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REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Barriers to Education:

There are several reasons for the low levels of literacy in India, not the least of which is the high level of poverty. Over one-third of the population is estimated to be living below the poverty line (The World Bank, 1997a). Although school attendance is free, the costs of books, uniforms, and transportation to school can be too much for poor families. Poor families are also more likely to keep girls at home to care for younger siblings or to work in family enterprises. If a family has to choose between educating a son or a daughter because of financial restrictions, typically the son will be chosen. Negative parental attitudes toward educating daughters can also be a barrier to a girl's education. Many parents view educating sons as an investment because the sons will be responsible for caring for aging parents. On the other hand, parents may see the education of daughters a waste of money because daughters will eventually live with their husbands’ families, and the parents will not benefit directly from their education. Also, daughters
with higher levels of education will likely have higher dowry expenses as they will want a comparably educated husband. However, education sometimes lowers the dowry for a girl because it is viewed as an asset by the husband’s family.

**Inadequate School Facilities:**

Another barrier to education in India is the lack of adequate school facilities. Many states simply do not have enough class rooms to accommodate all of the school-age children. Furthermore, the classrooms that are available often lack basic necessities such as sanitary facilities or water. In Uttar Pradesh, a recent survey found that 54 percent of schools did not have a water supply and 80 percent did not have latrines (The World Bank, 1997b). Lack of latrines can be particularly detrimental to girls’ school attendance. In some states, the inadequate supply of classrooms is further compounded by the large increase in the number of school-age children due to high population growth rates. For instance, in 1993, Uttar Pradesh needed to build 284,000 additional classrooms to achieve full enrollment of children age 6 to 10 (The World Bank, 1997b). The need for new classrooms will persist as the population continues to grow. On the other hand, in states where population growth rates are
low (e.g., Kerala), the number of primary-age children is beginning to decline and state governments can focus on improving the quality of education rather than increasing the supply of classrooms.

**India Has a Shortage of Female Teachers:**

Lack of female teachers is another potential barrier to girls' education. Girls are more likely to attend school and have higher academic achievement if they have female teachers. This is particularly true in highly gender-segregated societies such as India (Bellew and King, 1993; King, 1990). Currently, women account for only 29 percent of teachers at the primary level (MHRD, 1993). The proportion of teachers who are female is even lower at the university level, 22 percent of instructors (CSO, 1992). These proportions reflect the historic paucity of women with the educational qualifications to be teachers. However, the proportions are likely to change in the future as women currently account for nearly half of those being trained as teachers. Again there are differences among the states; the states with the highest literacy rates are also the states with the highest proportion of female teachers.
Gender Bias in Curriculum Still Exists:

As long ago as 1965, the Indian government agreed to rewrite text books so that men and women would not be portrayed in gender stereotype droles. However, a study of Indian textbooks done in the 1980s found that men were the main characters in the majority of lessons. In these lessons, men held high-prestige occupations and were portrayed as strong, adventurous, and intelligent. In contrast, when women were included they were depicted as weak and helpless, often as the victims of abuse and beatings (Kalia, 1988). These depictions are strong barriers for improving women's position in society. The most widely held belief regarding India's poor educational status relates the demand for education with the poor economic status of parents. Is the relationship between poverty and schooling as simple and unambiguous as claimed? Is poverty the main determinant of parental decisions regarding the schooling of children. What is the relative importance of opportunity costs and direct costs in schooling decisions. A look at some basic facts immediately highlights ambiguities in the presumed relationship between poverty and schooling. Several third world countries, for instance, have similar or even worse levels of poverty but much better records of mass literacy than India. Within India itself a
comparison of the poverty levels and educational achievements of say, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh also defies the claim that it is merely poverty that prevents the poor from sending their children to school. While poverty levels, as measured by the proportion of people below the poverty line, are similar in both states (e.g. 44 per cent and 45 per cent in rural and urban Kerala in 1987-88, respectively, compared with 48 per cent and 42 percent in rural and UP) educational achievement in the two states are vastly different. Kerala has an average literacy rate (7+age group) of nearly 90 per cent whereas in Uttar Pradesh the same figure is only 40.5 per cent. Furthermore, even within Uttar Pradesh, while western UP has seen a greater increase in rural incomes (relative to its eastern counterpart) this prosperity has not resulted in a corresponding increase in literacy and education (Dreze and Gazdar 1996). Thus, poverty is a highly inadequate explanation of regional variations in educational achievements. There is also a fair amount of anecdotal evidence that points to the same ambiguities. Kodathuchery, a harijan village in Tamilnadu is a particularly noteworthy example (Narayan et al 1984). Despite the very poor economic conditions of the population—almost complete landless and practically no other employment opportunities—the village had achieved literacy rates of above 99 per cent for males and females in 1980. The experiences of ILO's international
programme on elimination of child labour (IPEC) has also shown that, even among the most impoverished families, parents are quite willing to send their children to school provided the schools function adequately (ILO 1994). The MV Foundation in Andhra Pradesh working with bonded labour has had similar experience (Sinha 1995).

However, this is not to deny that poverty or low income often play a role in low schooling levels. In general, poorer countries or poorer sections of the population in the same country are more likely to be found with poorer educational records. Against this general proposition, which indicates that poverty can be a potential constraint on the demand for schooling, there are notable exceptions both among countries and within India as already pointed out. These exceptions point to the fact that the poverty constraint can be alleviated or defeated by appropriate intervention most notably by improving the provision of basic education.

A major practical difficulty in investigating schooling in relation to the rural socio-economic context is that unlike the urban and industrialized sectors, incomes in the rural sector remain largely non-monetised.
Very often when studies do consider the rural socio-economic status they are satisfied with matching the achievement levels of children belonging to various categories of castes, such as scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, backward castes, general category, etc. Size of landholding is another major indicator of rural socio-economic status, though it has not been given much attention in educational research. While the categories scheduled caste and scheduled tribe as well as size of landholding do have an immense importance in the rural context, a simple clubbing of children from these categories across geographical regions may be of little use. The pattern as well as the rigidity and importance of the caste hierarchy among various communities varies from one region to another. Therefore, caste tribe and size of landholding are categories that need to be handled with care. In other words, along with the traditional hierarchy, a new hierarchy along the ‘development or modern’ dimension has emerged and is continuously emerging in the rural countryside. This hierarchy is often neglected in educational research, though education of rural children is a critical and integral part of it. The changing rural socio-economic context does not lend itself easily to urban categories like income in terms of money and profession of parents and is not adequately understood in terms of traditional categories like caste and landholding either.
The need for a detailed and thorough understanding of the socio-economic context vis-à-vis schools is obviously in order. Some studies (not necessarily about elementary education) have looked at the relation of achievement to variables related to the immediate home environment such as family size, birth order, parental support and working mothers (Balasubramanian 1997).

Among the field based studies Sajitha Bashir’s (1994) study on schooling in Tamil Nadu makes a significant contribution. The author found that unpaid household work is the most common and regular form of child labour taking up about 1-2 hours a day. Evidence of the time use pattern of work among children was done by Shireen Jejeebhoy and Sumati Kulkarni (1989) in rural Maharashtra. They found that “while a large proportion of children do help out, not much time is devoted to these activities” (Jejeebhoy and Kulkarni 1989:110). In a study of rural Karnataka, Ramesh Kanbargi, and PM Kulkarni found that “working for wages is significant among children in 12-14 age group” (Kanbargi and Kulkarni 1991:137). While boys in the 5-7 age group could be found working for about two hours per day on various activities, in the older age group of 12-14 years, they worked for more than five hours a day. BM Dinesh (1988) who has studied three villages in Karnataka, also
reports similar results. He found that on average, 6-14 year old children spent 3.2 hours a day on "household activities".

Jeemol Unni baswed on her study in Gujarat, concludes that "the overall work participation of children is not very high, 8 per cent among boys and 9.4 per cent among girls. (Unni 1996:8). A study by V Ramachandran in a relatively progressive pocket' of Tamil nadu also supports the hypothesis that children contribute very little time in the household or agricultural economy. He found that while child workers constitute 10 per cent of the work force, the actual work done by them conswstituted only 2 per cent of total labour time deployed in agricultural and non-agricultural activity (Ramachandran 1990:135). In a recent study conducted under the auspices of the UNDP research programme for human development, Srivastava foundm, in two districts of Uttar Pradesh (Ballia and Rampur), that "the problem of children's involvement in paid / unpaid work is much more significant for older children (10-14 years) and for girls (generally unpaid domestic work)” (Srivatsava 1997:36).

An important part of domestic work that is often cited as effecting enrolment is the burden of dependents, especially younger
siblings, passed on to the children. Using three different variables to measure the burden of dependants, Srivatsava has found that in fact they do not show any systematic relationship between total or even female enrolment rates (Srivatsava 1997:18).

A similar study by Majumdar in Kanyakumari, Tamil nadu, also shows that work participation rate among the children of this category (5-14 year old) is not very high. In a footnote she states that interestingly, despite the absence of mandatory schooling laws, the opportunity costs of child's time is not a major factor deterring their school attendance at this age level" (Majumdar 1997:11). Child Labour poverty and land ownership; Kanbargi and Kulkarni (1991) have(222,16),(793,956) pointed out that ownership of productive assets generally increases the demand for child work.

Jabbi and Rajyalakshmi (1997) found in Bihar that children of parents employed in service jobs were most likely to be enrolled in school, followed by children of cultivators. Non agricultural workers children were least likely to be enrolled, although those of agricultural workers had only marginally better enrolment rates.
Jeemol Unni found in Gujarat that "a higher proportion of children from predominantly non-agricultural households attended schools as compared with those from agricultural households" (Unni 1996:6). She also found that the "proxy for wealth (value of assets) and composition of household income did not influence boys schooling but had a positive impact on education of girls" (Unni 1996:15). For children taken together it does not show a positive relationship at all, implying that poverty by itself does not have a major impact on schooling.

A study in Uttar Pradesh by the Giri Institute of Development Studies (Asraf 1989) also found that dropouts do not bear a clear relationship with per capita income levels of the household.

Majumdar’s study of Kanyakumari district in Tamil Nadu shows that “almost all the never-enrolled come from households with marginal land holdings. Among households with land, it notes, “there is a positive, though weak, relationship between land size and educational participation of children” (Majumdar 1997:13).

A compilation of field reports from Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan by Sinha and Sinha (1995) provides
insights into the state of the education system in some of the more remote and poorer parts of the country. They found that in several villages despite high levels of poverty there was practically no dependence on child labour. One such village was Kanji in Purnia (Bihar), where even the poorest scheduled caste community, the musahars, were found not to put their children to work. Interestingly, they did not send them to school either. In Salana and Saikot villages of Chamoli district (UP), on the other hand, while no child labour was reported, almost all the children were enrolled. They conclude that the “dependence on child labour varies a great deal between different villages, even at similar levels of poverty depending on the nature of the local economy” (Sinha and Sinha 1995:9).

Several studies support the notion that dropout tends to be heavily concentrated in grades 1 and 2. Seethuraman and Usha Devi (1985) found that 35 percent of children in Karnataka dropped out in grades 1 and 2. Also in Karnataka, Nayan Tara (1985) reports a dropout rate of 31 per cent in grade 1.

The role of direct schooling costs as cause of non-enrolment has been emphasized by Mehrotra’s study, cited earlier. The author’s
research in Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala shows that often it is the “inability to meet direct costs (which includes fees, cost of textbooks and other writing materials, etc.) which compels parents to withdraw children from school” (Mehrotra 1995:6).

Several other studies also highlight the importance of direct schooling costs. The report by Sinha and Sinha (1995) has information from 17 schools on direct costs of education. In these schools, they found that the annual cost could be anywhere between RS.90 and RS.380. According to a study by the Madras Institute of Development studies (1970-71) private costs (on books, stationary etc.) could add up to 40 per cent of institutional costs. Bhagwati (1973) also found that direct costs, more than income foregone by attending school, were stated as a significant factor in schooling decisions.

Tilak using NSSO (1986-87, 42nd Round data on ‘participation in Education’, reports the following: 1. a sizeable number of students do not receive primary education free in contrast to the claims made by the government. 2. A large number of students pay tuition fees, exam fees and other fees, even in government primary schools” (Tilak 1995:57). Specifically, Tilak claims that 14.4 per cent in
urban areas pay tuition fees in addition to other fees and non-fee expenses. In conclusion, he states that “households spend large sums of money on acquiring primary education” (Tilak 1995:57).

A study Panchmukhi (1990) in Maharastra, Karnataka and Rajastan, also shows that household expenditure on elementary education even in government schools is not negligible. Panchmukhi has found that these expenditures could range from Rs.385 per student per year in Maharastra, and Rs.810 in Rajastan to nearly Rs.1,200 in Karnataka. Of this total expenditure the corresponding figures for fees were found to be up to Rs.60, Rs.244 and Rs.320, respectively.

The studies done under the UNDP-GOI research programme also provide evidence of the fact that the direct costs of schooling even at the primary level, often add up to substantial amounts imposing a burden on poor families especially if there is more than one school going child in the family.

Quality of Primary education as a cause of educational deprivation.
Sadly, there is overwhelming evidence that only a small proportion of schools in India meet these very basic requirements. According to the fifth all India education survey for instance, 1. barely half of all primary schools in India have a pucca building 2. 42 per cent have a single classroom (if any), 3. just over half have a usable blackboard, 4. less than half have any drinking water facilities, 5. only 16 per cent have urinals, 6. more than 60 per cent have only one or two teacher in position (if any), and only 15 per cent have more than four teachers.

Teacher motivation and accountability:

Dreze and Gazdar’s study describes the problems of chronic teacher absenteeism in Uttar Pradesh. They found in their sample of schools that the teachers were present only 30 per cent of the time they were required to. In several instances they found that the school had been closed without prior notice “because the teachers had decided to engage in some other activity” (Dreze and Gazdar 1996:67).

The most alarming fact noted by the authors is that according to local perceptions “teaching standards in government
schools have significantly deteriorated during the last 2-3 decades. The extent of teacher absenteeism and shirking has dramatically increased over this period and shows no sign of improvement.” (Dreze and Gazdar 1996:75).

HOME & HABITATION ENVIRONMENT:

Home Environment:

A few well known earlier studies stress that “Parental attitudes” makes the difference rather than the material deprivation. For instance, Wiseman (1957) reports that “the most important of our findings is the demonstration that the major forces associated with educational attainments are to be found within the home circumstances of the child. The educational deprivation is not merely the effect of poverty. Parental attitude and care is more important than the level of material needs. What matters is the attitude of parents to books and school.

Similarly, the well known Plowden report (1957) in England on Children and their Primary Schools finds that “More of the variations in school achievements is specifically accounted by the variation in
parental attitudes than by either variation in the material circumstances of parents or by variation in schools; and secondly, the relative importance the child grows older.

Duraiswamy in his study in south India also shows that "mother's education has a bigger effect on the probability of child enrolment in rural areas" (Duraiswamy 1992:21); while both parents' education has a bigger effect on daughter's schooling than on son's.

A crucial role in determining motivation is played by gender. The difference in educational attainment that is found between educational motivation is highly gender-specific.

While economists suggest that differential market returns to educational investment in girls and boys are important determinants of parental decisions regarding schooling, sociologists argue that social considerations such as perceptions of gender roles (implicit in the sexual division of labor) and son preference (biased intra-household allocation of resources) have led to educational discrimination against the female child. The perceived difference in benefits for boys and girls (no doubt a
combination of both economic and non-economic factors) has obviously led to an under-valuation of female education.

Evidence of the time use pattern of work among children was done by Shireen Jejeebhoy and Sumati Kulkarni (1989) in rural Maharashtra. They found that “while a large proportion of children do help out, not much time is devoted to these activities” (Jejeebhoy and Kulkarni 1989:110).

An important part of domestic work that is often cited as effecting enrolment is the burden of dependents, especially younger siblings, passed on to the children. Using three different variables to measure the burden of dependants, Srivastava has found that in fact they do not show any systematic relationship between total or even female enrolment rates (Srivastava 1997:18).

A similar study by Majumdar in Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu, also shows that.. Work participation rate among the children of this category (5-14 years old) is not very high.” In a footnote she states that “interestingly, despite the absence of mandatory schooling laws, the
opportunity costs of child's time is not a major factor deterring their school attendance at this age level” (Majumdar 1997:11).

**HABITATE ENVIRONMENT:**

Area type, can be seen as a kind of level of economic development or modernization. Easily observable and tangible factors like presence or absence of road connectivity, available printed matter, market (no. Shops etc) presence of government and other institutions characterize area type. Percentage of irrigation, agricultural productivity and may more variables also can be associated additionally to characterise area type. But development or existence of basic rural infrastructure is a major characteristic of area type. The significance of the area type for effective schooling indicates that the rural socio-economic context can not be understood adequately in terms of traditional categories (Rashmi Sharma 1998).

Distance of schools from home is observed to be influencing school participation. Schools within the locality or village would attract greater participation.
Based on the findings a national study conducted in 44 districts with low levels of female education, Usha Nayar concluded that smaller villages were particularly dis-privileged as they lacked minimum educational facilities and infrastructures such as roads, water and electricity which actual as deterrents for education, particularly girl education (Nayar 19940).

The distance factor: Duraisamy (1992) found in his empirical study using NSS (1987-88) data for Tamil Nadu, that an increase in distance to primary school by one kilometer reduces the probability that a daughter will attend school by 2 percent. For boys the reduction in probability of attending is 1 percent.

Dreze and Gazdar (1996) in their study of UP found that parents are reluctant to send girls outside the village to study in middle or secondary schools, or to pay the higher fees of private schools, which typically are middle or secondary schools and often situated outside the village or at least a greater distance.
EDUCATION, MOBILITY AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY:

The formal education system has been regarded as vital for occupational mobility. Accordingly, Sociologists of education and others in related filed have over the years examined the nature of the relationship between mobility and education (Acker 1980; K. Ahemed 1979; Beuls 1971; Cosina 1972; K Chanana 1988; Dahrendorf 1959; Davis K and WE Moore 1945; Douglas 1964; Gore, Deasi, Chitnis 1967; Halsey Floud and Anderson 1961; Karlekar 1983; Shukla & Krishna Kumar 1985; and others). Their work proved that the relationship between education and mobility could not be studied in isolation; it was dependent on a range of social economic and factual factors. In recent years there has been a move to study these factors which effect a childs educability (Karlekar1998).

In the 1950s, the work of British social scientist (Dahrendorf 1959, Donglas 1964, Floud Malin and Halsey 1963, Jackson & Marsden 1963) indicated that the working class child was disadvantaged in relation to its middle class peers; environmental and socio-economic factors determined the child ability to adjust to a largely middle class school ethos. Their findings were substantial by James Coleman et al.
(1960) whose Equality of Educational Opportunity survey came to the conclusion that family background differences account for more variation in achievement than do school differences.

**Education & Economic Development:**

Education in India has been recognized, as the key input to development, yet the growth of education has been inadequate and largely centred in and around urban areas. The earlier attempts to study the economic aspects of education have also been confined to urban areas with scanty reference to rural areas and to issues like crude assessment of the stock of human capital and returns to education. Some major studies include Sahota (1962); Nalla Goundan (1965); Harberger (1965); Kothari (1967); Husain (1967); Selowsky (1967); Blaug, Layard and Woodhall (1969); Husain (1967); Selowsky (1967); Balug, Layard and Woodhall (1969); Psacharopoulos (1969, 1973, 1975), Paul (1972), Pandit (1972); Goel (1975); Tilak (1980, 1982, 1984); Venkatasubramanian (1980). Most of these studies are based on secondary data complied for other purposes. For instance Pandit, Nalla Goundan, Goel, Blaug et al used the Urban Income Survey of the National Council of Applied Economic Research. Husain used the data from the Directorate General of Employment and Training Service, Kothari and Panchamukhi used City
Survey of Greater Bombay. Most of these studies have been confined to male workers.

In the rural context pioneering work was done by Chaudhri (1968, 1980), but his study was confined to workers only and covered limited aspects of the economics of education, i.e., returns to education and impact of education on agricultural productivity and related attitudinal behaviour. Venkatasubramanian (1980) tried to estimate economic contribution of primary education limiting the analysis to crude aggregates only. Tilak (1980, 1982 & 1984) made a bold attempt on measuring inequality in education by estimating returns to education by sex, caste groups in rural and urban areas. However, his study does not cover other aspects of the economics of education.

As an exercise in expediency most of these studies have been confined to macro aspects in urban setting and unfortunately the crucial micro aspects and rural context have remained neglected. The studies have often yielded misleading pictures of the intricate inter-relationship between education and economic indicators.
Secondary education has been discussed widely in recent development literature and its potential for furthering economic development and redistribution by empowering deprived communities has been highlighted (G. Drez and Sen 1995, Haq 1997, World Bank 1977a, 1977b). In this context education has often been viewed as input into the economic development basket like capital and labor, that affects output. Quality of schooling and school effectiveness are only just beginning to find their due place. (Drez and Gazdar 1996 Beshir 1994.

**Socio-economic context:**

Indian educationists find it difficult to ignore the socio-economic context.

Karuna Chanan (1991) points out that the major concern has been up till now the study of the socio-economic background of the SC/ST and Non SC/ST students and its influence on their access to educational institutions.

She further observes that a shift has taken place from broad general surveys of the earlier period to the study of several specific, social context factors such as cognitive and other psychological
dimensions, family size, parental values, aspirations etc. that influence students access to education.

Thus, a vast literature has been built around the relation of social stratification with the educational system and the resulting inequalities of educational opportunities, differential utilization of educational facilities, drop-out rates, aspirations, achievements etc. However, by and large the general focus was mainly on SC, ST; and the girl child; and a scarce attention towards backward caste community (Non SC, ST). As such there were no mention worthy studies specifically on Backward Caste Communities; and this is particularly true with regard to basic education of Backward Caste Communities in rural areas of Andhra Pradesh.

However, insights can be drawn from the studies, which relate to socio-economic status or social class background variables. Shah (1979) Patel & Sewell; Singh, Pandey (1979); Bisht (1979); Singh & Mitra (1972); and others come to the conclusion that the students educational aspirations depend on the socio-economic status of their families much more than on their academic performance.
Deasi, IP, (1953) reported that lower class (caste) students are more irregular in attending the school than middle and upper class (caste) status. Shah BV & Shah KB (1998) observed that in the Indian context the material deprivation of the family has been the sole determining factor in producing under achievement in case of the lowest of the low class living below the poverty line such as unemployed rural labourers, SC, ST and other backward social groups, slum dwellers.

In the Indian context socio-economic factors seem to have a heavy bearing on schooling the child, particularly the girl child. Malavika Karlekar (2000) observed that socio-economic factors such as parental illiteracy, costs of education and the vital role of the girl child within the home overrode considerations of accessibility of school.

Socio-economic factors such as parental illiteracy, costs of education, role of child within home, influence school participation and some times override considerations of accessibility of school (Karlekar: 2000).