CHAPTER- IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter is the main focus of the research work and is named as Analysis and interpretation of data.

After collection of data and its tabularization, the data are analyzed. The analysis of data refer to breaking down the complex factors of the tabulated material in terms of simple parts and putting the parts together in arrangement in order to determine inherent facts or meanings. Analysis requires an alert flexible and open minded. Good, barr and scates (1941, p.p.599-601) suggests four helpful modes to get started on analyzing the gathered data.

1. To think in terms of significant tables that the data permit.
2. To examine carefully the statement of the problem and earlier analysis and to study the original record of data.
3. To get away from the data and to think about the problem in layman’s terms, or to actually discuss the problem with others.
4. To attack the data by making various statistical calculation.

The tabularized data are subjected to statistical treatment and the obtained results are examined up to the level of significance. In this light of framed assumptions or hypotheses are tested for either accepted or rejected. The results are discussed keeping in view the inherent facts or factors influencing the obtained results and on the basis of discussion and interpretation of findings the meaningful conclusions are drawn.

In the present research work the data analysis work has been performed in the following manner.
Testing assumption –I

It is assumed that the rate of enrollment in primary schools remain unchanged for the last three years before and after launching DPEP in Tehri Garhwal District.

For studying the rate of enrollment of students in primary schools Net Enrollment Ratio (NER) was determined. It has been described year wise in following table.

**Table 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasons</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year wise increase in enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of out of school students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>84.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>87.23</td>
<td>86.78</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>90.02</td>
<td>89.96</td>
<td>89.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>93.85</td>
<td>94.76</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>98.12</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>99.55</td>
<td>99.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>99.93</td>
<td>99.91</td>
<td>99.92</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>99.95</td>
<td>99.93</td>
<td>99.94</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bar Diagram 4.1 Year Wise Net Enrollment Ratio (N.E.R.) In District Tehri Garhwal
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1999-2000: 99.92
2000-2001: 99.66
2001-2002: 99.76
2002-2003: 98.97
2003-2004: 89.99
2004-2005: 87.00
2005-2006: 84.66
Table 4.1 is showing Net Enrollment Ratio (N.E.R.) from 1997 to the end of DPEP i.e. 2005-06. Data show that in the year of 1997 near about fifteen percent students were out from the school. Same data in case of girls is more than one percent less compared to the boys. Slight rise of 1.5 percent in enrollment takes place in next year, but surprisingly due to unknown reasons, near about three percent rise in N.E.R. takes place in third year which was the base line year of DPEP. After launching DPEP in district Tehri Garhwal enrollment rate increased rapidly and in the first year due to several enrollment drives, in this year four percent increase in enrollment takes place. Although data are showing that rapid increase in enrollment does not continue as to be before and after one year of the launching DPEP in district but it is increasing continuously. It was challenging goal to bring target group in school, because in general population can be brought in school but the children belonging to below the poverty line, children of lower social and economic status, and children suffering from physical disability were reluctant to be brought in the school. Educational Planner, coordinators and all other human resource appointed under DPEP accepted this challenge. It is now result of several DPEP interventions that at the end of DPEP goal of universal primary education to 6-11 year age group students are missed by a minor margin of 0.06 percent. This difference may be missed due to major physical and other disability of children of mentioned age group. On the basis of above mentioned analysis it leads us to deduce that the assumption It is assumed that the rate of enrollment in primary schools remain unchanged for the last three years before and after launching DPEP in Tehri Garhwal District, stand for not to be accepted i.e. rejected.
Testing assumption 2

There has been no change in drop out rate of children under the DPEP for the last three years in reference to different social classes.

For testing this assumption the data were analyzed in following table

### Table No 4.2

a- Total Enrollment and Dropout rate Under DPEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasons</th>
<th>Drop out Rate</th>
<th>Decrease in Drop out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bar Diagram 4.2 Year wise decrease in Dropout rate Under DPEP

Yearly Decrease in Dropout Rate:
- 2000-2001: 0.28
- 2001-2002: 0.42
- 2002-2003: 0.61
- 2003-2004: 0.64
- 2004-2005: 0.64
- 2005-2006: 1.04
Data in table are showing that in the base line year of DPEP i.e. year 1999-2000 there was total 3.83 percent student's dropout from school, and interesting figure emerges of the equal percentage of dropout of boys and girls that is 3.83 percent. In the First year of launching of DPEP, in year 2000-01 slight reduction in drop out of student took place. Successful achievement in reducing dropout occurs in the first year of DPEP and drop out is reduced to 1.04 percent, which was a major success for the human resource working under this project. Data also show that owing to several interventions applied for bringing students in main stream of education received gradual reduction in drop out rate and at the end of this project total 0.29 percent students were out from the main stream of education.

Problem of drop out is different among the children of varied socio-economic status and for more depth study it was necessary to analyze data separately according to different category.
### Table 4.3
b- Enrollment and dropout rate of Scheduled caste students Under D.P.E.P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasons</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Drop out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>19755</td>
<td>19158</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>19724</td>
<td>19203</td>
<td>97.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>20195</td>
<td>19731</td>
<td>97.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>20368</td>
<td>19930</td>
<td>97.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>20321</td>
<td>19990</td>
<td>98.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>20223</td>
<td>20075</td>
<td>99.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>20275</td>
<td>20210</td>
<td>99.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures mentioned in table 4.3 show that in the base line year of DPEP there were about 3 percent students out of school or they were taken out from school due to their domestic works. In the year of 2000-01 by making provisions to bring these students in school drop out rate of these students reduced more than 0.35 percent and . Data also show that although there does not occur an immense fall or reduction in drop out but it reduced gradually and a target of bringing students back to school was succeeded due to several DPEP interventions. At the end of this project there were only 0.32 percent students out from the main stream of education.
Bar Diagram 4.3 year wise decrease in Drop out of SC Students
Table 4.4
Table- Total Enrollment and Drop Rate of Girls Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Total Girls</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Drop out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>39422</td>
<td>38224</td>
<td>96.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>39694</td>
<td>38606</td>
<td>97.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>40311</td>
<td>39440</td>
<td>97.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>40023</td>
<td>39335</td>
<td>98.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>40110</td>
<td>39665</td>
<td>98.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>40200</td>
<td>40035</td>
<td>99.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>40320</td>
<td>40199</td>
<td>99.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education of girls of 6-1 I year age group was the main focus area under the DPEP. Data regarding the drop out rate of girl children presented in table 4.4 show that in the year of 1999-2000 there were 1198 girls whose percentage is 3.04 of their total population, were out from the main stream of primary school. Several steps have been made under the project DPEP and reduction in the rate of drop out of girls took place. It is very interesting that rate of reduction in drop out is not sudden but is a gradual process of about 0.30-0.40 decrease in drop out of girls. It may be due to the reasons that as programme got perspective intensity, comprehensive interventions were taken under it to reduce the drop out rate of girls. At the end of DPEP there were only 121 girl children out from the main stream of education.
Bar Diagram 4.4 Year wise decrease in Drop out of Girls Students
Table 4.5

d- Enrollment and drop out rate of Scheduled tribe Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasons</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Drop out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data regarding the drop out rate for Scheduled tribe students are not of more significant importance because it has mentioned earlier that there is no habitation of Scheduled tribes in this district. In the year of 1999-2000 there were total 54 Students in the district in which only two student were drop out from school, again two and in next two year of DPEP this condition was in 2, 1 and in 1 student. The target to bring all student of this category was achieved in fourth year and at the end of this project no Scheduled tribe student was drop out from the main stream of education.
Bar diagram 4.5 year wise decrease in drop out of Scheduled tribe Students
### Table 4.6

Enrollment and drop out rate of OBC Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasons</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Drop out</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>95.98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>9935*</td>
<td>9834</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>98.98</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increase in Enrollment of OBC in 2005-06 is due to whole jaunpur block is declared OBC by Govt. of Uttaranchal, previously it was under general category.

In table 4.6 data regarding the enrollment and drop out of other backward class students presented, in base line year there were five percent students of their total population who were taken out from school due to various causes. Under DPEP some provisions are made to bring back these students again in school to make them in main stream. Data are showing that reduction in drop out rate occurs in a uniform manner with near about 0.5 percent. It is here important to
mention that sudden increase in the student of other backward class takes place in year 2005-06 this was due to the decision of govt. of Uttaranchal to cover block Jaunpur under other backward class. Before the year of 2005 this population of students was considered under general category. The analysis of data is indicating that still there were 101 Students of this caste who were out from main stream of school.

The analysis of data of table 4.2 to 4.6 it appears that although there are some children which still could not get enrolled in school but there has been made immense efforts for it and maximum no of children are got enrolled so the assumption There has been no change in drop out rate of children under the DPEP for the last three years in reference to different social classes. Could not be accepted rather stand to be rejected.
Bar Diagram 4.6 year wise Drop Out of O.B.C. Students
Table 4.7
Comparative year wise decrease in drop out of SC,ST,OBC And Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% SC</th>
<th>% Girls</th>
<th>% ST</th>
<th>% OBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line chart-4.1 Comparative year wise decrease in drop out of SC,ST,OBC and Girls
Testing Assumption 3rd

"The opinion of teacher's working under DPEP has been normally positive towards the district primary education programme".

This assumption was tested on the basis of opinion scores of teachers working under D.P.E.P. These scores were given weightage and mean & standard deviation values were calculated for four categories of teachers viz. general, male, female and Para teachers on their opinion towards D.P.E.P. The two groups were compared by applying t- ratio. Thus t- value were obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comparative mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of opinion of teachers (General)

Male Teachers Female Teachers and Para Teachers working under DPEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t- value</th>
<th>Level of signify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in general</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male teacher</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female teacher</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table4.8 shows that the mean value of teacher's score is above average 22.77 to the total which Indicates that DPEP was very much successful in meeting the goal of universalization of primary education. As teachers perceived that the programme was most effective for strengthening of primary education. The programme was also recognized by teacher's "for decentralize the primary education" to the grass root level in all aspects i.e. universal enrollment, retention and completion.

It also emphasizes upliftment of the target group in to main
streaming is as for children with special needs; S.C., S.T. and minority group children and most specifically to the Girl child. The programme laid its impact in capacity building of teachers and project functionaries through trainings, Seminars and workshops. The programme also provides an opportunity to job by filling up the vacancies of teachers & para teachers. The teachers also expressed their active participation and co-ordination with village level committees and also with the other stakeholders who happened to be thoroughly engaged in the programme.

The above table revealed that mean value of teacher's score is 22.77 to the total of 30 which indicates that DPEP has been very much successful in meeting the goal of universalization of primary education in the district as per the opinion of teacher's, in general, working under DPEP.

On analyzing the data presented in the table in terms of ‘t’ values, it remarkably indicates that there is significant difference in the opinion of male and female teachers about the functioning of DPEP. However a little difference is shown in the opinion of teachers and Para teachers due to late inception in the programme and less knowledge of Para teachers about the functioning of DPEP as well as their capacity of being a teacher in comparison of regular teachers.

On analyzing the t-values obtained in the table makes it clear that teacher's in general and Para teachers differed significantly beyond .01 level on their opinion. However the Para teachers obtained lowest mean-valve showing their deviated opinion on the various plus points covered in DPEP, though they expressed their high positive opinion about DPEP. The reason behind their negative opinion on some points in DPEP might be due to their no pre -service teacher training and fewer opportunities in participating in DPEP compared to these regular teachers. Similarly,
male teachers obtained better mean-values than to female teachers on their opinion regarding the effectiveness of DPEP and their opinion were found to be differed beyond.01 level of significance. This might be owing to the low participation of female teachers as being engaged in their family-affairs besides their role and the low exposure of ladies in the region. Yet, the overall, opinion of the teachers belonging to any category has been found to be of very high positive degree in favor of DPEP. As such, the assumption no. 3ed. stands to be accepted applaudly.

However, for going to depth study Item wise analyses of the Appendix III was also performed by using advanced software which has been described in the previous chapter -III

Teachers were asked to give their opinion on the various statements related to the District Primary Education Programme. Below is the statement wise analysis of their opinion.
Statement 1.
The analysis reveals that an overwhelming majority (86%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. It was found that out of total 250 teachers, 214 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.7: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement

![Bar diagram showing 214 agreed, 36 disagreed, and 250 total teachers.]

The further analysis of teachers among the ‘agreed’ category shows that 89 teachers were male, 82 teachers were female and 43 were Para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.8: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement

![Bar diagram showing 89 male teachers, 82 female teachers, and 43 Para teachers.]

(83)
**Statement 2.**

Around 74% of teachers were found to be agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 185 teachers were responded positively for the statement, while 65 teachers were totally disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.9: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement**

The further breakup of teachers, who agreed with the statement, shows that 89 teachers were female and 43 were Para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.10: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**
Statement 3.
Out of total 250 teachers, 185 teachers were agreed with the statement, which is significantly higher. There were 65 teachers who were not agreed with the statement.

Bar diagram 4.11: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement

The gender wise analysis of `agreed' teachers show that there were 81 male teachers, 69 female teachers and 35 Para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.12: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
**Statement 4**

For this particular statement, 75% of teachers responded in affirmative tone, while the rest of the proportion responded negatively.

**Bar diagram 4.13: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed With the statement**

The further gender wise categorization of teachers among the 'agreed' category reflects that the 80 teachers were male, 69 teachers were female and 38 were Para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.14: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**
Statement 5

The analysis of teachers' opinion reveals that good proportions (73%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 183 teachers reported to be agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.15: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement**

There were 79 male teachers, 70 female teachers and 34 Para teachers in the category of those teachers who agreed for this particular statement.

**Bar diagram 4.16: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**
Statement 6

The analysis reveals that majority (75%) teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 188 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.17: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The further gender-wise analysis of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that 84 teachers were male, 74 teachers were female and 30 were Para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.18: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 7

As clear from the chart given below, an overwhelming proportion (79%) of teachers reported to be agreed with the statement.

**Bar diagram 4.17: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

**With the statement**

A gender-wise breakup of teachers under the 'agreed' category reveals that there were 87 male teachers, 73 female teachers and 38 para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.20: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**
Statement 8

Around 79% of teachers were agreed with the statement. The analysis reveals that out of total 250 teachers, 198 were favoring the statement, while the rest were disagreed with it.

Bar diagram 4.21: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

There were around 84 male teachers, 75 female teachers and 39 Para teachers in the 'agreed' category of teachers.

Bar diagram 4.22: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
**Statement 9**

Out of total 250 teachers, a high proportion (76%) were agreed with the statement while the rest of the respondents were not agreed with the statement.

**Bar diagram 4.23: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

*With the statement*

![Bar diagram showing the number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement.](image)

A gender-wise analysis exhibits a higher proportion of male teachers, than female, who agreed with the statement. Out of the total teachers in the 'agreed' category, 84 teachers were male, 69 teachers were female and 36 were Para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.24: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**

![Bar diagram showing the break up of teachers agreed with the statement by gender.](image)
Statement 10

It was found that out of total 250 sample size of teachers, 189 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were not in favour of the statement.

Bar diagram 4.25: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed
With the statement

The further gender wise breakup of teachers under the agreed category shows that 87 teachers were male, 72 teachers were female and 30 were Para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.26: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 11

The analysis reveals that a majority (75%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. It was found that there were 188 teachers who agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed over the same.

Bar diagram 4.27: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The gender wise categorization of teachers among 'agreed' category found 76 male teachers, 73 female teachers and 39 para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.28: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 12

Around 74% of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 184 teachers reported positively while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.29: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed
With the statement

The further breakup shows that 76 teachers were male, 73 teachers were female and 35 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.30: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
**Statement 13**

The analysis reveals that a majority (73%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 182 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.31: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

*With the statement*

![Bar diagram showing number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement.](image)

The further analysis of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that 82 teachers were male, 73 teachers were female and 27 were Para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.32: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**

![Bar diagram showing break up of teachers agreed with the statement by gender and Para teachers.](image)
Statement 14
Out of total 250 teachers, 191 teachers were agreed with the statement, while the rest were disagreed with it.

Bar diagram 4.33: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed
With the statement

The gender wise breakup reveals that there were 83 male teachers and 74 female teachers. Besides male and female teachers, there were 34 para teachers in the `agreed' category of teachers.

Bar diagram 4.34: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 15

A majority (73%) of teachers were found to be agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 196 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.35: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The further analysis of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that 85 teachers were male, 76 teachers were female and 35 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.36: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 16

It was found that out of total 250 teachers, 196 teachers (around 78 %) were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.37: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The breakup shows that 89 teachers were male, 75 teachers were female and 32 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.38: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 17
Out of total 250 teachers, 184 teachers (around 74%) were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.39: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

With the statement

Out of total 184 'agreed' category teachers, 79 were male teachers, 77 were female teachers and 28 were para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.40: Break LIP of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**
Statement 18

The analysis reveals that an overwhelming majority (81%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 204 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.41: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The further gender wise analysis of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that besides 50 para teachers, 76 were male teachers and 78 were female teachers. It is significant to note that all the Para teachers were agreed with the statement.

Bar diagram 4.42: Break Lip of Teachers Agreed with the Statement

(100)
Statement 19
An overwhelming majority (81%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. It was found that out of total 250 teachers, 204 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.43: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed
With the statement

The further breakup of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that 87 teachers were male, 82 teachers were female and 35 were Para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.44: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 20
The analysis shows that around 74% of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 185 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.45: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The further categorization of teachers who were agreed with the statement shows that 80 teachers were male, 71 teachers were female and 34 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.6: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 21
Out of total 250 teachers, 191 teachers (76%) were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.47: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

With the statement

The further analysis shows that 82 teachers were male, 73 teachers were female and 27 were para teachers among the `agreed' category of teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.48: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**

(103)
Statement 22
A majority (77%) of teachers were found to be agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 192 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.49: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

The further breakup shows that 86 teachers were male, 76 teachers were female and 30 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.50: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 23

The analysis reveals that a majority (76%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. It was found that out of total 250 teachers, 189 teachers responded in favour of the statement, while 61 teachers were against the statement.

Bar diagram 4.51: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed
With the statement

The breakup of teachers among the 'agreed' category shows that 75 were male teachers, 76 were female teachers and 30 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.52: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 24

A majority (76%) of teachers were found to be agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 189 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest (61 teachers) were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.53: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The gender wise analysis of the teachers revealed that there were 89 male teachers, 67 female teachers, besides 30 para teachers, in the category of 'agreed' teachers.

Bar diagram 4.54: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 25
Out of total 250 teachers, 198 teachers (79%) were agreed with the statement while the rest 52 teachers were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.55: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The further gender wise analysis of teachers who agreed with the statement reveals that there were 85 male teachers and 80 female teachers besides 33 para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.56: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
Statement 26

The analysis reveals that a majority (78%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. It was found that out of total 250 teachers, 196 teachers responded in favour of the statement, while 54 teachers were against the statement.

Bar diagram 4.57: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

With the statement

The breakup of teachers among the `agreed' category shows that 82 were male teachers, 79 were female teachers and 35 were para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.58: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
**Statement 27**
Out of total 250 teachers, 196 teachers (78%) were agreed with the statement while the rest 54 teachers were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.59: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

With the statement

![Bar diagram 4.59: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed](image)

The further analysis of teachers who agreed with the statement reveals that there were 85 male teachers, 78 female teachers besides 33 para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.60: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**

![Bar diagram 4.60: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement](image)
Statement 28

A majority (77%) of teachers were agreed with the statement. Out of total 250 teachers, 192 teachers were agreed with the statement while the rest (58 teachers) were disagreed.

Bar diagram 4.61: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed

The further breakup of teachers who agreed with the statement reveals that there were 85 male teachers, 76 female teachers, besides 31 para teachers.

Bar diagram 4.62: Break up of Teachers Agreed with the Statement
**Statement 29**

A total of 182 teachers (73%) were found to be agreed with the statement while the rest of the 68 teachers were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.63: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Total no. of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 85 male teachers, 78 female teachers besides 33 para teachers in the category of `agreed' teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.64: Break Lip of Teachers Agreed with the Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Teacher</th>
<th>Female Teachers</th>
<th>Para Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 30

Out of total 250 teachers, 142 teachers (57%) were agreed with the statement while rest 108 teachers were disagreed.

**Bar diagram 4.65: Number of teachers agreed and disagreed with the statement**

The further analysis of teachers who agreed with the statement reveals that there were 66 male teachers, 54 female teachers besides 22 para teachers.

**Bar diagram 4.66: Break up of Teachers Agreed With the Statement**
"The participation and co-operations community in development of primary education seems to be normal in respective areas".

It is worth to be mentioned that village education committee came in existence in 1974 under Uttar Pradesh Shiksha Adhinium 1972. The committee had three members with pradhan as chairperson, Head teacher as secretary and one nominated member of village. The main role of VEC during that period was to provide infrastructural support to the school. On the said period Govt. of Uttar Pardesh made an important change in the role of VEC by involving teacher of school in the construction of primary school building popularly known as community construction programme. This programme shows successful results in terms of cost effectiveness and also in the quality of construction, compared to the quality of Govt. agencies.

**VEC under DPEP**

Under DPEP, the need of active participation of local community was felt necessary for the successful implementation of primary education programme. Another important concept of DPEP was that action planning for universal primary education should beat local/habitation level. Keeping in the view the above two concept emphasis was given on initiating process for community mobilization and development of participatory institutional which was conceived of as critical programme implementation. Thus role and responsibilities of VEC under DPEP, broadly covered as of school construction, creation of school facilities, maintenance and repair of schools, supervision of all the school activities appointment of Para teacher, ECCE worker and making co-ordination and convergence with other Governmental agencies. As it has been said earlier that first VEC came in existence
1974 under Uttar Pardesh Shiksha Adhinium which has 03 member body extended to 05 members in year 1993 by basic education project Uttar Paresh. Under DPEP once again the composition of VEC was amended by Govt.

**Participation of community in activities of District Primary Education Programme.**

In India community participation in primary education is not a new area. History of education in India clearly deals about the role of community or local bodies in the development of primary education. But after independence several education commission and especially National policy on education and programme of action suggested extensive structural reforms for decentralization of educational planning and management. National policy on education 1986 recommended empowering of communities for the management of educational institution at local level. After Independence educational planner in India thought that challenges of expanding primary education is not possible with out the decentralization of educational management thus to achieve the goal of universalization of primary education it is necessary to sensitize community so that they can play active role in the development of primary education. An important feature of District Primary Education was to achieve universalization of elementary education through participatory process where by the local primary schools are covered in their served areas.

**Participation of community (VEC) in District Tehri Garhwal in the activities of DPEP.**

Under DPEP all the constitution works, primary facilities in schools and appointment of Para teachers was decentralized by Govt. to VEC and local community level.

Following are the works in District Tehri Garhwal done by VEC.
Table 4.9
1. Participation in Training Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Training Module</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Trained VEC</th>
<th>Trained Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Sankalp Evam Prayash</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>Sankalp Evam Prayash</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>12369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Sankalp Evam Prayash</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>No training due to dissolution Panchayat</td>
<td>No training due to dissolution Panchayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Shiksha ke aur Badte Kadam</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>11482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Shiksha ke aur Badte Kadam</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9171*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Shiksha ke aur Badte Kadam</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>8434*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No reduced due to lack of fund under members training.

Above table shows that a lot of member are trained by DPEP for development of skills of VEC/Community member for enabling them to participate actively in the management and in active conduction of district primary education programme. Beside above training, a special programme of sensitization of women members Mamta Samooh, Maa Beti Mela’s are also organized which clearly indicated that participation of VEC and community member is good under DPEP.

The successful outcome of construction programme led to popular thinking that if VEC could be involved in developing school infrastructure. Why is it not involved in its maintenance of assets created? Why not in the role of management and planning? soon after the potential of VEC were realized by the educational planner later on it led to define the role of VEC in the context of universalization of primary education.
**Construction Works**

Various types of construction work were performed by VEC members in their areas. Following are the year wise construction works done by VEC under DPEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new primary school building</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of primary schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Extra classroom</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of NPRC Office</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Toilets in primary school</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Drinking Water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of buildings of primary schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Planning Management Information System Room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>484</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>381</strong></td>
<td><strong>1503</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table indicates that total 1503 construction works are completed by VEC in their served area in district Tehri Garhwal which is a best effort. No Govt. agency was involved in the construction mentioned in table. It helped to save the man power and money of Govt. by employing local human resource by decentralizing the construction work to community and their active participation with quality of construction work showed their active participation and co-operation in
the development of primary education.

**Establishing the Education Guarantee centers**

Universilization of primary education by enrolling all the children was the principal aim of DPEP. So schools were established in all the areas. There were some areas like non revenue habitation, forest villages and other places who have agriculture practices in remote areas where norms to establish primary school education does not complete. So to bring the student in the main stream of education Vidhya Kendra's were established under DPEP.

One Important effort of DPEP was to provide facility of primary education in the circle of 1 km radius. As Tehri Garhwal is hilly district which has its district problem and there were so many barriers in the way of school like river, forest etc. acting as constraints to the students class 1st and 2nd. So EGS scheme were introduced under DPEP in such habitation. These EGS centers were affiliated to the primary school and one Achryaji was appointed in the centre as teacher.

Community member (village education committee) played an active role to establish the Vidhya Kendra and in appointment of Acharya ji

Following is the year wise statement of establishing EGS centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>EGS Center Sanctioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>263</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table indicate that 263 non revenue habitation, areas, forest villages are identified by committee for the establishment of vidhya kendra under education Guarantee scheme (EGS) which shows that community played a active role in the development of primary education in district Tehri Garhwal under DPEP.

On analyzing above facts regarding participation and cooperation of community under DPEP the assumption "that participation and co-operations of community in development of primary education seems to be normal in respective areas." May not be accepted as it was found to be beyond normal rather more active.

**Testing Assumption 5th**
**Role of New primary school, Vidhya Kendra and Alternative education centers proved to be positive for the development of primary education.**

Universilization of primary education was the first and important objective under DPEP. To achieve this target access of Primary schools in the circle of 1 km to all children were taken under consideration by the planner of DPEP. So to provide the access of primary education to children of 6-11 year age group in some areas, villages and forest villages were identified at cluster level and schools were opened there. Thus students have not to walk more than 1 km. for going to school.
Table 4.12
Year wise opened new primary schools and enrolment covered to to those children due to non-accessibility of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of primary school opened with DPEP</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>1587</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13
Year wise Vidhya Kendra (EGS) and enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vidhya kendra</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>263</strong></td>
<td><strong>4607</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows that in the year of 2000-01, 30 villages were identified for establishing new primary school and 1050 students of district were benefited by the easy access of the primary education. Next year due to motivation of the good results, the enrolment no. of New primary school were doubled and 60 schools were established and as per the district figures 2220 students were again benefited by the access of primary education.

Simultaneously this process was continued and areas of villages and habitations without school were identified continuously and annual work plan and budget was sanctioned by the district project office for establishing New Primary Schools.

Figures are showing that at the end of programme 148 new primary
schools were established under DPEP and 1587 students were enrolled there in the first year of the establishment of school.

**Establishment of Vidhya Kendra:**

As it has been already mentioned that to provide easy access of primary education was kept in mind to ensure hundred percent enrolments of students of 6-11 year age group, under DPEP.

But due to adverse geographical condition of Uttaranchal state there were some habitations where in like forest villages and non revenue locality, due to less population in these areas, norms were not complete to establish schools in these habitations. So under the programme of education guarantee scheme Vidhya Kendra were established in these areas. These Kendra were affiliated by the main primary school of the village and students of class 1st and IIInd were enrolled therein.

Table-4.13 shows that in the first year of DPEP 72 such habitations were identified and 1080 students were directly benefited by the access of primary education. Next year 129 vidhya Kendra were established and 2510 students were enrolled in these centers. The process of identification of such habitation was continued to the period of DPEP i.e. 2000-2005-06 and at the end 263 vidhya Kendras were established in the district.

One thing is Important regarding the vidhya kendras that these Kendras played important role in reduction of dropout because due to geographical berries because children from forest village and non revenue village were enable to come school due to unavailability of school.

As such the newly opened schools, Vidya Kendra etc. were observed as more positive in the enhancement of student’s enrollment.
Thus analyzing table 4.12 and 4.13 it reveals that assumption 5th, "Role of new primary school, Vidhya Kendra and alternative education centers proved positive for the development of primary education" stands to be applaudly accepted.

**Testing assumption 6th**

"As per opinion of community members the district primary education does have an effective and useful role in the growth, development of primary education"

**Table 4.14**

Comparative mean values of opinion of community members in general, block education committee members and district education committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members in general (Block education committee and District education committee)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block education committee</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District education committee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For assessing the opinion of community members regarding the role of district primary education programme in the growth and development of primary education an opinionnaire was constructed and administered on the 50% members of block education committee (Block resource group) and on all the members of district education committee (District resource group) The mean values of the scores were calculated and arranged in table mentioned above.

On analyzing table 4.1 It indicates that mean value scores of community member is 12.08 to the total of 15 which confirms that DPEP had been very much successful in the growth, development (upliftment) of primary education in the district Tehri Garhwal community members perceived that DPEP was an effective programme.
for the universal primary education, which brought qualitative and quantitative improvement in the field of primary education. On analyzing Appendix IV. It exhibits that highest score was obtained for item 12 which is related to the reserving a place for women members in village education committee. So it can be said that DPEP also brought gender equity in society.

Table 4.14 reveals that there is a slight difference of 1.66 in the mean scores of block education committee and that of district level education committee. District education committee shows high scores, as the most of members in the district resource group are planner and persons directly associated with the DPEP and they knew very well that after independence no any programme was launched by Govt. for the upliftment of primary education like DPEP. Frequency of the participation in the programms of DPEP of D.R.G. members was more as compared to block education committee members so there appeared a high variation in the mean scores of district education committee members and block education committee members.

Hence forth, the above discussion leads to accept the assumption no. VI, that is, **the opinion of community members favored the DPEP in having an effective and useful role in the growth & development of primary education in general.**

**Demerits of District Primary Education Programme**

District primary Education programme was an important programme to uplift the quality and expansion of primary education financed by World Bank. This programme brought remarkable improvement in the primary education of district. Although it brought
outstanding improvement in primary education of district and succeeded to reduce the dropout at maximum level but due to lack of suitable monitoring system and adverse geographical condition there remained some shortcomings in programme mentioned follows.

1- In comparison to the enrollment drive, there was less focus on the quality improvement of education and training were provided to the teachers to improve the classroom teaching learning process but its implementation could not have a better impact on the primary education.

2- There was no suitable strategy for evaluating the impact of programme and Monitoring system could not be developed properly in the beginning to overcome the possible shortcomings.

3- Schools were graded under DPEP in respect to the physical and academic dimensions and physical improvement in schools was found effective but not the academic improvement at the desired level.

4- Although students with special needs were brought in the main stream of education through enrollment drive but it lapsed of suitable measures to provide the education to these students according to their need.

5- It has been seen that though there were various training programme for teachers to develop their skills but before providing training to them the training needs were not identified. As such similar type of trainings were provided to all the teachers at block level.

6- Norms to appoint Para teachers were set at village panchayat level, and due to this norms in some schools competent and efficient candidate could not get appointment
which results the slow impact on the quality of primary education in some primary schools.

7- A lot of emphasis has been given on the education of girls and students of weaker section of society, under DPEP but this was based mainly to enrollment and other quantity indicators like distribution of books free of cost. There was less focus on the quality improvement of their learning due to weak monitoring system, especially in remote areas.

8- Decentralization of primary education through community participation was main concept under DPEP. Financial as well as non financial powers were delegated to community members but in some areas there was misuse of these powers. It was seen mainly in construction works in some schools.

9- There was liberty to introduce innovative programme in primary education but it has been seen that due to reluctancy of management system and implementers, innovative programmes like Kunjapuri pattern, Bal Sabha, Bal Sarkar could not get popularity as was expected.

However in spite of few demerits and short comings, the DPEP brought remarkable change and improvements in upgrading the quality of primary education by providing academic and physical support by making programme successful to achieve its objectives to maximum level. The investigator hopes that above short comings can be removed under Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan mission.