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
No. of Schools Per Thousand Population	0.091	0.314	-0.066	-0.245
Ratio of Primary Schools to Upper Primary Schools	-0.307	-.465**	-0.243	-0.023
Single Classroom Schools	-0.12	-0.187	-0.171	-0.292
Pupil Teacher Ratio	-.530**	-.515**	-.589**	-0.183
Single Teacher Schools	-0.288	-.341*	-.412*	-.338*
Schools with Drinking Water Facility	0.209	-0.021	0.136	.644**
Schools with Girls Toilet Facility	0.065	-0.025	0.242	0.311
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

Dependent Variable taken is Net Attendance Ratio

4.5 Conclusion

Present chapter discussed the reasons of non enrolment and dropout and came to a point that parental disinterest; child labour etc. are often given as reasons of children not being in schools. However the literature and data of NSSO 64th round suggests that the major reason behind dropout is not parental disinterest but the lack of interest of child in studies. This lack of interest of child towards studies discourages parents to send other children to school. There is a demand for quality of education from the parents. On the other hand it was found that India even after ten years launch of Sarv Siksha Abhiyan is still lagging behind in providing basic infrastructural facilities. Single teacher schools, single classroom schools and high pupil teacher ratio are still a reality in many parts of the country. Therefore there is a need to focus on the improvement of the infrastructural facility in backward areas of the country so that the problem of dropout and non enrolment can be solved.

Chapter 5

Elementary Education and Sarva Siksha Abhiyan: A Case Study of Rajasthan

5.1 Introduction

Rajasthan is one of the educationally backward state in India. A number of programmes have been launched in the state such as Lok Jumbish, Shiksha Karmi Project, DPEP, Jan-Shalas etc. to improve the condition of elementary education which has shown some improvement but still the state occupies lowest rank. The discussion on enrolment and out of school children in chapter three revealed that among the states of India, Rajasthan has lower enrolment and higher dropouts and non enrolment in the elementary school going age group. The present chapter tries to see the effect of Sarv Siksha Abhiyan in Rajasthan in terms of enrolment, increase in supply side variable after the launch of programme and role of supply side variables in influencing the enrolment.

5.2 Status of current attendance in Rajasthan

To have a broad picture of status of education, current attendance in the 5-29 years of age group is taken into consideration. Current attendance in the age group of 5-29 years of population reveals the fact that from the year 1999-2000 to the year 2009-10 there has been a decline in percentage of those who are currently not in education system by approximately 10 percent. Among the out of school children, there has been a significant decrease in never enrolled population i.e. from 33.7% in 55th round to 17.4% in 66th round, but over the period of ten year an increase in dropout rate has been seen. It is an important fact to note that the dropouts also include dropout from secondary and higher educational levels. Dropouts at elementary school level will be discussed in detail in the next section.

However, one thing is clear that people are giving chance to education as never enrolled percentages have come down but the increase in dropout rate suggests that there is a flaw in the system as the individuals are not retained in the education system. Table 5.2 and 5.3 shows current attendance among different social groups and religions in India during 55th round throws light on the fact that scheduled population and Muslims have the highest percentage of population that are out of the education system and are the least represented in higher education levels. There has been a reduction in never enrolled population in 66th round, but this is followed by rise in dropouts. Added to this, there has been an increase in representation in higher levels of education but as compared to non scheduled population and other religious group, the scheduled and Muslims continues to have lower participation at higher education levels. Non scheduled and other religious groups have comparatively less never enrolled population and have greater representation at higher education level. Therefore, the overall increase in percentage of never enrolled population has been accompanied by increasing dropout. From 55th round to 66th round, the story remains the same i.e. scheduled population and Muslims continue to lag behind.

Table 5.1 Percentage distribution of persons (age 5-29 years) by status of attendance in Rajasthan

	1999-2000	2009-10
Out of School	54.5	44.4
Never Enrolled	33.7	17.4
Dropout	20.8	27.0
Below Primary	6.1	0.8
Primary	23.1	25.4
Upper Primary	8.9	11.1
Secondary & Higher Secondary	5.5	9.7
Higher Levels	1.9	8.5

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Table 5.2 Percentage distribution of persons age 5-29 years) according to religion by status of attendance in Rajasthan

	1999-2000				
	Hinduism	Islam	Christainity	Sikhism	Jainism
Out of School	53.7	62.7	41.5	64.2	40.2
Never Enrolled	33.5	41.8	15.1	28.6	1.3
Dropout	20.3	20.8	26.4	35.5	38.9
Below Primary	6.2	4.5	9.0	4.8	3.9
Primary	23.5	21.8	31.5	16.0	16.9
Upper Primary	9.2	6.8	11.9	5.3	10.7
Secondary & Higher					
Secondary	5.6	2.9	4.4	7.1	17.4
Higher Levels	1.8	1.3	1.6	2.6	11.0
	2009-10				
	Hinduism	Islam	Christainity	Sikhism	Jainism
Out of School	43.4	54.0		51.7	23.7
Never Enrolled	16.4	26.6		23.5	0.0
Dropped Out	27.0	27.4		28.2	23.7
Below Primary	0.9	0.9		0.0	0.0
Primary	25.6	25.4	34.5	18.6	22.1
Upper Primary	11.2	10.4	33.3	10.5	10.5
Secondary & Higher					
Secondary	10.1	4.3	32.2	12.7	10.0
Higher Levels	8.8	5.0	0.0	6.4	33.8

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Table 5.3 Percentage distribution of persons (age 5-29 years) according to religion by status of attendance in Rajasthan

	1999-2000			
	ST	SC	NSD	All
Out of School	63.3	61.1	50.5	54.5
Never Enrolled	48.2	41.0	28.2	33.7
Dropout	15.1	20.1	22.4	20.8
Below Primary	5.7	5.8	6.3	6.1
Primary	19.5	21.2	24.5	23.1
Upper Primary	5.7	6.6	10.4	8.9
Secondary & Higher Secondary	5.0	4.0	6.1	5.5
Higher Levels	0.9	1.4	2.2	1.9
	2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	All
Out of School	47.7	51.4	41.6	44.4
Never Enrolled	25.4	21.8	14.4	17.4
Dropped Out	22.4	29.6	27.2	27.0
Below Primary	1.1	0.3	0.9	0.8
Primary	28.7	26.2	24.5	25.4
Upper Primary	9.2	9.8	12.0	11.1
Secondary & Higher Secondary	7.0	7.3	10.9	9.7
Higher Levels	6.3	5.0	10.1	8.5

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

5.3 Gross Attendance Ratio

After having a broad outlook on the status of attendance, focus will now be on elementary education, because it is the starting point in education system. A good start at the basic level motivates individual to continue further in studies. Table 5.4 provides gross attendance ratio at the regional level of Rajasthan for 55th and 66th NSSO rounds. There has been an increase in gross attendance ratio over the period of ten years. North Eastern region in Rajasthan has the highest gross attendance in both the years.

Table 5.4 Regionwise Gross Attendance Ratio at elementary level in Rajasthan

Regions	1999-2000	2009-10
Western	73.8	99.7
North Eastern	81.6	105.4
Southern	61.2	97.8
South Eastern	79.1	93.5
Rajasthan	76.2	100.9

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

In year 1999-2000 southern region had the lowest gross attendance among all regions, but in the year 2009-10 this region recorded the highest increase in gross attendance (more than 35%). An important point to be noted here is that during the 55th round gross attendance ratio had huge differences among the regions but in 66th round all had the percentages above 90%, with north eastern region leading all the regions. As already discussed that gross attendance ratio captures the overage and under age factor, usually overage factor is dominant than the other one, therefore gross attendance gives us the true picture of the efficiency in the system. The most probable reason is the overage factor which is predominant in the rural areas, where children of rural backgrounds enroll little later, and another important factor is related to repeaters. There are many children who are first generation learners and therefore they do not have anyone to help them in their studies at home.

An important point to be noted here is that as per the norms of RTE act enrolment of students would be on the basis of the age. This means that if a child who has never been to school before the age of 10 then the child instead of being

enrolled in class I gets enrolled in class V, and to raise the learning of child to standard V he/she is given training in the condensed form course which run for a limited period. Though, this norm of RTE act would reduce grossness in school, but on the other hand, it will discourage the child from studies, because children will not be able to cope up with studies.

Gross attendance ratio captures the overage and underage factor, therefore, to have a clear picture of what's happening in the elementary school going age group i.e. 6 to 13 years of age group, net attendance ratio is taken into consideration.

5.4 Net Attendance Ratio

Net attendance ratio in table 5.5 reveals that attendance has improved after the Sarv Siksha Abhiyan came into effect. Net attendance increased from 61.7% in 1999-2000 to 81.8% in 2009-10. During the 55th round north eastern Rajasthan had the highest attendance, whereas the southern region had the lowest attendance. Over the period of ten years net attendance ratio for all regions have increased, the highest increase being in southern region. Western region had the highest NAR closely followed by northeastern region. Again like the year 1999-2000, in the year 2009-10 too, southern region had the lowest attendance, but the gap between the western region (which has the highest net attendance ratio) and southern region has reduced in 66th round as compared to the gap between southern region (lowest net attendance ratio) and north eastern (highest net attendance ratio) in 55th round.

Table 5.5 Regionwise Net Attendance Ratio at elementary level in among boys and girls in rural and urban Rajasthan in age 6 to 13 years

	1999-2000								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
55th	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total
Western	67.0	40.3	54.3	78.4	70.4	74.7	69.8	47.5	59.2
North Eastern	77.5	51.2	65.7	70.0	63.8	67.1	76.1	53.7	66.0
Southern	56.5	35.3	46.8	71.4	77.4	73.9	58.5	40.3	50.3
South Eastern	69.0	57.2	62.9	80.8	62.0	72.2	71.4	58.0	64.7
Rajasthan	70.5	46.4	59.3	74.6	67.3	71.3	71.4	50.6	61.7
	2009-10								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
66th	Male	Female		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Western	88.4	81.0	85.0	83.1	71.8	77.9	87.4	79.3	83.7
North Eastern	86.0	77.8	82.1	82.4	83.1	82.7	85.1	79.1	82.2
Southern	80.3	74.0	77.3	77.9	72.7	75.0	80.1	73.9	77.1
South Eastern	82.4	83.7	83.0	64.1	71.9	67.8	78.4	80.6	79.4
Rajasthan	85.7	79.1	82.7	79.9	77.3	78.7	84.5	78.8	81.8

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

During 55th round net attendance ratio was higher for urban areas and that too for urban boys, highest attendance was for urban boys in southeastern region, whereas the lowest attendance was observed for rural girl in southern region. The gap between the highest and lowest values was approximately 45% in 1999-2000. Generally speaking boys had higher attendance than girls except for urban southern region. Urban boys had highest attendance, whereas rural girls had lowest attendance. Added to this the gap between rural boys and rural girls was also wide, the highest gap being in western region. If urban rural gap is taken into consideration then it is the southern region which has the highest gap (Table 5.6).

In year 2009-10, there was rise in attendance except for urban boys in southeastern region, where there has been a drop in net attendance ratio of approximately 16 percent. It is interesting to note that in 66th round, rural areas had higher net attendance ratio than urban region of the state except for northeastern region. Boys had higher attendance than girls. Both rural boys and girls had higher net attendance ratio than their counterparts in urban areas except for girls in northeast region. Among regions, western region has the highest attendance and southern region has the lowest in rural areas, but the gap is not so much wide. In urban areas, it is the north eastern region that has performed better than the other regions and the south eastern the worst, added to this the gap between them is greater than the difference between the best and worst performing region in the rural areas. There has also been decline in the gap between the boys and girls in 66th round.

Among social groups non scheduled had the highest attendance in 55th round. Scheduled population of western and southern region had the lowest attendance. Impact of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan could be seen as the net attendance ratio has increased among all the social groups and the gap between scheduled and non scheduled has reduced and in the region southern and south eastern scheduled population performed better than non scheduled. From 55th and 66th round scheduled tribes of western region and scheduled caste of southern region continues to have lower values of among their respective social groups. Overall, there has been an increase in net attendance ratio and reduction in gaps between non scheduled and scheduled and between different regions (Table 5.7).

Table 5.6 Regionwise Net Attendance Ratio at elementary level in among social groups in Rajasthan in age 6 to13 years

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
Western	39.8	49.6	63.3	59.2	65.8	79.2	86.6	83.7
North Eastern	62.6	57.3	69.0	66.0	75.5	81.6	83.7	82.2
Southern	38.9	39.8	69.1	50.3	81.3	75.7	72.1	77.1
South Eastern	56.9	55.9	69.9	64.7	78.9	85.6	77.7	79.4
Rajasthan	49.6	53.4	67.0	61.7	77.3	80.5	83.3	81.8

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

5.5 Out of School

Attendance ratio shows that there has been an increase in the enrolment of children but Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan has not been able to bring all children to school. Out of school children are shown in the table 5.7 shows that in the year 2009-10, 10.9% children in the age group of 6 to 13 years were out of school. Though, these percentages have come down from 26.9% in 1999-2000 but still 11% of the children are not in school.

Table 5.7 Regionwise out of school children in Rajasthan

	1999-2000	2009-10
Western	30.7	11.8
North Eastern	22.8	11.5
Southern	33.3	10.9
South Eastern	24.8	6.6
Rajasthan	26.9	10.9

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

To probe further, where does the problem lies, out of school children are further studied under never enrolled and dropout. Table 5.8 depicts that during 55th round, rural areas had higher never enrolled population.

Table 5.8 Regionwise percentage of never enrolled children in in age 6 to 13 years in rural and urban Rajasthan

	1999-2000								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
Region	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total
Western	19.9	44.2	31.5	7.9	12.3	10.0	16.9	36.5	26.2
North Eastern	10.5	37.8	22.8	7.9	15.2	11.2	10.0	33.4	20.6
Southern	18.3	47.4	31.6	12.3	3.7	8.7	17.5	42.2	28.7
South Eastern	15.8	30.0	23.1	8.7	18.0	12.9	14.3	28.0	21.2
Rajasthan	15.0	40.1	26.7	8.4	13.5	10.7	13.7	34.8	23.5
	2009-10								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
Region	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total
Western	5.8	11.6	8.4	5.1	20.2	12.1	5.6	13.2	9.1
North Eastern	7.1	11.8	9.3	5.8	7.9	6.7	6.8	10.8	8.7
Southern	4.7	8.7	6.6	0.0	0.8	0.4	4.4	8.0	6.2
South Eastern	4.8	6.5	5.5	4.8	3.0	4.0	4.8	5.6	5.2
Rajasthan	6.0	10.7	8.2	5.2	10.9	7.9	5.8	10.8	8.1

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

5.5.1 Never Enrolled

Urban boys had the lowest non enrolment, whereas the rural girls had the highest non enrolment with all regions having never enrolled population above 30% in the age group 6 to 13 years in 1999-2000. Gap between boys and girls was wider in the rural areas as compared to the urban area. Southern region had the highest never enrolled percentages in rural areas, both for girls and boys and even

for urban boys, but for urban girls southern region had the lowest non enrolment in 55th round. In the year 2009-10, the percentage of never attended children declined along with this the gap between rural-urban, boys-girls and different regions have also come down. Southern region showed significant improvement from the last decade in both rural and urban areas, there were no urban boys who have not been enrolled in school. On the contrary, urban girls in western region have non enrolment as high as 20.2%, which is greater than the past decade, this increase in non enrolment needs further investigation.

The percentage of never enrolled (Table 5.9) among different social groups have also come down. Southern region again showed a remarkable progress from the last decade as never attended population has declined for all the social groups. Non scheduled continues to have a upper hand over scheduled, but the gap between the social groups have come down except for north eastern region and for south eastern region.

Table 5.9 Regionwise never enrolled children among social groups in age 6 to 13 years in Rajasthan

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
Western	45.4	39.9	20.9	26.2	11.2	13.7	7.2	9.1
North Eastern	26.0	26.4	18.0	20.6	16.5	12.2	6.3	8.7
Southern	41.6	35.3	8.1	28.7	6.1	8.5	5.6	6.2
South Eastern	26.4	35.2	15.3	21.2	10.9	3.9	3.3	5.2
Rajasthan	34.4	33.2	18.1	23.5	11.0	11.8	6.2	8.1

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

5.5.2 Dropout

Attendance ratios and percentage of never enrolled population showed that the children of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan have been able to bring children to schools to some extent, but are the children who enter into the schooling system will remain in the school system or they will dropout? This question needs further investigation (Table 5.10). Dropout rates have reduced from 55th round to 66th round, but girls continues to drop from the school more than the boys. During 66th round dropouts have been reported high for urban areas. Urban areas of western and north eastern region have lower dropouts than their rural counterparts, whereas for southern and south eastern regions rural regions have lower dropouts than urban areas. Girls dropout more than boys however, the gap between girls and boys have come down from the past decade. The highest dropouts were reported for southern region in 55th and 66th rounds. Though, there has been a decline in dropout, but for urban girls in the southern region the dropouts have been reported to increase. On one hand, the never enrolled population of urban girls in southern region declined, but on the other hand, dropouts have been increased, which indicates that school system is not able to retain the children and this problem needs to be solved with rational planning.

Dropouts in different social groups show a declining trend but the highest decrease is observed for schedule tribe of south eastern region. Though ST of the region had 11% never enrolled population, but lower dropout rates show that once child get into school the survival in schools are high for them. Similar is the case with ST of north eastern region.

Table 5.10 Percentage distribution of dropouts (age 6 to 13 years) in rural and urban regions of Rajasthan

	1999-2000								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total
Western	3.4	12.2	6.8	3.2	5.3	4.1	3.4	9.9	6.0
North Eastern	1.7	4.6	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.8	1.9	4.2	2.8
Southern	4.1	12.5	7.1	3.0	3.4	3.2	4.0	10.7	6.4
South Eastern	4.4	6.3	5.3	0.0	4.6	2.0	3.4	6.0	4.6
Rajasthan	2.8	8.0	4.8	2.6	4.2	3.3	2.7	7.0	4.4
	2009-10								
	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total	Boy	Girl	Total
Western	1.2	4.6	2.7	4.4	4.2	4.3	1.8	4.5	3.0
North Eastern	1.5	4.4	2.9	3.0	4.2	3.5	1.9	4.4	3.0
Southern	3.8	6.4	5.0	0.1	9.7	5.4	3.5	6.7	5.1
South Eastern	0.7	2.0	1.2	0.6	4.3	2.4	0.7	2.6	1.5
Rajasthan	1.6	4.5	2.9	3.0	4.5	3.7	1.9	4.5	3.1

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

Highest dropout rates in 66th round were recorded for ST of southern region, it is important to note the fact that the region had the lowest non enrolment which suggests that merely ensuring enrolment would not benefit the people. Positive impact of schooling would only be seen when children retain in school. Therefore, now the main focus of education policies should be to ensure the retention of children in school (Table 5.11).

Table 5.11 Percentage distribution of dropouts (age 6 to 13 years) among social groups of Rajasthan

	1999-2000				2009-10			
	ST	SC	NSD	ALL	ST	SC	NSD	ALL
Western	17.9	4.3	6.0	6.0	8.5	5.0	1.9	3.0
North Eastern	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.8	0.2	4.3	3.2	3.0
Southern	9.5	0.0	4.1	6.4	7.9	3.0	2.0	5.1
South Eastern	11.1	2.6	3.1	4.6	2.9	1.4	1.1	1.5
Rajasthan	7.8	3.3	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.2	2.3	3.1

(Source: NSSO 55th and 66th Rounds)

5.6 Reasons for Children being Out of School

It becomes important to know reasons behind children being out of school so that problem of non enrolment and dropout should be solved. Table 5.12 explains the reasons of non enrolment as provided by NSSO 64th round. Around 37% of those who have never been to school says that their parents are not interested. However, this is a major reason only in rural areas, whereas in the urban Rajasthan, financial constraints (31%) is the main cause for on enrolment. Parental disinterest is more important factor for rural boys than girls, but the difference in the percentage between rural boys and girls is not much significant, whereas in urban areas, parents are not interested in sending girls to school more than boys (table 5.12 (b)). Education not considered necessary is another major reason and more for girls than boys in both rural and urban areas. Financial constraints is another important reason and as said earlier that this factor is one of the biggest factors in urban areas owing to the high cost of living in urban areas.

Table 5.12 (a) Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban Rajasthan (2007-08)

Reasons for Non Enrolment	Rural	Urban	Total
parent not interested in studies	38.9	21.7	37.3
education not considered necessary	21.8	23.2	22.0
No tradition in the community	12.7	9.5	12.4
financial constraints	8.2	31.0	10.4
school is far off	2.3	1.2	2.2
to look after younger siblings	2.1	2.7	2.1
to attend other domestic chores	0.8	2.4	0.9
inadequate number of teachers	1.0	0.0	0.9
for participating in other economic activities	0.9	0.0	0.9
for helping in household enterprises	0.4	0.0	0.3
to work for wage/salary	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	10.4	8.3	10.2

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

Though, there is no significant gap between girls and boys as far as financial constraints are concerned. No tradition in family comes out to next factor and more importantly for rural girls and urban boys. Rural and urban girls are loaded with the responsibility of looking after younger siblings and this is why girls have reported this reason more than boys.

Table 5.12 (b) Reasons for Non enrolment in age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban Rajasthan(2007-08)

Non Enrolment	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
parent not interested in studies	40.0	38.4	38.9	16.2	26.4	21.7
inadequate number of teachers	1.0	1.0	21.8	0.0	0.0	23.2
school is far off	2.3	2.3	12.7	0.0	2.2	9.5
to work for wage/salary	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	31.0
for participating in other economic activities	0.4	1.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.2
to look after younger siblings	1.8	2.2	2.1	0.0	5.1	2.7
to attend other domestic chores	2.4	0.0	0.8	3.8	1.2	2.4
financial constraints	7.6	8.5	1.0	31.4	30.8	0.0
for helping in household enterprises	1.1	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
No tradition in the community	5.5	16.1	0.4	14.9	4.9	0.0
education not considered necessary	17.5	23.9	0.0	19.0	26.8	0.0
others	19.2	6.2	10.4	14.8	2.8	8.3

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

Reasons of Dropout

Disinterest of child comes out to be the major cause of dropout and particularly for rural areas than urban areas (tables 5.13(a) and table 5.13(b)). Around 40% of rural boys and 33.6% of rural girls dropout because of disinterest in studies, whereas 19.5% urban boys and 21.2% urban girls dropout due to lack of interest in studies. Financial constraints are one of the biggest factors of dropout in urban areas, 50% of the urban boys and 34.8% of urban girl's dropout because of the financial constraints. Parents not interested in the studies is another important reason especially for rural girls. But this was not a reason for dropout for urban boys as the parental disinterest is zero percent for them. Added to this only 3.2% parents showed no interest in the education of an urban girls. Unable to cope in studies and unfriendly atmosphere at school are important causes for the dropout

among urban boys. Completion of the desired level of education as a cause of discontinuous holds importance in urban areas, and 9.5% urban boys and 14.1% urban girls discontinue because they have completed the desired level of education. Participation in economic activities of livelihood are important reason of dropout for boys and girls for rural as well as urban areas.

After having discussions on reasons of non enrolment and dropout it is clear

Table 5.13(a) Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years in rural and urban India (2007-08)

Reasons for Dropout	Rural	Urban	Total
child not interested in studies	36.0	20.1	33.2
financial constraints	12.6	45.1	18.2
parent not interested in studies	14.0	1.0	11.7
for participating in other economic activities	9.2	2.5	8.1
to attend other domestic chores	6.5	1.7	5.7
unable to cope up or failure in studies	3.9	8.6	4.7
to work for wage/salary	3.5	2.0	3.2
completed desired level/class	0.8	11.0	2.6
unfriendly atmosphere at school	1.7	6.4	2.5
for helping in household enterprises	2.5	0.0	2.0
to look after younger siblings	1.7	0.0	1.4
school is far off	1.6	0.0	1.3
inadequate number of teachers	1.0	0.0	0.8
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.0	0.0	0.0
Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.0	0.0	0.0
non-availability of lady teacher	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	5.1	1.6	4.5

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

Table 5.13(b) Reasons for Dropout in age group 6 to 13 years among boys and girls in rural and urban India (2007-08)

	Rural			Urban		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
child not interested in studies	40.4	33.6	36.0	19.5	21.2	20.1
completed desired level/class	0.0	1.3	0.8	9.5	14.1	11.0
financial constraints	13.6	12.0	12.6	50.0	34.8	45.1
for helping in household enterprises	1.2	3.2	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
for participating in other economic activities	5.0	11.5	9.2	3.8	0.0	2.5
inadequate number of teachers	2.8	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Language/medium of instruction used unfamiliar	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
non-availability of lady teacher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
others	8.8	3.1	5.1	0.0	4.9	1.6
parent not interested in studies	4.9	19.0	14.0	0.0	3.2	1.0
school is far off	1.7	1.5	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
timings of educational institution not suitable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
to attend other domestic chores	3.4	8.2	6.5	0.0	5.4	1.7
to look after younger siblings	0.0	2.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
to work for wage/salary	6.7	1.7	3.5	0.0	6.1	2.0
unable to cope up or failure in studies	9.2	1.0	3.9	7.7	10.3	8.6
unfriendly atmosphere at school	2.2	1.4	1.7	9.5	0.0	6.4

(Source: NSSO 64th Round)

that financial constraints are major cause that keep children out of school in urban regions. Though, government schools are said to provide free education but it is only the fee in government schools that the parents are not supposed to pay. There are other things that are required for a child to go to school such as textbooks, uniforms, other stationary items etc. Economically poor families cannot afford basic needs and that too for many children in a family and the cost of living is also higher in urban areas and therefore, expenditure on such items increases the burden more in urban areas as compared to rural areas. That's the reason why financial

constraints are reported to be major cause of non enrolment and dropout in urban areas.

Indirect cost of education is another factor. Child labour required in the support of earnings of family is a form of indirect cost. Reasons of dropout and non enrolment like participation in other economic activities, 'to look after younger siblings', 'attend other domestic chores' and 'helping in household enterprises' denote that labour of child is utilized in the family. Though, child labour is not in the form of regular salaried job but informal child labour is required in the economically poor families. It is difficult to address this problem but it is important that the indirect cost of education in the form of child labour should be given appropriate attention.

There exists gender bias in the motivation of education of child. This is because reasons for non enrolment like 'parents not interested in studies', 'no tradition in the family' and 'education not considered necessary' have higher weightage for girls than boys. On the same lines causes of discontinuation of children education are like 'parents not interested in studies' and 'completed desired level of education' hold more important for girls.

'Parents not interested in studies' comes out to be an important cause in rural areas for non enrolment. Similarly, 'child not interested in studies' is a significant factor of discontinuation in rural areas. Both of these factors are inter-related. Parents send their children to school but when they find that learning of child is not improved and the child is also not showing any interest in studies, this discourages parents towards the education of children. Though, the quality of education in schools has not been the reason of dropout, but disinterest of children towards studies proves the fact that the quality of education and required infrastructural

facilities are not up to the mark. Poor quality infrastructural facilities of school is also reflected in the reasons such as 'unfriendly atmosphere at school' and child 'unable to cope up the studies'. Therefore there is a need to upgrade the quality of schools in state. Next section deals with the quality of education in the state of Rajasthan.

5.8 Supply Side of Elementary Education

As discussed in chapter 4 that the school are the main providers of quality in education system. Present discussion focus on the quality of education in the state of Rajasthan and role of Sarv Siksha Abhiyan in influencing the quality of schools. The same indicators that were chosen for India are selected for Rajasthan to cover two aspects of quality, i.e., a) the availability of school /Physical infrastructure and b) school teachers.

5.8.1 Number of Schools Per Thousand Population

This indicator tells about the availability of schools per thousand population of the school going age. For the present study 7 to 14 years of age group has been taken and number of elementary schools are taken into consideration. For the year 2001 census data of 2001 for the age group 7 to 14 is used and for 2011 estimated population has been worked out using percentage share of 7 to 14 age group in 2001.

Table 5.14 reveals that from 2001 to 2011 availability of upper primary schools have increased. But the availability of primary schools and overall elementary schools have decreased. Though, the decrease is not much significant except for Rajsamand, Tonk and Baran. It is important to note that the districts in.

Table 5.14 Districtwise number of schools per thousand population in rural and urban Rajasthan

	2001			2011		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Ganganagar	11.7	9.7	11.0	11.3	12.1	11.6
Hanumangarh	10.2	11.5	10.7	8.8	12.7	10.2
Bikaner	9.8	8.5	9.4	9.1	8.9	9.0
Churu	7.6	8.8	8.0	8.5	11.7	9.6
Jhunjhunun	11.3	12.1	11.6	10.3	13.0	11.3
Alwar	10.9	11.3	11.1	9.5	12.4	10.5
Bharatpur	10.1	10.6	10.3	8.7	10.8	9.4
Dhaulpur	10.7	8.5	9.9	9.7	10.4	9.9
Karauli	11.2	8.3	10.1	10.0	10.1	10.0
Sawai Madhopur	11.8	9.6	11.0	10.2	10.9	10.4
Dausa	11.3	10.5	11.0	10.1	12.2	10.8
Jaipur	8.1	8.7	8.3	7.9	10.3	8.8
Sikar	11.5	11.6	11.5	9.7	12.3	10.6
Nagaur	11.0	9.6	10.5	9.9	11.6	10.5
Jodhpur	10.2	7.0	9.1	8.9	8.0	8.6
Jaisalmer	18.9	9.2	15.6	16.2	12.4	14.9
Barmer	17.2	6.7	13.6	14.9	10.7	13.5
Jalor	11.0	6.8	9.5	10.3	9.4	10.0
Sirohi	10.9	7.1	9.6	9.0	8.7	8.9
Pali	10.3	9.2	9.9	10.0	12.5	10.9
Ajmer	9.2	8.5	9.0	8.7	10.2	9.3
Tonk	12.6	9.9	11.7	2.2	0.2	0.5
Bundi	13.8	9.8	12.3	12.9	11.4	12.4
Bhilwara	14.4	10.0	12.9	12.5	11.7	12.2
Rajsamand	15.8	10.8	14.1	14.1	13.5	13.9
Dungarpur	32.8	20.1	28.5	12.0	9.4	11.1
Banswara	12.6	6.3	10.4	14.9	10.0	13.3
Chittaurgarh	16.0	6.9	12.8	13.7	8.4	11.9
Kota	16.4	11.1	14.5	13.2	13.3	13.2
Baran	15.4	14.8	15.2	8.2	9.9	8.8
Jhalawar	11.3	10.3	10.9	12.2	11.5	12.0
Udaipur	5.9	5.1	5.6	11.8	12.6	12.1

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11 and Census of India 2001 – c Series, Census of India 2011 Provisional Population Totals: Rajasthan)

which the number of single teacher schools, single classroom schools and higher ratio of primary to upper primary is found, has higher availability of schools. These districts include Jaisalmer and Barmer. On the other hand, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Ajmer have lower availability of schools per thousand population. This could be because Jaipur, Jodhpur, Ajmer are class 1 cities, therefore, the population would be high in these districts, whereas Jaisalmer and Barmer have less population, therefore, availability of schools is high

5.8.2 Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary

This ratio suggests availability of upper primary schools on primary schools. Greater the ratio lesser would be the upper primary school available and greater would be burden on upper primary schools. Usually a primary school is available in village but upper primary schools are not available in same village or locality, therefore, children especially girls dropout because of the unavailability of upper primary school. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan aimed to improve availability of upper primary schools. From table 5.15 it can be said that availability of upper primary schools has increased over the period of time. In 2006-07, there were nine districts which had the value of ratio lesser than 2, and this number increased to approximately 20 in the year 2010-11. Highest value was reported for Chittaurgarh, where on 3.11 primary schools there was one upper primary school. Highest value has come down from 4.85 in Barmer for 2006-07 to 3.11 for Chittaurgarh in 2010-11. This shows that there has been an improvement in the availability of upper primary schools in the state. Secondly, southern and western districts such as Dungarpur, Banswara, Chittaurgarh, Jaisalmer and Barmer continue to have high values of ratio in both the year, but definitely with a signs of positive change.

Table 5.15 Districtwise Ratio of Primary schools to Upper Primary schools in Rajasthan

	2006-07	2010-11
Ganganagar	2.11	1.62
Hanumangarh	1.57	1.23
Bikaner	2.16	1.90
Churu	1.60	1.34
Jhunjhunun	1.58	1.33
Alwar	1.77	1.41
Bharatpur	1.72	1.45
Dhaulpur	2.30	1.70
Karauli	2.49	1.84
Sawai Madhopur	2.17	1.66
Dausa	2.08	1.61
Jaipur	1.73	1.42
Sikar	1.76	1.41
Nagaur	2.16	1.63
Jodhpur	2.70	2.03
Jaisalmer	3.98	2.54
Barmer	4.85	2.61
Jalor	2.93	1.98
Sirohi	2.98	2.00
Pali	2.00	1.43
Ajmer	1.92	1.51
Tonk	2.33	1.71
Bundi	2.46	1.99
Bhilwara	2.77	2.06
Rajsamand	2.86	2.04
Dungarpur	3.18	2.44
Banswara	3.83	2.90
Chittaurgarh	4.36	3.11
Kota	2.47	1.85
Baran	1.81	1.39
Jhalawar	2.04	1.84
Udaipur	2.25	1.73

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

5.8.3 Single Classroom Schools

Single classroom schools is another indicator that tells about the shortage of infrastructural facilities, prevailing in the system. It is obvious that more than one class cannot be taught in a single room as it leads to disturbance and confusion, which demotivates both teacher as well as students. For the teaching and learning environment it is important that schools should have appropriate number of instructional rooms.

Table 5.16 shows the percentage of single classroom schools of primary, upper primary and all elementary schools. Like single teacher schools, in single classrooms too the percentage of primary schools with single classroom is higher in number, therefore, present study focus on single classroom primary schools. There has been a decline in single classroom primary schools in most of the districts except a few such as Jhalawar, Chittaurgarh, Bhilwara and Jalore where the number of single classroom schools have been increased. Ajmer, Rajsamand, Jalore, Pali had less than 2% single classroom schools in 2006-07, in this group ten more districts were added in 2010-11 with Bikaner having the least number of single classroom school. Udaipur, Barmer and Jodhpur districts have done significant improvement, as there have been significant reduction in percentage of such schools. Jhalawar and Bhilwara districts of south-eastern region had the highest single classroom schools in year 2010-11, as said earlier that for Jhalawar as well for Bhilwara there has been an increase in percentage of such schools, therefore, it should be noted that SSA has increased number of schools in all the districts but merely increasing number of schools would not help, schools should.

Table 5.16 Districtwise percentage distribution of single classroom schools in Rajasthan

	2006-07			2010-11		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Ganganagar	5.7	0.5	4.1	2.4	0.6	1.7
Hanumangarh	2.4	0.1	1.5	1.7	0.5	1.2
Bikaner	2.1	0.1	1.5	0.9	0.4	0.7
Churu	2.4	0.4	1.7	2.5	0.4	1.6
Jhunjhunun	2.6	0.1	1.6	1.3	0.3	0.9
Alwar	2.4	0.4	1.7	1.9	0.3	1.2
Bharatpur	2.9	0.6	2.1	3.8	0.8	2.6
Dhaulpur	4.2	1.0	3.3	3.2	1.4	2.5
Karauli	4.1	0.7	3.1	3.0	0.7	2.2
Sawai Madhopur	3.1	0.6	2.3	2.5	1.0	1.9
Dausa	3.8	0.3	2.7	1.7	0.3	1.2
Jaipur	2.5	0.3	1.7	1.0	0.2	0.7
Sikar	3.1	1.2	2.4	1.8	0.5	1.3
Nagaur	5.9	0.9	4.4	2.7	0.4	1.9
Jodhpur	9.0	0.5	6.8	3.6	0.5	2.6
Jaisalmer	8.2	0.8	6.7	4.5	0.2	3.3
Barmer	7.9	1.0	6.7	2.3	0.5	1.8
Jalor	1.4	0.5	1.1	1.6	0.3	1.2
Sirohi	3.8	0.2	2.9	1.7	0.3	1.2
Pali	1.7	0.3	1.3	1.5	0.4	1.1
Ajmer	1.3	0.4	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.7
Tonk	6.6	1.0	4.9	3.6	0.7	2.5
Bundi	6.1	0.5	4.6	2.9	0.9	2.2
Bhilwara	5.4	0.8	4.2	5.5	0.5	3.9
Rajsamand	1.3	0.1	1.0	1.2	0.7	1.0
Dungarpur	8.0	0.3	6.5	2.8	0.7	2.2
Banswara	6.3	1.0	5.3	2.5	0.3	1.9
Chittaurgarh	3.0	0.7	2.4	4.5	0.8	3.6
Kota	5.6	0.2	3.7	1.6	0.3	1.2
Baran	7.5	1.1	5.6	2.5	0.2	1.6
Jhalawar	3.5	0.4	2.5	11.4	1.3	7.9
Udaipur	9.6	0.5	7.5	1.3	0.1	0.8

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

have proper facilities so that children are not demotivated and they do not dropout from school

Table 5.17 Districtwise Pupil Teacher Ratio in Rajasthan

	2006-07	2010-11
Ganganagar	29.6	23.2
Hanumangarh	29.4	21.8
Bikaner	33.7	28.0
Churu	34.0	28.1
Jhunjhunun	31.8	21.2
Alwar	30.5	25.2
Bharatpur	30.6	26.4
Dhaulpur	37.1	36.9
Karauli	46.2	33.2
Sawai Madhopur	32.3	23.7
Dausa	33.4	28.6
Jaipur	29.5	24.0
Sikar	33.4	22.2
Nagaur	32.0	26.8
Jodhpur	33.2	30.1
Jaisalmer	32.6	28.2
Barmer	39.8	33.9
Jalor	41.3	32.6
Sirohi	36.7	30.0
Pali	31.4	26.6
Ajmer	27.9	27.1
Tonk	29.3	17.8
Bundi	28.7	22.7
Bhilwara	29.3	25.8
Rajsamand	30.4	26.2
Dungarpur	28.0	26.5
Banswara	31.9	26.8
Chittaurgarh	25.8	25.7
Kota	24.6	23.2
Baran	28.1	21.5
Jhalawar	30.1	24.4
Udaipur	29.8	26.5

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

5.8.4 Pupil Teacher Ratio

Pupil teacher ratio tells about the availability of the teachers. Higher the ratio, higher would be the load on a teacher. As per the norm of government there would be a teacher on 35 children, but in practice usually the ratio exceeds 35. More the number of children a teacher handles less would be the time and attention given to each student. Therefore, for a better learning environment in a school, pupil-teacher ratio should be rational, or not more than 40 as it directly affects the effective time given to a child.

Pupil teacher ratio over the period of time has shown a positive shift in Rajasthan after the launch of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan in the state (table5.17). For most of the districts pupil teacher ratio has decreased except for few. In the year 2006-07, with the value 24.6 Kota had the lowest pupil teacher ratio. Twelve districts in Rajasthan had pupil teacher ratio lesser than 30, these districts are from north eastern, southern and south eastern region of the state, whereas the western region of Rajasthan has none of the districts having pupil teacher ratio below 30, infact the district of Jalore and Barmer had highest pupil teacher ratio values among all districts in state. Some of the districts of north eastern region of state such as Karauli and Dhaulpur also had high pupil teacher ratio.

After the launch of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, pupil teacher ratio has decreased for most of the districts and infact as many as ten districts including two from western region has Pupil Teacher Ratio below 25. Tonk had the lowest PTR with a value of 17.8. Most of the district having pupil teacher ratio below 25 are from north-eastern and south-eastern region of Rajasthan. In the year 2006-07, the districts that had pupil teacher ratio below 30 are the same that had pupil teacher.

Table 5.18 Percentage distribution of Single Teacher Schools in Rajasthan

	2006-07			2010-11		
	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary	Primary	Upper Primary	Elementary
Ganganagar	26.83	1.14	18.70	17.84	1.46	11.59
Hanumangarh	17.18	0.80	10.88	5.30	1.15	3.44
Bikaner	28.64	0.37	20.27	23.72	1.02	15.90
Churu	14.45	1.07	9.47	11.74	3.10	8.04
Jhunjhunun	10.57	0.31	6.70	4.70	0.75	3.01
Alwar	14.95	0.38	9.77	8.50	0.83	5.32
Bharatpur	11.36	0.77	7.54	5.90	0.55	3.71
Dhaulpur	26.16	0.43	18.50	16.34	1.57	10.88
Karauli	40.09	22.83	35.20	14.86	4.35	11.16
Sawai Madhopur	26.05	6.07	19.81	6.45	1.14	4.46
Dausa	19.11	0.47	13.20	9.65	1.33	6.46
Jaipur	18.13	0.15	11.78	6.85	0.80	4.36
Sikar	19.83	2.91	13.89	8.69	1.11	5.55
Nagaur	23.09	1.63	16.50	14.69	1.62	9.72
Jodhpur	34.00	1.14	25.43	23.49	2.89	16.69
Jaisalmer	57.80	4.88	46.94	46.64	4.65	34.76
Barmer	57.66	3.68	48.38	41.60	6.64	31.93
Jalor	35.67	2.28	27.32	23.59	2.19	16.40
Sirohi	31.82	1.15	24.31	12.95	0.48	8.78
Pali	20.22	0.74	13.89	12.03	2.30	8.02
Ajmer	13.49	1.03	9.30	6.86	1.02	4.54
Tonk	22.57	1.10	16.28	5.09	0.29	3.32
Bundi	30.48	1.22	22.26	21.57	0.93	14.66
Bhilwara	31.29	2.07	23.67	20.98	2.17	14.83
Rajsamand	39.94	1.52	30.31	23.25	2.12	16.30
Dungarpur	31.40	0.59	25.14	24.60	2.51	18.18
Banswara	37.84	0.73	31.01	17.79	0.43	13.34
Chittaurgarh	28.52	4.29	21.74	16.61	0.84	12.77
Kota	17.48	0.24	11.41	17.79	2.17	12.31
Baran	27.70	1.95	19.90	4.75	0.62	3.03
Jhalawar	32.00	2.48	23.09	20.84	1.08	13.89
Udaipur	36.47	2.36	28.60	14.82	1.12	9.80

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

ratio value below 25 in 2010-11. Districts of western region and a few of north eastern region had higher values, and these are the ones that had greater values in 2006-07

5.8.5 Single Teacher Schools

Probe report tells that government has abolished single teacher schools. However, in the state of Rajasthan, it was found that single teachers still exist. Pupil teacher ratio provides information about the average number of teachers available per student in a district but single teacher schools present us shortage of teachers¹ in schools.

Learning environment of school gets adversely affected if number of teachers is not sufficient. In single teacher schools, a teacher has to handle pupils of different classes, has to teach them and is burdened with non teaching assignments. Probe Report states that out of the 53 single teacher schools surveyed by Probe Team, 30 such schools had no teaching activity.

Table 5.18 gives percentage of single teacher schools in primary, upper primary schools and in total elementary schools. Primary schools have greater number of single teacher schools. Therefore, for present study primary schools are taken into consideration. The percentage of single teacher primary schools have decreased from 2006-07 to 2010-11 in all districts of Rajasthan. This is a positive impact of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. But as the state already had high percentage of single teacher schools, therefore, in 2010-11, the percentage of single teacher schools is quite high, but there are variations within districts. North eastern and south eastern regions have less number of single teacher schools as compared to

¹PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press

western and southern regions. Though there has been positive change but the pattern remains almost the same. Sarv Siksha Abhiyan has been working more than seven years but still percentage of single teacher schools in Barmer and Jaisalmer is more than 40 percent. This is a matter of concern and infrastructural facilities should be improved in these districts.

5.8.6 Girls Toilet Facility

It is important to have girls toilet facility, because it ensures not only girls enrolment but also availability of female teacher which again supports girls enrolment. Probe Report says that many parents do not send their daughter to school, especially after her puberty because of the lack of toilet facility. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan aimed to improve infrastructural facilities in schools and its impact can be in Rajasthan. Till 2006-07 most of the districts lacked girls toilet facility in schools (Table 5.19). Only districts like Ganganagar, Churu and Hanumangarh had this facility in 60% and above 60% in schools. In 2010-11 most of the districts had girls toilet facility in schools and that too above 90 percent. Chittaurgarh, Jalore, Jhalawar, Jaisalmer, Karauli, Bundi, Rajsamand and Pali had less than 90% schools with separate toilet facility, however none of the districts had percentages below 80 percent This is a big achievement for state, now it is required that the facility is utilized. While interaction with one of the principal of DIET, it was found that though many schools had toilet facility for girls but either toilets do not have water facility, or there is no one to clean toilets which again reduces its utility. Therefore, the need of the hour is to maintain and increase the utility of the facility which demands efforts from teachers, parents and the whole community.

Table 5.19 Percentage of elementary schools with Girls Toilet Facility in Rajasthan

	2006-07	2010-11
Ganganagar	60.0	96.1
Hanumangarh	75.1	98.4
Bikaner	53.0	97.3
Churu	60.8	96.1
Jhunjhunun	58.3	95.2
Alwar	43.6	94.4
Bharatpur	38.0	94.1
Dhaulpur	49.2	95.6
Karauli	34.3	88.0
Sawai Madhopur	40.6	95.7
Dausa	53.7	96.9
Jaipur	44.3	94.8
Sikar	49.8	97.8
Nagaur	50.4	90.6
Jodhpur	32.9	95.8
Jaisalmer	41.8	87.5
Barmer	20.1	93.0
Jalor	29.5	84.3
Sirohi	40.7	91.6
Pali	40.9	89.9
Ajmer	54.3	98.4
Tonk	38.2	91.1
Bundi	34.8	89.4
Bhilwara	24.3	96.6
Rajsamand	31.6	89.6
Dungarpur	37.6	92.1
Banswara	28.7	90.1
Chittaurgarh	37.3	83.8
Kota	50.6	93.9
Baran	33.4	99.8
Jhalawar	33.8	84.5
Udaipur	22.0	97.9

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

5.8.7 Drinking Water Facility

Schools should have atleast drinking water facility and toilet facility so that child does not go back home to either drink water or to relieve himself/herself. Once a child goes back to home from school it is less likely that the child will return back to school. Therefore a school should have these basic facilities so that the child stay is ensured in school.

Table 5.20 shows that the drinking water facility in schools have increased from 2006-07 to 2010-11. Till 2006-07 eight districts of western, southern and two from north eastern Rajasthan had less than 80% schools with drinking water facility. Barmer had less than 50% schools with this facility, but in 2010-11 drinking water facility has increased in all districts and only two districts i.e. Karauli and Bharatpur of north-eastern Rajasthan had less than 90% schools with drinking water facility.

As far as potable water facility and toilet facility are concerned, state government has shown significant improvements, now it is a collective responsibility of teachers, parents and community to maintain and properly utilize these facilities for better environment of schools for sound future of education in the state.

Table 5.20 Percentage of elementary schools with drinking water facility in Rajasthan

	2006-07	2010-11
Ganganagar	87.8	97.9
Hanumangarh	94.8	99.0
Bikaner	82.3	99.0
Churu	94.5	99.0
Jhunjhunun	93.7	97.0
Alwar	82.8	92.3
Bharatpur	80.1	88.3
Dhaulpur	88.4	95.1
Karauli	69.4	80.8
Sawai Madhopur	78.3	94.5
Dausa	87.3	96.9
Jaipur	84.8	98.9
Sikar	93.1	99.6
Nagaur	86.1	98.2
Jodhpur	83.8	98.3
Jaisalmer	74.5	93.9
Barmer	49.4	96.6
Jalor	77.0	92.7
Sirohi	85.6	97.9
Pali	85.2	96.3
Ajmer	88.6	99.7
Tonk	83.6	93.0
Bundi	83.6	96.0
Bhilwara	77.9	99.7
Rajsamand	83.1	96.5
Dungarpur	85.5	92.5
Banswara	78.6	92.6
Chittaurgarh	88.2	95.4
Kota	91.4	96.7
Baran	81.3	99.7
Jhalawar	78.3	91.1
Udaipur	81.6	94.2

(Source: District Report Cards 2006-07 and 2010-11)

Coefficient of Correlation

To know the role of the above quality indicators in influencing the enrolment, coefficient of correlation was worked out. Net enrolment ratio was taken as a dependent variable and the quality indicators were independent variable. Following results were obtained (table 5.19)- for the year 2006-07 there was a negative relationship of 99% confidence level between net enrolment ratio and ratio of primary schools to upper primary schools, however, over the period of 5 years it has become positive but is not significant. This means that in 2006-07 higher the ratio i.e., lower the availability of upper primary schools lower would be enrolment though with time it has turned out to be positive but relationship is not significant.

Percentage of

Table 5.21 Coefficient of Correlation (Karl Pearson)

Independent Variables	2006-07	2010-11
No. of Schools Per 1000 Population	0.191	-0.087
Ratio of Primary Schools to Upper Primary Schools	-.469**	0.016
Percentage of Single Classroom Schools	-0.218	0.262
Pupil Teacher Ratio	0.012	0.298
Percentage of Single Teacher Schools	-.378*	-0.162
Percentage of Schools with Drinking Water Facility	.365*	-.486**
Percentage of Schools with Girls Toilet Facility	0.226	-0.196
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		

Dependent Variable taken is Net Attendance Ratio

single teacher schools also had negative relation with net enrolment ratio of 95% significance level in 2006-07. The relation remains negative but it is not significant. This implies that in 2006-07 the more the number of single teacher schools the less

would be enrolment. In 2010-11 only drinking water facility showed significant relationship of 99% confidence level but again it has negative relation with net enrolment ratio meaning that with increasing supply of drinking water the enrolment has decreased.

5.9 Conclusion

Rajasthan is one of the educationally backward state in India. The state has lower enrolment and higher dropout rates in the country. With the introduction of Sarv Siksha Abhiyan there has been improvement in the enrolment but there is not much significant decrease in dropout rate and also there are inter district variation in enrolment and dropout. The districts of north eastern and south eastern Rajasthan have better performance in terms of attendance than districts of western and southern Rajasthan. Added to this Sarv Siksha Abhiyan has been successful in reducing the gaps between boys and girls, scheduled population and non scheduled population, rural and urban and between different regions but still girls, scheduled population, rural areas and backward regions in the state continue to have low performance.

There has been improvement in terms of infrastructural facilities in Rajasthan. However, some of the districts of western and southern region of Rajasthan continues to lag behind in terms of facilities. Sarv Siksha Abiyan has made improvement in these districts but still a lot of efforts need to be done in these areas in upgrading the facilities to the satisfactory level.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Present research work looked at the achievements and failures of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan. Like other programmes Sarva Siksha Abhiyan aimed at universalizing enrolment and retention. Changes in the enrolment, non enrolment ,dropout and supply side variables was examined. Along with change in supply side variables their effect on enrolment was also worked out. Reasons of non enrolment and dropout was also analysed. The attendance worked out by using NSSO data for 1999-2000 and 2009-10 clearly shows that in India at state level and Rajasthan at district level there has been improvement in attendance of children of 6 to 13 years of age. But the success of Abhiyan is not same for all and varies for different states, regions, gender, social groups etc. Those states that were educationally forward before the launch of Sarva Siksha such as Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Tamil Nadu etc. repeated the same success story after the Abhiyan came into effect. On the other side educationally backward states such as Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan continues to perform below the average in the country. Though there has been improvement in attendance in these states but it is still far away from cent percent attendance rate. Rural areas lag behind urban areas in terms of attendance. Boys have better enrolment than girls. If the factor of region and gender is added then a rural girls have lesser enrolment as compared to urban boys. Among different social groups scheduled population especially schedule tribe had lower enrolment than non scheduled.

Sarva Siksha Abhiyan to some extent was successful in bringing children to school but it's objective of universal retention is still a distant dream. Out of school children has declined after the Abhiyan came into effect. There has been significant fall in never enrolled children in the age group 6 to 13 but over the period of ten years the dropout rates continues to be more or less the same. Therefore on one side children are entering into the education system but on the other side they are dropping out of the system. To have benefits of school education a child must have survival for a considerable period of

time. Out of school children too varies with different states, regions, gender, and social groups. Children who have never enrolled and those who have dropped out are higher in educationally backward states and rural regions. Girls once again are more out of school as compared to boys. Among social groups it is schedule tribe that have higher dropouts and non enrolment followed by schedule castes. Non scheduled continue to have less out of school children. Even in educationally backward states non scheduled have better enrolment and lesser out of school children. Over the period of ten years the gaps in enrolment, dropout and non enrolment among different regions, social groups, gender have been reducing which is a positive outcome of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan but the pace at which changes are taking place is slow.

To achieve the objective of universal enrolment and retention it is necessary to know probable hurdles that are coming in the path. The most commonly given reasons that are responsible for non enrolment and dropout is that parents are not interested in studies, child labour etc. It is a common notion that education in government school is free and easily available but it is the fault of parents that they don't send their children to school. Labour of child is used to earn money and the child is not free to pursue his/her studies. Probe report says that all these assumptions are myth only. The field work of Probe says that parents know about the importance of education and want their children to get educated. Present work analyzed the reasons of dropout and non enrolment given in the 64th round of NSSO. It was observed that the major reason of dropout is disinterest of child towards studies. Parents, too get demotivated when they don't see any progress in child. This discouragement influences other children in family.

Another major reason is the financial constraints and it is a major reason in urban areas. Parents invests two type of cost in child i.e., direct as well as indirect cost. Direct cost are the cost of uniforms, textbooks, stationary items etc. and the indirect costs are the time and effort that parents invest in child for preparing him/her to go school. This time could have been used in other productive (income earning) work.

If child labour would have been the problem then percentage of children reporting reason of out of school working for a salaried job would have been higher. But the data findings from 64th NSSO round suggest that not more than 3 percent of the children dropout or

never enroll because they go for regular salaried job. It is said that children of elementary school going age are not physically able contribute their labour. Most of the child labour is informal in nature and is required in family only. Though there need to have further research on the issue of informal child labour.

The disinterest of child towards studies and financial constraints as a major reason of children being out of school reveals that parents are interested in educating their child but when they don't see their efforts being rewarded appropriately they pull out their children from education system. There is a demand of quality education from parents and children which needs to be properly addressed.

Sarv Siksha Abhiyan aimed to provide elementary education of appropriate quality. Therefore government planned to address the issue of quality but has Sarv Siksha Abhiyan been successful in improving the quality of education? Quality of education system comprises of schools as well as teachers. If the schools supplied in appropriate quantity, with proper facilities like drinking water, toilet facilities and have sufficient number of teachers then it stimulates learning. It was found that eight to nine years have been passed after the Abhiyan came into effect in country but still in many parts of country single teacher teacher schools and single classroom schools exists in large number. Though the programme have been successful in upgrading the facilities such as drinking water and toilets in schools but the major factors that influence the quality of education such as teachers and schools have still not being properly being addressed. The condition of educationally backward states in terms of availability of schools and teachers is more dismal and with time there has been improvement but the process of change has been very slow.

Case study of Rajasthan also had similar results. The pattern of enrolment and out of school children over the period of ten years after the launch of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan has not changed and the regions that performed well or worse continues to perform the same , though there has been improvement in enrolment but the dropout rates continues to remain high. In general girls, rural areas and scheduled population lag behind when compared to boys, urban areas and non scheduled population respectively. Role of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in improving the supply side variables has been positive but here again

those districts that earlier had better or worse supply have not changed, though there has been improvement.

On a whole Sarva Siksha Abhiyan to some extent was able to improve enrolment, decrease non enrolment and dropout. Though, the decline in dropout rates is not much significant. The success of Abhiyan is not same for all and there are gaps. Those states/UT's that performed well before the launch of Sarva Siksha Abhiyan continue to perform at the same level whereas those states/UT's whose performance was unsatisfactory continue to lag behind the others. Similar is the case with rural areas, girls, and scheduled population, all of them performed below the expected level. However, the gap between regions, gender and different social groups has declined after Sarva Siksha Abhiyan came into effect. In terms of quality the Abhiyan has been improved the facilities in schools but here again, in the backward areas the change has been slow. Some of the important quality parameters like schools and teachers still not supplied in the appropriate quantity. Similar results were obtained for Rajasthan at district level.

Following are the suggestions to improve the state of elementary education in the country-

- a) Some of the regions that lag behind others should be given special attention from the government. Girls and scheduled population should also be given special attention.
- b) Region specific policies should be made. Though Sarva Siksha Abhiyan talks about the decentralization of policies but this is little in practice. Policies that are framed from top often ignore the region specific problems.
- c) There is need for upgrading the facilities in backward areas and these facilities should be used properly.
- d) To improve quality of teaching, teachers should be made accountable not only to the seniors but also to the parents.
- e) Collective efforts should be made by parents, teachers and to the other members of the community to improve the state of elementary education in the country. The best example of success of collective effort can be seen in the state of Himachal Pradesh.
- f) Common schooling system should be encouraged as it would remove the hierarchies existing in the system of Education.

g) Schools should give incentive such as free text-books, other stationary item so that parents send their children to school without incurring any direct cost.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Acharya, Sarthi (1996): "Access and Returns to Education: Analysis for Maharashtra", *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol X(4).
2. Aggarwal, Yash (2001), "Quality Concerns in Primary Education in India: Where is the Problem?" NIEPA, New Delhi.
--), "Access and Retention under DPEP: A National Overview" NIEPA, New Delhi.
3. Alexander, Robin (2008), "Education for All, The Quality Imperative and the Problem of Pedagogy" *Creative Pathways to Access Research Monograph No. 20*.
4. Bhatta, Kiran (1998): "Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 28 (Jul. 11-17, 1998), pp. 1858-1869.
5. Chanana, Karuna (1993), "Accessing higher education: the dilemma of schooling women, minorities, Scheduled Castes and scheduled Tribes in contemporary India" *Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Perspectives on Higher Education in India (Jul.,1003), pp.69-92.
6. Chanana, Karuna (2000), "Treading the Hallowed Halls: Women in Higher Education in India" *Economic and Political Weekly* March 18: 1012?1022.
7. Choudhary, Amit (2006), "Revisiting Dropouts Old Issues, Fresh Perspectives" *Economic and Political Weekly* Dec 23:5257?5263.
8. Chugh,S (), "Data Needs for Achieving UEE in Urban Areas: focus on Disadvantaged Group"
9. Das, Amarendra (2007), "How Far Have We Come in Sarv Siksha Abhiyan?" *Economic and Political Weekly* Jan 6:21?23.
10. Desai, Uday (1991): "Determinants of Educational Performance in India: Role of Home and Family", *International Review of Education* Vol. 37, No. 2 (1991): 245?265.
11. Dholakia, R.H. and Shreekanth Iyengar (2008): "Access of Poor Households to Primary Education in Rural India", *Journal Of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol XXII(3): 255?271.
12. Dreze, J. and Amartya Sen (1995), "*India Economic Development and Social*

- Opportunity*” Oxford University Press New Delhi.
13. Dreze, J and Aparijita Goyal (2003), “Future of Mid-Day Meals” *Economic and Political Weekly* Nov 1-7:4673-4683
 14. Jayachandran, U. (2007), “How High Are Dropout Rates in India?”, *Economic and Political Weekly* March 17:982-983
 15. Kingdon, Geeta Gandhi (:): “The Progress of School Education in India”, Global Poverty Research Group : 1-37
 16. Kingdon, Geeta Gandhi and Mohd Muzammil, (2001), “A Political Economy of Education in India: I : case study of UP” *Economic and Political Weekly* Aug11-17: 3052-3063
 17. Lloyd, Cynthia B and Others (2000), “Effects of Primary School Quality on School Dropout among Kenyan Girls and Boys”, *Comparative Education Review* May 113-147.
 18. Majumdar, Manabi (2006): “Primary Education: Debating Quality and Quantity”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 4, 2006.
 19. Mukherjee, Dipa (2011), “Reducing Out of School Children in India”, NUEPA
 20. Mythili, N (2001), “Cost-mix for Achieving Higher Quality Schooling”, *Perspectives in Education* July 155-164.
 21. Naik, J.P (1966), “Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission”
-(1975), “*Equality, Quality and Quantity: the Elusive Triangle in Indian Education*” Allied Publishers, Bombay.
 22. Nautiyal, K.C. (1995): “Disparities in Public Expenditure on Primary Education and Their Impact on Equality, Quality and Quantity”, *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration* ,9(4): 361-388. PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press.
 23. Pandey, S (2006), “Para Teacher Scheme and quality Education for all in India: Policy Perspectives and Challenges for School Effectiveness” *Journal of Education for Teaching*.
 24. PROBE Report 1999 published by Oxford University Press.

25. Rao, Nitya (2000), "Education Quality with Quantity" *Economic and Political Weekly* Nov 25:4181?4185.
26. Ramachandran, Vimla (2003), "Backward and Forward Linkages that Strengthen Primary Education" " *Economic and Political Weekly* March 8:959?968.
- (2004), "Is Schooling for the Poor on the Government Agenda?" *Economic and Political Weekly* July 24:3349?3350.
- (2005): "Why School Teachers Are Demotivated and Disheartened", *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 21, 2005: 2141?2144.
- (2006): "Urban Schooling: Mired in Apathy and Prejudice" , *Economic and Political Weekly*, Feb 4, 2006 : 383?384
27. Rao, Nitya (2009): " Structural Constraints in Sarv Siksha Abhiyan Schools" , *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol XLIV(16): 17?20.
28. Sengupta, Atanu and Naibedya Prasun Pal (2010), "Primary Education in India: Delivery and Outcome – A District level analysis based on DISE data" *Journal of Education Planning and Administration* Jan 5?21.
29. Sengupta, Piyali and Jaba Guha (2002), " Enrolment, Dropout and Grade Completion of Girl Children in West Bengal" *Economic and Political Weekly* Aug 27:1621?1635.
- Sengupta,P and Jaba Guha (2004): "Enrolment, Dropout and Grade Completion of Girl Children in West Bengal" *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 27, 2002: 1621?1635.
30. Vaid, Divya (2004): "Gendered Inequality in Educational Transitions", *Economic and Political Weekly* Aug 28:3927?3938.
31. Velaskar, Padma(2005): "Education, Caste, Gender: Dalit Girls' Access to Schooling in Maharashtra", *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol XIX(4): 459?482.

32. Venkatanarayana,M (2009): “School Deprivation in India”, Economic and Political Weekly, XLIV(32): 12?14.

-(2004): “Out-of-School Children: Child Labourers or Educationally Deprived?”, Economic and Political Weekly, September 18, 2004.











































