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Certain methods were adopted for ascertaining the relative importance of the causes of dropout. The methods were adopted for identifying the causes. After identification of the causes their relative importance was ascertained. The ascertained causes were analysed for retaining it finally. Each of these methods and processes were dealt separately.

Method adopted for Identification of Causes:

In studying the relative importance of the causes of dropout three agencies were connected directly and indirectly. These agencies were the Head Teachers, the Inspecting Officers and the Local Educationists. Under the group of Head Teachers the headmasters and headmistresses of primary, middle and high school and the Principal of higher secondary school and college included. For the purpose of convenience opinions under head teachers were taken from (1) Primary and Middle, (2) High and Higher Secondary School and (3) College as given in Appendices J.K. and L. The opinion of the local educationists were taken
into consideration since no teachers training institution existed in the area. The teaching agency was connected because they actually worked and taught the students. Thus they had direct relation with the students of their respective Institutions.

The teachers of the primary and middle schools knew the children and their family background as most of the teachers were from their own locality. These teachers knew the conditions of the people in general and of the society in particular in which the school was located as they were from the same locality. They also knew the economic condition and educational position of the locality towards education.

Similarly, the headmasters and Principals of the higher secondary school knew the activities and circumstances of the teachers. They also knew the professional competence of the teachers. They knew those students who dropped out from the class and those who repeated in a class. They knew the causes too.

These headmasters and the Principals gave full statement of the causes against each pupil who repeated in the class and also those who left school for good. Thus
the headmasters and principal who had the experience of knowing the pupils, the teachers and the people of the area were the best sources of getting the possible causes of dropout.

Teachers of the secondary and higher secondary schools, on the other hand, knew the students although forty percent of the teachers were from outside the locality. By coming into contact with the students as well as with the local people they became aware of the economic, social and cultural position of the area. Thus the teachers both from local and outside the area knew the students and cultural position of the locality and attitude of the people towards education. They gathered knowledge about the family background and the causes of dropping out from their educational career. The opinion given by the teachers regarding the causes of dropout were found important as they were directly connected with the students.

The teachers of the local college were both from the locality and outside the district. Except three all the teachers were from the local higher secondary school upto 1975. After that full time college teachers were appointed, out of which 29 percent were local and 71
percent were from other parts of the State. Generally, it was difficult for the college teachers to know each of the students individually along with their family background. However, since the college was a newly established one and the students also were not many, almost all the teachers were interested to know about the dropouts and the causes of their dropping out. They knew about the attitude of the local people towards college education. They came to know about the family status and family background of the dropouts. Thus the opinion of these teachers were as important as the opinions given by the teachers of other stages. Sometimes, the Principal also came to know the actual dropouts and their causes. Again, the Principal of the local college knew the abilities and circumstances of the teachers. He also knew their professional competence. The Principal also knew the number of students who dropped out from their course through the teachers, staff members and students.

The opinion given by the head teachers and the principals regarding the dropouts and their causes were verified by collecting individual details of 3438 children who were admitted in 1968 in class - A from the head teachers of 130 schools and 41 students of
the lone college in 1971. The selection was made of 6824 children admitted in 1968 in class A in 258 schools and one college of Sipajhar Development Block. The head teachers of the 130 schools and principal of the lone college gave full statement of the causes against each pupil who had repeated in classes and also those who left school and college for good. So the head teachers and the principal who had the experience of knowing the pupils the teachers and the people of the area were the best agency to provide the possible causes of dropouts.

The statement of the causes of dropout was given in Appendices J to L. These statements of the causes of dropout were given as felt and experienced by those head teachers. Thus all total 1986 sets of causes of dropout were received from 131 head teachers and principals of Sipajhar Development Block. There were many common individual causes among those causes. The causes were then sorted out to fall into some common patterns. However, the number of causes were very large. So the numbers were again reduced to 60 after initial processing and sorting out into common patterns. The causes which were related to the problem in most indirect and remote way were rejected. The slightly minor causes were merged into slightly
broader causes which covered them. Thus the total remaining number of causes were 40. These causes were then retained for further analysis and study. The percentage of frequency of teachers against each cause was computed. It indicated the relative importance of causes as perceived by teachers. Then by arranging the causes in descending order, the importance of causes of dropout given by head teachers were found out.

The opinion of the principal of the local college was clubbed together under the group of the judges of the head teachers for the purpose of convenience as well as they all were the administrative heads of the educational institutions. The clubbing was made since almost all the 75 questions of the five point scale opinionnaire remained almost same except some slight modifications. The reason for framing a separate opinionnaire was because of the different age level and educational stage from the other stages of education. Although the number of question was 75 in the questionnaire the finally retained causes were 40 while the method of sorting out and processing of the minor causes were same as it was followed in the other stages of education. Since the 40 retained causes of dropout given by the Principal of the College was almost
same as the 40 retained causes of dropout given by the head teachers the investigator clubbed them together under the group of judges of head teachers and principals.

The second agency was the Inspecting Officers which was directly or indirectly related to the problems of primary, middle, secondary, higher secondary and college under different management. The inspecting officers who had inspected and supervised the schools and colleges by actually visiting the different types of educational institutions were the real field workers. These field workers knew the human and material resources of the schools and college. They knew the abilities, efficiencies and background of the teachers along with their problems. These field workers scrutinised the general educational environment in the society, in relation to the teachers and local people. So their opinion regarding the causes of dropout were considered to be very important and fruitful.

The inspecting staff which consisted of the Inspector, Assistant Inspectors, Deputy Inspector and the Sub-Inspectors inspected all types of schools under different managements. The Inspector and the Assistant Inspectors
inspected high and higher secondary schools. The Deputy Inspector inspected middle schools. The Sub-Inspectors inspected the primary schools. The Deputy Inspector inspected primary schools too.

These inspecting officers inspected all the schools under different management, that is, provincialised and private schools. No Government school existed in the block till the period under study. Thus these inspecting officers were in touch with the managing committees as well as the teachers. They sometimes acted as a co-ordinating agency between the teachers and the managing committee members.

The inspecting officers of the schools did not inspect the college. All the colleges were inspected by the Inspector of Colleges who was appointed by the University from among the Principal of colleges and sometimes from the University. Although the college had its own Governing Body for management, the inspection of the college by the Inspector of Colleges was inevitable.

The total number of inspecting officers including the college was eight during the period under study. These inspecting officers were the nerves of the whole ganglion of education in the Sipajhar Development
Block. These Inspecting Officers detected 600 causes of dropout.

The third important agency was the local educationists. The opinions of the local educationists were taken into consideration in the present study in asserting the relative importance of the causes of dropout. The reason for undertaking the opinion of the local educationists was because of the non-existence of teacher training institute in the area. The opinion of the local educationists were taken into consideration because, these local educationists knew the socio-economic position of the local people. Their opinion was free and frank without any bias. They also could scrutinise the educational positions of those institutions and they observe the status and functioning of the institutions with open mind. Since they were from the local area itself, they knew the students as well as the teachers. They also knew the dropout students as well as their causes.

Thus they sometimes could come in contact with large number of primary, middle, secondary, higher and secondary/even college teachers. They not only could
give information of the dropouts but also could provide an insight into the teaching methods in the classroom.

Thus their opinion was directly or indirectly related in ascertaining the causes of dropout. As such the opinion of 30 local educationists were taken into consideration. These local educationists gave 2250 causes of dropout.

Thus 131 head teachers, eight inspecting officers and 30 local educationists gave a total of 12036 causes of dropout. These 12036 causes were then processed and proper wordings were used so that it could be sorted out to fall into some common patterns. Some minor causes were merged. Some were rejected which were neglected to the problem in the most indirect and remote way. The pattern of processing and sorting out was the same as done in the case of teachers. Thus after merging of minor causes and rejecting or indirect and remote ones the finally retained causes remained 40. These retained 40 causes were taken for analysis and study. Percentage frequency of teachers, inspecting officers and local educationists against each cause was computed. Rank orders as given by these three agencies were given to each cause in descending order.
Majority of the respondents were not only teachers, field workers, administrators and educationists but parents too having their own children. Thus all the parents involved for the study were not only observers or analysers but participants or feeders too.

Methods adopted for Ascertaining the Relative Importance of the causes of Dropout.

After retaining the 40 identified causes of dropout the next step was to find out the relative importance of the causes. This step was felt necessary since opinions given by these three agencies were verified. Because, there was no objective or established order of importance of the causes. So, to obtain a common order of ranks based on the ranks assigned by different agencies or groups of judges was a must in ascertaining the relative importance of the causes of dropout. It was the only scientific method. Therefore, the three agencies involved would be termed as groups of observers or judges.

Appendices J to L contained 75 opinions each on the causes of dropout which was put in the form of a five point opinionnaire scale. The opinionnaire consisting of 75 questions was given to all the 131 head teachers, 08 Inspecting Officers and 30 local educationists for scoring
in the importance scale. For the purpose of convenience the opinionnaires were divided into two columns - one column was for the primary and the other column for middle schools covering classes from A to VII. It was given in Appendix J. Appendix K was meant for secondary and higher secondary schools consisting of classes from VIII to XII. Appendix L was meant for college consisting of classes from Pre-University to Degree. Thus any teacher belonging to any one of these categories could answer according to his or her occupational status.

Analysis was made on the opinions given by these three groups of judges, that is, head teachers, inspecting officers and local educationists. Each item was quantified. Average ratings of the quantified items were computed for each set of judges or respondents. Ranks were then given to each item separately on the basis of quantified average ratings for each set of judges. The ranks thus obtained had indicated the relative importance of the causes of dropout according to each set of judges.

Basing on the average of ranks given by the three different groups of judges a new set of ranks was assigned to the causes of dropout. Thus, this newly given common rank
was the final rank order of the causes of dropout. 97
Before assigning the final rank order the agreement or
concordance among the three sets of judges were examined.
When the final rank order was set it was further examined
with the help of 'Concordance Test' and the 'Coefficient
of Concordance' was tested for significance. Thus this
test made it possible to an established agreed order
basing on the community agreement among the various sets
of judges. Table No. 7.1 had shown the rank order of causes
of dropouts as perceived by the three sets of judges.
Thus the common rank order was established after testing.

ANALYSIS OF FINALLY RETAINED CAUSES OF DROPOUT:

The forty finally retained causes of dropout in
the schools and the college of Sipajhar Development Block
was given in Table No. 7.2. Ranks were given to those
forty retained causes. These ranks were according to the
assessment of each sets of judges. It contained the common
ranks based on community agreement of the three sets of
judges.

The commonly agreed item of causes were arranged
in order of importance according to the common rank. Code
letters 'SE', 'E' and 'M' were used among the forty
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Causes of dropout</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Inspecting Officers</th>
<th>Local Educationists</th>
<th>Common rank based on community agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE₁</td>
<td>Poverty and economic backwardness of the family.</td>
<td>58.78</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M₁</td>
<td>Natural calamities like flood, epidemic, storm, erosion etcetera</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>Defective system of examination having liberalised promotion rules</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>Repeated failure in the examination.</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SE₂</td>
<td>Involvement in domestic work like cultivation, weaving, rearing cattle, fishing, looking after younger etcetera.</td>
<td>53.44</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE₃</td>
<td>Large - family-families with more children unable to take care for their education and maintenance.</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E₃</td>
<td>Caught while copying in the examination.</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>Absence of teacher parent relationship.</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M₃</td>
<td>Physical handicapness, frequent illness and poor health of the students</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>38.93</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E₄</td>
<td>Inability to pay tuition fee in the College.</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SE₄</td>
<td>Ignorance and low status of the family</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>E₅</td>
<td>Irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers.</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>E₆</td>
<td>Lack of interest in education.</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>M₄</td>
<td>Bad communication specially during summer season.</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>SE₅</td>
<td>Parents needed them to supplement family income.</td>
<td>48.62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>SE₆</td>
<td>Polluted family and poor social environment</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>SE₇</td>
<td>Indifference and lack of consciousness of parents and guardians towards education.</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>M₅</td>
<td>Mixing up with bad companion.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>SE₈</td>
<td>They wanted to secure a job immediately</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>E₇</td>
<td>Large number of untrained, unqualified and in-experienced teachers.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>E₈</td>
<td>Unkind and incompetent teachers giving harsh punishment to students.</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>SE₉</td>
<td>Lack of adjustment of school and college hours and vacation according to local needs.</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>E₉</td>
<td>Teachers indifference towards profession.</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>E₁₀</td>
<td>Many teachers and students come from distant homes.</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>SE₁₀</td>
<td>Early marriage specially for girls.</td>
<td>37.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>E₁₁</td>
<td>High pupil-teacher ratio, overcrowded class</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>M₆</td>
<td>Continuous sickness of parents.</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>SE₁₁</td>
<td>Discontinuing education after getting job.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>E₁₂</td>
<td>Selecting wrong subject combination due to limited scope.</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>SE₁₂</td>
<td>Parents pampered them as they were first born/last born or the only child.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>E₁₃</td>
<td>School/college libraries did not meet the need of the students.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>SE₁₃</td>
<td>Educational programmes and curriculum did not meet the individual needs.</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>E₁₄</td>
<td>Irregular attendance and long absence of students.</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>SE₁₄</td>
<td>They were from authoritarian home and influenced by social taboos.</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>M₇</td>
<td>Unpleasant relationship with classmates in co-educational institutions.</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>M₈</td>
<td>Overage in the class.</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>SE₁₅</td>
<td>Death of either or both the parents.</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>M₉</td>
<td>Inadequate physical facilities like toilet, hostel, building etcetera.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>SE₁₆</td>
<td>Residing in rented house with great difficulties.</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>E₁₅</td>
<td>Lack of teaching aids.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES</td>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL CAUSES</td>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>Poverty and economic backwardness of the family (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Lack of interest in education (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>Involvement in domestic works like cultivation weaving, rearing cattle, fishing, looking after youngsters etcetera (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>Parents needed them to supplement family income (4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Repeated failure in the examination (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>Indifference and lack of consciousness of parents and guardians towards education (6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Caught while copying in the examination (14)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>Ignorance and low status of the family (9)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Selecting wrong subject combination due to limited scope (16)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>Lack of adjustment of school and college hours and vacations according to local need (10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Unkind and incompetent teachers giving harsh punishment to the students (19)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES</td>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL CAUSES</td>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>SE13</td>
<td>Educational programmes and curriculums did not meet the individual needs (12)</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Teachers indifference towards profession(19)</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SE16</td>
<td>Residing in rented house with great difficulties (13)</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Large number of un-trained, incompetent and inexperienced teachers (21).</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SE10</td>
<td>Early marriage specially for girls (19)</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Many teachers and students came from distant homes (29)</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Death of either or both the parents (22)</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Defective system of examination having liberalised promotion rules (31.5)</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>Large family-families with more children unable to take care for their education and maintenance (24)</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>E13</td>
<td>School/college libraries did not meet individual needs (31.5).</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES</td>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL CAUSES</td>
<td>SL. NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>SE14</td>
<td>They were from authoritarian home and influence by social taboos (26.5)</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Irregular attendance and long absence of students (31.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>SE11</td>
<td>Discontinuing education after getting job (36).</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Lack of teaching aids (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>SE12</td>
<td>Parents pampered them as they were Ist born/last born or the only child (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
retained causes of dropout for the purpose of minute classification and thorough analysis of the problem.

The code letter 'SE' meant socio economic causes, 'E' meant educational causes and 'M' meant miscellaneous causes. The code letters in the serial column against each cause had indicated the broad category to which the item belonged. While following the common rank order the subcrips denoted the order of that item within the particular category.

In order to verify the common rank order graded in establishing relative importance on the causes of dropout by a common agreement of the three sets of judges, Kendall's "Coefficient of Concordance (W)" was used. Thus, the relative importance of established by the three sets of judges were tested by Kendall's "Coefficient of Concordance. The formula of 'W' was given below:-

\[
W = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} ij \right)^2}{m \cdot n \cdot (n+1)^2 - \frac{m \cdot n \cdot (n^2 - 1)}{12}} \quad ...(1)
\]
Here \( x_{ij} \) was the rank assigned by the \( i \)th item of causes. The three ranks of each item were added in finding the value of \( x_{ij} \). The result of the addition of the three ranks were against squared for each item of forty causes. These squared result of each item of forty causes were again added. This finally achieved result was the value of \( x_{ij} \). In the formula of co-efficient of Concordance' 'M' was the sets of judges or sets of ranks. The value of 'M' was three. 'N' was the number of items of causes which was forty.

Considering the three sets of judges in columns 4, 6 and 8 against the items it was found that -

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{3} x_{ij} \right) \\
\sum_{j=1}^{40} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{3} x_{ij} \right) = 181636.5
\]

Substituting the values of \( m, n \) and summation \( x_{ij} \) in the formula (i) we have,
\[
\frac{181636.5}{3} - \frac{3 \times 40 \left( 40 + 1 \right)^2}{4} \\
\frac{3 x 40 \left( 40^2 - 1 \right)}{12} \quad \cdots \quad (2)
\]

\[
W = \frac{3 \times 40 (40^2 - 1)}{12} \quad \cdots \quad (2)
\]

\[
= 0.632614133 \\
= 0.633
\]

Hence, 0.633 was the degree of agreement among the three sets of judges of 40 ranks. The significance of this index or Concordance was tested by 'F' test.

The formula for 'F' for testing the Concordance of Co-efficient was given below:

\[
F = \frac{(m - 1)w}{1 - w} \quad ................. \quad (3)
\]

Substituting the value of \( m \) and \( w \) in formula (3) we have:

\[
F = \frac{(3 - 1) \times 0.632614133}{1 - 0.632614133} \\
= 3.443867551 \\
= 3.44
\]

The value of \( F \) was 3.44 which was highly significant. For the value of df the number was \( (n - 1) \) and \( (m - 1)(n - 1) \) for denominator. Thus the value of df were 39 for the numerator and 78 for the denominator.
The result proved that there was significant agreement among the three sets of judges so far the relative importance of the 40 causes of dropout were concerned. Hence, the common rank order showing the relative importance of the causes of dropout could therefore be accepted as the established order.

The mean value of all possible Rank Correlation Co-efficient among the three sets of judges could be worked out direct from the known value of the Concordance Co-efficient with the formula 'R' 98. The formula for 'R' was given below:

\[ R = \frac{mw - 1}{m - 1} \]  
\[ \text{............... (4)} \]

Here, 'R' was the average value of the three possible rank Correlation Co-efficient among the three sets of ranks, 'm' was the sets of ranks and 'w' was the Concordance Co-efficient.

Substituting the values of 'm' and 'w' in formula we have,

\[ R = \frac{3 \times 0.632614133 - 1}{3 - 1} \]
\[ = 0.448921199 \]
\[ = 0.45 \]  
Highly significant

98. Ibid P. 412
The rank correlation coefficient between various sets of judges in respect of the causes of dropout were found out among the three sets of judges applying the formula 'r' by rank difference method. The formula for 'r' was as given below:

\[ r = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N (N^2 - 1)} \] .......... (5)

The individual rank correlation coefficient between various groups of judges in respect of the causes of dropout were found out as (1) Head teachers and Inspecting Officers by using code Hd. T & I.O, (II) Head teachers and Local Educationists by using code Hd.T & L.E. and (III) Inspecting Officers and Local Educationists by using code I.O. & L.E. The respective results substituting its respective values the rank correlation for the three codes were found as follows:

1. \[ r, (Hd.T \& I.O) = 1 - \frac{6 \times 6447.5}{40(40^2 - 1)} \]
   \[ = 1 - 0.604831144 \]
   \[ = 0.395168811 \]
   \[ = 0.40 \]

2. \[ r_2 (Hd.T \& L.E) = 1 - \frac{6 \times 7258}{40(40^2 - 1)} \]
   \[ = 1 - 0.680863034 \]
   \[ = 0.319136961 \]
   \[ = 0.32 \]

r_3 (I.O & L.E) = 1 - \frac{6 \times 3865}{40(40^2 - 1)}
= 1 - 0.362570356
= 0.637429644
= 0.64

Thus the value of rank correlation coefficient between the Head Teachers and the Inspecting Officers was found 0.40. The value of rank coefficient correlation between the Head Teachers and Local Educationists was found 0.32. The value of rank correlation coefficient between the Inspecting Officers and Local Educationists was found 0.64.

The rank coefficient correlation between the three sets of judges and the mean value of the three possible rank correlation coefficient were tested by 't'. The formula for 't' was given below:

\[ t = \frac{r}{\sqrt{1 - r^2}} \]  \( ...... (6) \)

Here in the formula 'r' was the coefficient of correlation of the three sets of judges and 'n' was the number. Substituting the values of 'r' and 'n' in the formula we have:

---

\[ t = \frac{45}{\sqrt{1 - (45)^2 \sqrt{40 - 2}}} \]

= 3.106268311

= 3.11 Highly significant.

The value of 't' was 3.11 which was, highly significant at the two levels of 0.01 and 0.05. For df 38 the level of significance was 2.72 and 2.03 at both the levels.

By applying the same formula the values of 't', 't_2' and 't_3' for the Head Teachers and Inspecting Officers, Head Teacherse and Local Educationists and Local Educationists and Inspecting Officers were also found out by substituting the values of 'r_1' in 't_1', 'r_2' in 't_2', and 'r_3' in 't_3'. The respective values were:

1. \[ t_1 (Hd.T. and L.E.) = \frac{.40}{\sqrt{1 - (.40)^2 \sqrt{40 - 2}}} \]

= 2.690370836

= 2.69

2. \[ t_2 (Hd.T. and L.E.) = \frac{.32}{\sqrt{1 - (.32)^2 \sqrt{40 - 2}}} \]

= 2.082094107

= 2.08
3.  \[ t_3 \text{ (L.E. and I.O.)} = \frac{.64}{\sqrt{40 - 2}} \sqrt{1 - (.64)^2} \]

\[ = 5.134505202 \]

\[ = 5.13 \]

The values of \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) were found 2.69 and 2.08 respectively which was highly significant at .05. Thus the value of \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) were found highly significant at 0.05 for df 38, that is, \((n - 2)\). The level of significance at 0.05 and 0.01 were 2.03 and 2.72. \(^{101}\) The value of \( t_3 \) was found 5.13 which was highly significant. Thus the value of \( r_3 \) was found highly significant at the two levels. The values of \( t_1 \), \( t_2 \), and \( t_3 \) showed that there were good agreement between any two sets of judges and also a general or community agreement among all the three sets of judges.

**RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE CAUSES OF DROPOUT**

The retained 40 causes of dropout were again grouped into three broad categories, that is, socio-economical, educational and miscellaneous. Under the socio-economical category 16 causes were grouped, 15 causes belonged to educational and nine causes belonged to miscellaneous category. The broad category-wise importance grading of dropout was shown in Table No.7.2. The code

---

\(^{101}\) Garrett H.E.: *Statistics in Psychology and Educational*, Columbia University - P.44.
serials or abbreviations designating the causes were used in Table No. 7. The figures within brackets against each cause had indicated common rank.

Relative ranking of the broad categories based on the average rank of the cluster of causes belonging to each category showed that socio-economic was the most important cause of dropout. It was followed by educational and miscellaneous causes respectively.

Under each broad categorical causes the first five most important causes of the forty were sorted out. They were; (a) poverty and economic backwardness of the family; (b) involvement in various domestic works like cultivation, weaving, rearing cattle, fishing, looking after youngsters etcetera; (c) lack of interest in education; (d) parents needed them to supplement family income and (e) bad communication specially during summer.

Each of the first five most important causes under each broad category in order of importance were graded as follows:

1. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES:

The first five most important causes of dropout
under socio-economic category according to the common rank order were :-

a) Poverty and economic backwardness of the family.
b) Involvement in various domestic works like cultivation, weaving, rearing cattle, fishing, cooking, looking after youngsters etcetera.
c) Parents needed them to supplement family income.
d) Indifference and lack of consciousness of the parents and guardians towards education.
e) Ignorance and low educational status of the family.

2. EDUCATIONAL CAUSES:

The first five most important causes of dropout under educational cause according to the common rank order were :-

a) Lack of interest in education.
b) Irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers.
c) Repeated failure in the examination.
d) Residing in rented house with great difficulties.
e) Caught while copying in the examination.
3. MISCELLANEOUS CAUSES:

The first five most important causes of dropout under miscellaneous category according to the common rank order were:

a) Bad communication specially during summer,
b) Natural calamities like flood, storm, erosion, epidemic etcetera.
c) Lack of adjustment of school and college hours and vacations according to local needs,
d) Mixing up with bad company,
e) Physical handicapness, frequent illness and poor health of the students.

The first five most important causes of dropout under each broad category as perceived by each group of judges were dealt here separately as it would provide basis to examine the variation in the general trend of opinions among the group of judges.

The first five most important causes of dropout as given by the Head Teachers under each category were graded in order of importance as follows:-
a) **SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES:**

1. Poverty and economic backwardness of the family \((SE_1)\).

2. Involvement in various domestic works like agriculture, looking after youngsters, rearing cattle etcetera \((SE_2)\).

3. Parents needed them to supplement family income \((SE_5)\).

4. Educational programmes and curricular did not meet the individual needs \((SE_{13})\).

5. Indifference and lack of consciousness of parents and guardians towards education \((SE_7)\).

b) **EDUCATIONAL CAUSES:**

1. Lack of interest in education \((E_6)\).

2. Irregular attendance and long absence of students \((E_{14})\).

3. Irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers \((E_8)\).

4. Defective system of examination having liberalised promotion rules \((E_1)\).

5. Selecting wrong subject combination due to limited scope \((E_{12})\).
MISCELLANEOUS CAUSES:

Had communication ($M_4$).

Physical handicapness, illness and poor health of the students ($M_3$).

Natural calamities like flood, storm etcetera ($M_1$).

Continuous sickness of parents ($M_6$).

Overage in the class ($M_{36}$).

The first five most important causes of dropout by the Inspecting Officers graded in order of stance under each category were as follows:

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES:

Involvement in various domestic works like cultivation, rearing cattle etcetera ($SE_2$).

Poverty and economic backwardness of the family ($SE_1$).

Lack of adjustment in schools, college hours vacations according to local need ($SE_9$).

Parents needed them to supplement family income ($SE_5$).
5. Ignorance and low educational status of the family ($SE_4$).

B. EDUCATIONAL CAUSES:

1. Irregular attendance and frequent absence of Teachers ($E_5$).
2. Repeated failure in the examination ($E_2$).
3. Caught while copying in the examination ($E_3$).
4. Selecting wrong subject combination due to limited scope ($E_{12}$).

5. Teachers indifference towards their profession ($E_7$) and unkind and incompetent teachers giving harsh punishment to the students ($E_8$).

C. MISCELLANEOUS CAUSES:

1. Bad communication specially during summer ($M_4$).
2. Natural calamities like flood, epidemic etcetera ($M_1$).
3. Mixing with bad companions ($M_5$) and continuous sickness of parents ($M_6$).
The first five most important causes of dropout as given by the local Educationists under each category were graded in order of importance as follows:

a) **SOCIO-ECONOMIC CAUSES:**

1. Poverty and economic backwardness of the family \( (SE_1) \).
2. Ignorance and low educational status of the family \( (SE_4) \).
3. Involvement in domestic works like agriculture, weaving, rearing cattle etcetera \( (SE_2) \).
4. Parents needed them to supplement family income \( (SE_5) \).
5. Indifference and lack consciousness towards education \( (SE_7) \).

b) **EDUCATIONAL CAUSES:**

1. Large number of untrained, unqualified and inexperienced Teachers \( (E_7) \).
2. Repeated failure in the examination \( (E_2) \).
3. Lack of interest in education \( (E_6) \).
4. Irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers \( (E_5) \).
5. Caught while copying in the examination \( (E_3) \).
c) MISCELLANEOUS CAUSES:

1. Natural calamities like flood, epidemic etcetera 
   \((M_1)\).
2. Bad communication \((M_4)\).
3. Mixing with bad companion \((M_5)\).
4. Physical handicapness, frequent illness and poor health of the student \((M_3)\).
5. Absence of teacher-parent relationship \((M_2)\).

The causes present in common within the five most important ones under each broad category perceived by the three sets of judges were:

Among the socio-economic causes three causes were found common as perceived by the three sets of judges. The causes were (i) poverty and economic backwardness of the family, (ii) Involvement in various domestic works like agriculture, weaving, looking after youngsters, fishing, rearing cattle etcetera and (iii) parents needed them to supplement family income.

Among the educational causes only one cause was found common as perceived by the three sets of judges. The
cause was irregular attendance and frequent absence of teachers.

Among the miscellaneous causes two causes were found common under three sets of judges. The causes were (i) natural calamities like flood, storm, epidemic etcetera and (ii) bad communication specially during summer.