INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most important factors to shape the personality of an individual. It is the potent source of material and human development. Especially the 'Secondary Education' is an indispensable passport to life upon which depends the quality to further education and life. All committees and commissions on education at state, National and International level have stressed upon the role of education in the well being of individual and society at large. India at present is on the fast track of globalization. The decade of nineties have experienced the liberalization of the most of economic activity. In the new millennium, we have already initiated second generation changes in our economic policies. A shift from government sector to private sector is gaining momentum day by day. So, in the field of education also, private sector seems to flourish due to its inputs (quality) as perceived by most of the parents. Secondary education is of paramount significance for the individual as well as for national development. As such it is an area of major concern in India. Though secondary education, at present is a priority sector in education, this sector has remained neglected in educational research. Especially the area of school inputs in relation to other variables like Socio-Economic-Status (S-E-S), class size and achievements have not been researched upon extensively in India. A good number of empirical studies in developed countries have been conducted at secondary
stage. But in India except for a few studies, make a comparative analysis of achievement directly between government and private schools. At present, there is a general trend of private schools both in urban and rural areas in the country. At the same time, there is a quality of research activity at the secondary stage of education in this new scenario in the whole country and particularly in Maharashtra. In Maharashtra a number of studies have been conducted on variables that affect academic achievement like intelligence, creativity, Socio-Economic-Status (S-E-S), teacher, evaluation techniques, use of educational technology and giftedness etc. But the question of school inputs has not been resolved upon neither in the above nor with other variables like class size, S-E-S, achievement etc. only one comparative study between Private and Government school was conducted by Geeta (1994)\(^1\) private unaided junior school were significantly more cost effective either than Government & private aided junior schools. The studies conducted on school inputs, class size and S-E-S as correlates of academic achievements, either in India or outside is mostly based on survey reports. Besides, in the contemporary educational research, there exists a lack of research activity regarding involvement of private school education especially at secondary stage. In the backdrop the investigator, observing such a lack of educational research at secondary stage of education in view of felt need and found solid reasons to conduct. Study that will attempt to give a clear picture, about the comparative status of private and government schools with respect to achievement, school inputs and S-E-S of the parents attracts serious attraction in present study. In a modern world based on science and technology it is secondary education which is being considered as the
minimum level of attainment for the survival of the people. It leads to the several middle level jobs and pre job training course and self employment.

Furthermore it explores students to the contribution in the field of science and humanities, to the development of the nation and provides them an opportunity to understand their constitutional duties and responsibilities. Secondary education is more valuable and immense importance in a country with a large number of villages and rural population because of its terminal and transactional nature and rapid urbanization it is a platform to foster and to develop economic and societal growth. The strategic importance of the secondary education stage is well organized in the most of the developing countries. Many developed countries have made an effort to provide free and compulsory education up to the age of 16.

According to Tilak B.G (1995) in India, secondary and senior secondary levels of education have growth at an unequal pace from 25.85% to 52.11% during 1986 to 1993. This has influenced the demands for tertiary and higher education. in present scenario secondary education should not be viewed as a mere extension of secondary education rather, it should be perceived as the preparation of adolescent as a better human resource, capable of contributing to economic, social and national development.

Education is the process of developing the capacities and potentials of the individuals as to prepare that individual to be successful in a specific society or culture. From this perspective, education is serving primarily as an individual development function. Education begins at birth and continues throughout life. It is constant and ongoing. Schooling generally begins somewhere between the ages four and six when children are gathered
together for the purpose of specific guidance related to skills and competencies that society deems important. In the past, once the formal, primary and secondary schooling was completed the process was finished. However, in today’s information age, adults are quite often learning in informal setting throughout their working lives and even into retirement.

Education in its broadest sense may be defined as a process designed to inculcate the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to enable individuals to cope up effectively with their environment. Its primary purpose is to foster and promote the fullest individual self realization for all people. Achieving this goal requires understanding of commitment to the proposition that education is a primary instrument for social and economic advancement of human welfare (Verma 1990).3

The world is becoming more and more competitive. Quality of performance has become the key factor for personal progress. Parents desire that their children climb the ladder of performance to as high a level as possible. This desire for high level of achievement puts a lot of pressure on students, teachers, and school and in general the education system itself. In fact, it appears as if the whole system of education revolves around the academic achievement of students, though various other outcomes are also expected from the system. Thus a lot of time and effort of the schools are used for helping students to achieve better in their scholastic endeavors. The importance of scholastic and academic achievement has raised important questions for educational researchers. How far the different factors contribute towards academic achievement? (Ramaswamy 1990).4
Education in its largest sense is any act or experience that has a formative effect on mind, character and physical ability of an individual. In its technical sense, education is a process by which society deliberately transmits its accumulated knowledge, skills and values from one generation to another. Etymologically, the word education is derived from educare “bring up”, which is related to educere “bring out”, “bring forth what is within”, “bring out potential” and ducere, “to lead”.

Teachers in educational institutions direct the education of students and might draw on many subjects, including reading, writing, mathematics, science and history. This process is sometimes called schooling when referring to the education of teaching only a certain subject, usually as professors at institutions of higher learning. There is also education in fields for those who want specific vocational skills, such as those required to be a pilot. In addition there is an array of education possible at the informal level, such as in museums and libraries, with the Internet and in life experience. Many non-traditional education options are now available and continue to evolve.

A right to education has been created and recognized by some jurisdictions: since 1952, Article 2 of the first Protocol to the European Convention \(^5\) on Human Rights obliges all signatory parties to guarantee the right to education. At world level, the United Nations’ International Convention \(^6\) on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 1966 guarantees this right under its Article 13.
School is a Place where students get together, share instructions and social infrastructures, which is fundamental to shaping their interests attitudes and, habits. Many activities in the classroom have an influence on the pupils and are like hidden curriculum. These are instrumental for personality development. The classroom climate is therefore an important input into the building of an effective learning environment responsive to the needs of the individual can result in positive motivational consequences. On the contrary negative motivational consequences will result if the environment is not facilitative (Das Swarnlata, 1996; Eccles, Midgley, Wigfield, et al. 1993; Chen, 2005; Brock, Nishida, Chiong, Grimm, Rimm-Kaufman, 2008).

The performance of students in any academic task has always been of special interest to educators, parents and society at large. The primary concern of any educator who is entrusted with the responsibility of selecting students for any advance training programme in a given field is the ability to underestimate as accurately and as early as possible the probability that such candidates will succeed or fail.

Secondary education is the stage of education following primary school. Secondary education is generally the final stage of compulsory education. However, secondary education in some countries includes a period of compulsory and a period of non-compulsory education. The next stage of Education is College or university. Secondary education is characterized by transition typically compulsory, comprehensive primary education for minors to the optional, selective tertiary, “post secondary”, or ‘higher” education (e.g. university, vocational school) for adults. Depending
on the system, schools for this period or a part of it may be called secondary schools, high schools, gymnasia, lyceums, middle schools, colleges, vocational schools and preparatory schools, and the exact meaning of any of this varies between the systems. Secondary education service as a bridge between elementary and higher education and prepares young person between the age group of 14-18 for entry into higher education.

The population of children in the 14-18 age group (the age for secondary and senior secondary level education) has been estimated a 96.6 million, as projected by the national sample survey organization in 1996-97\(^\text{11}\). However, enrollment figures show that only 27 million children were attending secondary schools, which means that two thirds of the eligible population remains out of the secondary school system.

The number of secondary schools in India increased from 7,416 in 1950-51 to 1,16,820 in 1999-2000. However, this number is not adequate to accommodate the out-of school children and the growing number of upper primary school pass outs. The impact on recent initiatives under taken for the universalization of elementary education is resulting in an increased demand for the expansion of secondary education.

There has been no fundamental change in the structure and organization of the secondary and higher secondary education system during the ninth plan period since the initiation of the national policy on education (NPE), 1986\(^\text{12}\). In the wake of the policy, several centrally-sponsored schemes were launched and national level institutions for school education were established/ strengthened. Ten centrally-sponsored schemes are in
operation in the secondary education sector. The experience of the implementation of the programmes as well as various revives and evaluation studies have highlighted the need to modify and strengthen these schemes. Against a budgetary allocation of Rs 2,603.49 crore for the sector in ninth plan, the expenditure incurred has been to the tune of Rs 2,322.68 crore.

The focus on the ninth plan was on reducing disparities, renewal of curriculum with emphasis on vocationalization and employment oriented courses, expansion and diversification of the open learning system, reorganization of teacher training and the greater use of information and communication technology. Hostel facilities for girls, integrated education for the disabled, free education for girls etc. have also received attention. During this period the various central institutes/organizations like national council of educational research and training (NCERT), National open school (NOS), Kendriya Vidyalayas and Navodaya Vidyalayas were further strengthened. In most contemporary educational systems of the world, secondary education comprises the formal educational systems of the world; secondary education comprises the formal education that occurs during adolescence. It is characterized by transition from the typically compulsory, comprehensive primary education for minors, to the optional, selective tertiary, “post-secondary”, or “higher” education (e.g., university, vocational school for adults. Depending on the system, schools for this period, or a part of it, may be called secondary or high schools, gymnasiums, lyceums, middle schools, colleges, or vocational schools. The exact meaning of any of these terms varies from one system to another. The exact boundary between primary and secondary education also varies from country to country and
even within them, but is generally around the seventh to the tenth year of schooling. Secondary education occurs mainly during the teenage years. In the United States, Canada and Australia primary and secondary education together are sometimes referred to as K-12 education, and in New Zealand year 1-13 is used. The purpose of secondary education can be to give common knowledge, to prepare for higher education or to train directly in a profession.

Secondary Education Commission\textsuperscript{13} made valuable suggestions for the improvement and re-organization of secondary education and recommended the diversification of courses to meet varying aptitudes, interests and talents of the learners.

The different states of India, therefore, introduced diversified courses at the secondary stage of education. The education commission recommended introduction of uniform structure of school and college education throughout the country. It also pointed out that secondary education is a complete unit by itself and that at the end of this stage the student should be in a position to, if he wishes, take up some useful vocation.

Prior to the implementation of 10+2+3 scheme of school and college education, diversification of courses started from class IX i.e. approximately at the age of 14+. The students at this age are not mature enough to take such as important decision. Moreover, their talents and aptitudes are not likely to have crystallized fully at this age to enable them to take a judicious decision in this regard. In this regard, kulshrestha\textsuperscript{14} stated
that the enlarged curriculum might create confusion in the mind of an immature child studying in class VIII, who is still young. Regarding the scheme of diversification of courses, education commission stated that one of the major weaknesses in the scheme is that specialization of studies begins too early. The streaming of pupils in this way is undesirable. The commission further suggested the secondary schools should admit the best students. At the higher secondary stage, the selections for admission have to be more rigorous. It is, therefore, imperative that only those students should be admitted to science stream that posses the cognitive, affective and other characteristics necessary for success at this stage. And attempt was made by British journal of educational psychology to organize a number of symposia for discussing the importance and procedure of selection of studies for admission to different streams of secondary education. A number of eminent psychologists and educationists participated in the deliberations and contributed research studies in that regard. The general agreement is that streaming and diversification of courses should be introduced at the age of 16+, when students have acquired necessary general education at least for 10 years.

The emergence of secondary education in the united states did not happen until 1910, caused by the rise in big business and technological advances in factories (for instance, the emergence of electrification), that required skilled workers. In order to meet this new job demand, high schools were created and the curriculum focused on practical job skills that would better prepare students for white collar or skilled blue collar work. This proved to be beneficial for both the employer and the employee, because this
improvement in human capital caused employees to become more efficient, which lowered costs for the employer, and skilled employees received a higher wage than employees which just primary educational attainment.

In Europe, the grammar school or academy existed from as early as the 16th century; public schools or fee-playing schools, or charitable educational foundations have an even longer history.

1.2 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AT SECONDARY STAGE

Academic achievement can be defined as excellence in all academic disciplines, in class as well as extracurricular activities. It includes excellence in sporting, behavior, confidence, communication skills, punctuality, arts, culture and the like.

Academic achievement has become an index of child’s future in this highly competitive world. Academic achievement has been one of the most important goals of the educational process. It is also a major goal. Which every individual is expected to perform in all cultures. Academic achievement is a key mechanism through which adolescents learn about their talents, abilities and competencies which are an important part of developing career aspirations (Lent et al. 2000) academic achievement and career aspirations are in adolescence are often correlated ( Abu-hilal, 2000). Crow and Crow (1969) defined “Academic achievement as the extent to which a learner profiting from instructions in a given area of
learning i.e. achievement is reflected by the extent to which skill or knowledge has been imparted to him”.

Academic achievement may be affected by various factors like intelligence, study habits, an attitudes of pupil towards school, different aspects of their personality, socio-economic status, etc. the desire of success is derived from individual’s concept of himself and in terms of the meaning of various incentives as they spell success and failure in the eyes of others, Thus a child who sees himself as top ranking, as scholars, may set as his goal the attainment of the highest grade in the class.

A modern society cannot achieve its aim of economic growth, technical development and cultural advancement without harnessing the talents of its citizens. One of the major tasks of education is to help children to develop the skills appropriate to the age in which they live and those skills which promote a life time of learning. Educationists and counsellors in educational settings are often confronted with students who appear to have above average scholastic aptitude but are very poor in their studies. A recurring question baffling them has been why some students succeed in their study while others do not. This question is sometimes considered to be closely related to learning then teaching. Jamuar (1974)\(^{18}\) stated that efficient learning depends not only on good teaching methods but also satisfactory learning procedures. Anwana and cobbach (1989)\(^{19}\) are also of the view that students do badly academically on account of factors other than low intellectual capacity. Tiwari & Bansal (1994)\(^{20}\) mentioned that a child with high academic achievement is likely to be well-treated as well behaved and
independent and low achievers as incapable and deprived of employment, which may lead this to maladjustment to life.

In our society academic achievement is considered as a key criterion to judge one’s total potentialities and capacities. Hence academic achievement occupies a very important place in education as well as in the learning process. Academic achievement is defined as the extent to which a learner is profiting from instructions in a given area of learning. i-e achievement is reflected by the extent to which skill and knowledge has been imparted to him. Academic achievement also denotes the knowledge attained and skill developed in the school subject, usually designated by test scores. Achievement is influenced by personality, motivation, opportunities, education and training.

A good school facility supports the educational enterprise. Research has shown that clean air, good light, and a small, quiet, comfortable, and safe learning environment are important for academic achievement (see, for example, Cash 1993\textsuperscript{21}, Lemasters 1997\textsuperscript{22}, Lackney 1999\textsuperscript{23}, Cotton 2001\textsuperscript{24}, Schneider 2002\textsuperscript{25}). While factors such as student’s socio-economic status and parental involvement are among the most important predictors of student’s academic performance, the condition, adequacy and management of a school building are directly under the control of the school district and state- hence improving school facilities offers a feasible opportunity for improving academic performance.

Study that turns conventional wisdom about public-versus private-school education on its head, a team of university of Illinois
education professors has found that public-school student outperformed their private-school classmates on standardized math tests, thanks to two key factors: certified math teachers, and a modern, reform-oriented math curriculum. Recent debates have highlighted the issue of school sector as an important consideration in student academic achievement. In 2004, a report contending that character school students scored lower than students in public schools was fiercely contested. Other studies were then released to demonstrate that character schools produce greater gains in student learning. Similarly, studies of students using vouchers to attend private schools have ignited heated debates about whether or not this programs boost achievement, especially for poor and minority students. Common wisdom and past research holds that private schools achieve better academic results. Assumptions of the superiority of private-style organizational models are reflected in voucher and charter programs, and in the choice provisions of the No Child Left Behind act. According to this thinking, schools in the choice-based independent sector are the best model for improving achievement in public schools. Market-oriented school choice reforms are premised on the idea that, by positioning parents as the driving force in the quest for quality, schools will be forced to improve when faced with competition from higher performing rivals.

However, new results from a study of large, comprehensive dataset on US students achievement seriously challenge assumptions of private school superiority overall, and find substantial differences between different types of private schools. Based on the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)\textsuperscript{26} mathematics exam, this analysis compares
achievement in public, charter, and different types of private schools. When compared with other subjects (like reading, for instance), math is more heavily influenced by school than home experiences, so studying math achievement provides clearer insights into the relative performance of different types of schools. The 2003 NAEP samples are over ten times larger than in any previous NAEP administration, providing achievement and student, teacher, and administrator survey data on over 190,000 4\textsuperscript{th} graders (Up from 13,855 in 2000) in 7485 schools, and more than 153,000 8\textsuperscript{th} graders (up from 15,930 in 2000) in 6092 schools. Earlier studies of charter school based on this data were disputed because researchers had to rely on a web tool that did not allow for simultaneous analysis of multiple student-and school-level variables. This new analysis of the complete raw data employees advanced statistical techniques (hierarchical linear modeling) to study the relationship between school type and mathematics achievement while controlling for demographic differences in the population served by the schools.

1.3 SCHOOL INPUTS

Currently school size is a topic of concern in the New South Wales educational arena. Reviewing school size in terms of whether or not some smaller high schools can continue to provide the breadth of curriculum needed today was an item on the reform agenda proposed by Dr Ken Boston\textsuperscript{27}, the director-general of school education, soon after signing a new five-year contract with the government. This move has political as well as academic implications. Critics would view the motive as purely economic:
closing smaller schools in order to save running costs. They could compare the debate about school size with the Wyndham ‘scheme’ in NSW (1960-1980) which brought about a transition towards large secondary schools of over one thousand students. Teachers, parents and students, however, may be more likely to recall the recent forced closure of about one thousand small schools and the associated laws of jobs in Victoria. However, how does school size relate to academic achievement? Does the relationship change after controlling for other student and school variables?

Over the past three decades much research has been undertaken both in Australia and overseas on the relationship between school size and academic achievement at secondary level. This study tended to adopt one of two opposing perspectives and yielded contradictory recommendations. Researchers taking the first perspective focused on economies of scale (Conant, 1959). Their arguments were based on the premise that, as school enrollments increased, so did the schools budget, and as a result, more efficient use of funds could be released for smaller schools. Larger schools had more resource opportunities, better market influence and were able to provide students with more varied and diverse curricula, better qualified teachers and more superior school physical environment and facilities (Haller, Monk, Bear, Griffith and Moss, 1990). Such views received wide support among policy makers.

David Newhouse & Kathleen Beegle (2005) by using Indonesian data evaluates the impact of school types on the academic achievement on junior secondary school students (Grade7-9). Public school
graduates, after controlling for a wide variety of characteristics, score 0.17 to 0.3 standard deviations higher on the national exit exam than their privately schooled peers. This finding is robust to OLS, fixed effects, and instrumental variable estimation strategies. Students attending Muslim private schools, Results provide indirect evidence that higher-quality inputs at public junior secondary schools promote higher test scores. Different studies showed that the most important resource input in the school is teacher quality (TQ) that predicts a student achievement. The economists, who measure the effect of TQ on student learning and achievement, provide evidence of the importance of teaching. Researchers look for the teachers’ effectiveness as a determining factor for student’s achievement. An effective teacher will have students with a good test score. In this way, the researchers isolate the effect of TQ from that of the other factors that may affect student’s achievement. The Tennessee value-added assessment system (TVASS)\textsuperscript{31}, student teacher achievement ratio (STAR) project and the University of Texas at Dallas Texas schools project provided considerations about the effect of teachers on student’s achievement. TQ has an important role in student’s achievement as Goldhaber (2003)\textsuperscript{32} stated that: teachers clearly play an important role in shaping the future of individuals as well as of entire generations and in recent years, new research has demonstrated the dramatic effect that teachers can have on the outcomes of students from all academic and social backgrounds.

In most third world countries, enrollment exceeds provision for secondary education in terms of adequate furnishing classrooms, Hence the perennial problem of classroom congestion. The poverty level and low
classroom utilization rates in these countries worsen the situation. Nigeria is a third world country where the situation is not different. Secondary education in the country is poorly funded, hence most of the secondary schools experience classroom congestion, low students-classroom space and low classroom utilization rates. These situations may likely affect secondary school student’s academic performance adversely; hence this sought to establish the extent to which the selected classroom factors determined secondary school student’s academic performance in Oyo state, Nigeria.

Whether raising school expenditure is an effective way to improve educational outcomes is a contentious issue. Hanushek (2008) argues that accumulated research says that there is currently no clear, systematic relationship between resources and students outcome, with the implication that conventional input policies are unlikely to improve achievement. However, a critique of this argument has pointed out to a number of high quality studies that suggest otherwise. Two well known examples included the paper on class size in Israel (Angrist & Lavy, 1999) and the experimental Tennessee STAR class size reduction papers (Krueger, 1999; Krueger & Whitmore, 2001). A difficulty with this debate is that studies with an excellent methodological design are rare and data available to researchers usually falls well short of the ideal. Thus, it is not clear how far one can use the literature to give policy advice on whether or not Government should raise the amount of money they spend on school education.
In the UK, education is the third largest area of Government Spending (of which school spending has the largest share). Since 2000, school expenditure has increased by about 40 per cent in real terms for both primary and secondary schools. The question as to whether such investment is worthwhile is of central importance. The national debate is not revealing as to the answer. The Government targets in national tests whereas critics argue that this simply represents “Grade-inflation and teaching” to the test.

They find that school expenditure has a consistently positive and significant effect on all national tests taken at the end of primary school and has a higher effect for students who are economically disadvantaged. Thus, in contrast to much of the literature, we find evidence that a general rise in school expenditure can raise educational standards. Our analysis suggests that the English policy of increasing school spending over the past few years has been worth the investment a significant body of work has sought to explain the interrelationship between student achievement, family S-E-S, and school effects across various levels of national development. Heyneman & Loxley (1983)\(^{37}\) found that while nations with a high GNP per capita demonstrate larger family S-E-S effects relative to school effects on achievement, nations with lower GNP per capita exhibits the opposite-smaller family S-E-S effects relative to school effects. More recently, (Baker et. al 2002)\(^{38}\), and Hanushek and Luque (2003)\(^{39}\) have challenged the H-L effect utilizing different datasets, measures and methods (As cited in Chudgar & Luschei 2009)\(^{40}\). Their studies concluded poorer nations do not show stronger school effects, the evidence may even indicate that the relationship between family background and student achievement is similar
across nations regardless of national income (Baker), and outcomes related to school resource differences are not more positive for poorer countries or countries with lower levels of school resources (Hanushek), nevertheless, recent articles by Gamoran and long (2006)\textsuperscript{41}, and Chudgar & Luschei) challenge these conclusions. For instance, Gamoran and along found that by using data that more closely approximated the global average income and which was much lower than the baker et. al study, school resources still had a strong effect, especially for the poorest countries (Gamoran & Long). Similarly, Chudgar & Luschei found that while family effects accounted for more of the variation in student performance than school effects, school effects were nonetheless a significant source of variation, especially for poor nations (Chudgar & Luschei). In addition, Chudgar & Luschei work draws attention to the seemingly neglected aspect of income inequality. Their study suggests that “the importance of schools relative to families is particularly strong in countries with high levels of income inequalities”. And this irrespective of a nations GNI per capita (Chudgar & Luschei). They further argue for an international focus that more thoroughly investigates the impact of income inequality to help ascertain the relative overall importance of schools. Therefore, two important conclusions can be drawn from the literature. First, although the effect of family background (S-E-S) may be more significant than school effects in all countries except perhaps the poorest few, school effects are by no means insignificant. To neglect their influence or abandon the research would be inappropriately dismissive. What’s more, since the literature is by no means conclusive, it is important that future work build upon this foundation. Second, the influence of the
nation’s income inequality is an important factor that should be incorporated into future research seeking to explain school-level effects and impacts. Accordingly, this study seeks to address these two important aims by examining the relationship between single school level inputs (Class size) and academic achievement and performing the analysis in a country that exhibits high levels of income inequality.

Heinbuch & Samuels (1995)\textsuperscript{42} stated that the relatively poor performance in science is often blamed on lack of qualified teachers, poor instruction, inadequate curriculum, inadequate resources, or combinations of these. Little effort of has been made to establish the nature of the relationship between multiple educational inputs and student achievement in science, and only a few studies have looked at the relevance of multiple school-level inputs to student achievement (Agunloye & Sielke, 2007\textsuperscript{43}; Coleman, Easton & LaRocque, 1998\textsuperscript{44}, Cooper, Sarrel, Darvas et. al, 1994\textsuperscript{45}; Murnane & Levy, 1996\textsuperscript{46}; Murnane & Neilson, 1984)\textsuperscript{47}. Coleman & Easton, and LaRocque reported a distinction between the productive use of resources and the mere presence of such resources in schools and concluded that schools that used available resources effectively showed better and improved student achievement.

A recent research by Psacharopolous (1994)\textsuperscript{48} establishes that an additional year of schooling has larger effects on earnings for workers in developing countries, and that within developing countries the returns to education decline with the level of schooling. In light of observed returns to an extra year of schooling, the imposition of compulsory school attendance laws in
both developed and developing countries during the last 100 years and the associated expenditures are widely viewed as an excellent public investment.

Recently, researchers have examined whether the substantial observed returns to additional years of schooling depend on the level of funding that school receive. Put differently, would an increase in resources per pupil make as attractive an investment as requiring students to attend one additional year of schooling? Researchers have studied the impact of school spending in a number of ways. The most common method involves testing for a correlation between students’ test scores and the resources of the schools they attend, after controlling for confounding factors such as family background. In the United States, the landmark Coleman Report (1966)\(^{49}\) established that in American schools the most important determinants of student’s performance were family background and the student’s peer group. Surprisingly, variations in school resources accounted for little of the variation in student performance. The intervening decades have witnessed a massive effort to prove or disprove the contention that school resources have little impact on test scores. A recent review by Hanushek (1996)\(^{50}\) shows that the Coleman finding has stood the test of time remarkably well. For instance, Hanushek reports that of 277 estimates in the literature on the impact of the teacher-pupil ratio, only 15 showed a positive and significant impact on student performance, compared to 13 that showed a negative and significant link. Results for others measures of school resources are similarly mixed, although stronger in some cases. Hedges, Laine and Greenwald (1994)\(^{51}\) present a meta-analysis of the test score literature and claim to find strong effects of school resources. Hanushek provides a rebuttal. He
questions the validity of the technique used by Hedges et al. on several grounds. In particular, he notes that if their estimate of the impact of school resources were accurate, and then test scores in the United States should have skyrocketed during the 1970’s and 1980’s when spending per pupil rose significantly. In reality, student achievement in the United States improved very little over this period. Hanushek reviews research on the impact of school spending in developing countries. Based on 100 studies in developing countries, he reports little evidence that the teacher-pupil ratio or teacher salaries are positively and significantly related to student performance. But fully 35 of 63 studies found a positive significant effect of teachers’ education, and 22 out of 34 studies reported a positive and significant link between school facilities and student performance. The overall pattern suggests that school spending might matter more in a developing country context than in countries such as the United States. Fuller and Clerk (1994) report similar evidence. One obvious explanation is diminishing returns. (The phrase ‘diminishing returns’ refers to the often observed pattern in industry in which the effectiveness of an input is particularly high at low levels of application, but decreases as more and more of the input is purchased.) The researchers on test scores provide an extremely valuable insight into what types of school spending matter most. But economists have long noted that test scores themselves explain only a small part of the overall variation in outcomes such as earnings or the years of education students obtain (Mason and Griliches 1972). These letter measures, earnings and education, are perhaps more meaningful indicators of adult success than test scores. What, then, do we know about the long-
term effect of school spending on student’s later educational attainment and earnings? More broadly, do we even know if there are significant differences in outcomes between students who attend different schools?

Many panels and experts have endorsed small schools as educationally effective, often adding the parenthetical remark that smaller size is especially beneficial for impoverished students. A recent series of studies, the “Matthew Project,” substantially strengthens the research base on school size and school performance in impoverished communities, adding evidence to bolster these claims.

Since the mid-1990s, there have been efforts to summarize key findings of recent research on school size. In 1994, Howley focused on influences related to achievement and attainment (e.g., high school dropout rates), and noted evidence that smaller size seemed to improve the performance of schools serving impoverished communities. He also noted that several structural features of schooling had been reported to bear on the issue of size: grade-span configuration (the number of grades in a building), educational level (elementary vs. secondary), sector (private vs. public), and location (rural vs. urban), and curricular focus (comprehensive vs. special purpose). Both Irmsher’s and Raywid’s research reviews, by contrast, summarized the influence on a wider range of outcomes, with each author concluding that a preponderance of evidence favored smaller size nearly universally, Raywid’s summary pays particular attention to the policy issue of how large “small” should be. In brief, the upper limit of “small” had (as of 1997) been set as 350 for elementary schools and 900 for high schools.
Interestingly, Howley pointed out that studies on “outcomes” (e.g. achievement, completion rates, attendance) recommend smaller size than those based on “inputs” (e.g. teacher salaries, instructional materials, specialized staffing) and Raywid observes that studies based on the value of “community” recommend sizes smaller schools for nearly everyone; those concerned with outcomes will advise small schools but only for a portion of the population; and those most concerned with inputs will recommend schools that are larger than those recommended by other researchers.

1.4 SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

Socio economic status plays an important role in the life of a person. The status opens the ways for his progress. Intelligence, attitudes, aptitudes and even interests are patterned by socio economic background of the individual. The socio economic status pays rewards and punishment both to a person. Chaudhari et.al. (1998). Socio economic status refers to the position that an individual and family occupies with reference to prevailing average standards, cultural possession and participation in group activity of community. Socio economic status includes both the social and economic status of the individual in the group. The variations in achievement are also due to the differences in socio economic status of the children, differential treatment given by parents, parent’s educational level, and influence of the surroundings and so on. The influence of socio-culture factors on various aspects of individual’s development has particularly caught the attention of educationists. Individual success and failure can also be judged by facilities.
and environment provided for his study, self-concept and study habits. As pointed out children belonging to higher socio economic status are not only brilliant but also are provided better opportunities for developing intellectually, physically and emotionally. The type of intellectual environment in the home will definitely have an impact on the school achievement of the child and this intellectual environment in turn is determined by intellectual level of parents, parent’s education, occupation, income, size of the family etc. during the lifespan of an individual. Adolescence is a stage highly influenced by so many things around the world. Adolescents are highly influenced by society, socio economic status, self concept, study habits, emotional maturity etc. which may enhance the academic achievement of adolescence or may disturb the academic achievement of adolescence in high school period.

It is widely recognized that if pupils are to maximize their potential from schooling they will need the full support of their parents. Attempts to enhance parental involvement in education occupy Governments, administrators, educators and parents’ organizations across North America, Australasia, continental Europe, Scandinavia and the UK. It is anticipated that parents should play a role not only in the promotion of their own children’s achievements but more broadly in school improvement and the democratization of school governance. The European Commission, for example, holds that the degree of parental participation is a significant indicator of the quality of schooling. The nature of the relationship between socioeconomic status (S-E-S) and student achievement has been debated for decades, with the most influential arguments appearing in Equality of
Educational Opportunity (Coleman, et al. 1968)\textsuperscript{57} and Inequality (Jencks, et al 1973)\textsuperscript{58} in the United States of America, and a number of commissioned inquiries in Australia (Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, 1976\textsuperscript{59}; Karmel, 1973).\textsuperscript{60} How S-E-S influences student achievement is not clear, and there have been many theories to explain the relationship. In one scenario, school students from low-S-E-S homes are at a disadvantage in schools because they lack an academic home environment, which influences their academic success at school. Another scenario argues that school and neighbourhood environments influence academic home environment, which influences their academic success, so that low-S-E-S schools are generally lower-performing, and that only extremely resilient young people can escape the ‘fate’ of low academic achievement. How governments interpret the S-E-S-achievement debate influences education policies designed to ameliorate educational disadvantage, so it is important to examine the contribution S-E-S makes to achievement at both student and school level.

A main objective of the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS)\textsuperscript{61} conducted in 1965, was to document the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for minority students in public schools. Another equally important objective was to reveal specific inequalities in facilities and resources available to students in predominantly minority or predominantly White schools. Coleman et al. analyzed the EEOS data and found surprisingly few differences between the characteristics of schools attended by minority and White students. As a result, Coleman et al. concluded that school characteristics are not strongly related to student achievement in the presence of family background and that
family inputs are much more valuable predictors of student achievement than school inputs are. He found considerable and significant between-school variation in achievement. Our results also indicated that schools play meaningful roles in distributing equality or inequality of educational outcomes to females, minorities, and the disadvantaged. These results are in congruence with recent studies that examined school effects from 1970s to the 1990s using U.S. national probability samples of students (Konstantopoulos, 2006). The Matthew project shows that schools grew dramatically larger during the course of the twentieth century, and a huge professional literature that addresses school size now exists. But a surprisingly small proportion of this literature constitutes the “research” base on school size, and comparatively few studies address the interaction of school size and poverty as a major concern. Only 22 research reports during the whole period from 1966 to 2000 define school size, socioeconomic status (S-E-S), and school size issues as an important focus of investigation. Within this literature, however, the studies related to the Matthew Project are the only ones that pursue the issue systematically across multiple replications. In fact, the summaries of the literature cited above rely mostly on the early work in the Matthew Project in making the judgment that smaller size is “especially” beneficial for at-risk students. With the definition of S-E-S more clearly defined, it is now important to discuss the affects of S-E-S on students’ cognitive abilities and academic success. Several researchers have found that S-E-S affects students’ abilities. In a recent study that looked at the affects of childhood poverty on the life chances of children, results revealed that correlations were the highest between family
income less than one–half of the poverty line were found to score between 6 and 13 points lower on the various standardized tests” (Brooks-Gunn, & Smith, 1998). The researchers in this article also cite the comprehensive study by Haveman & Wolfe (1995) in which they found that finally income is positively associated with educational attainment.

In another study, Caldwell & Ginther (1996) found that students from a low socioeconomic background constitute the largest population of individuals considered to be at-risk of not graduating from high school. They cite that the lack of academic achievement is the best predictor of dropping out of school. Therefore, they reason that if dropout rates are going to be lowered, strategies to improve academic achievement of at-risk students must be formulated.

While there is some research that disputes, or at the very least finds inconsistencies within the fact that S-E-S affects students’ academic achievement, most researchers agree that children are affected by S-E-S. Perhaps most alarming are the findings that while S-E-S seems to affect all children in their academic achievement and cognitive abilities, it tends to be most detrimental in the earliest years of development. Study after reveals that children are hardest hit by family economic conditions during their early years (Ram & Hou, 2003; Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Lindjord, 2002). As the research has been conducted, there has been a considerable amount of time spent on trying to find out why S-E-S affects students’ achievement. Bradley & Corwyn found that the children coming higher S-E-S families. They gave less chances of visiting local libraries or museums, less chances
of visiting any educational centers in their communities or theatrical events. Constantino (2005) found that children from high S-E-S homes have more books in their homes than those of low S-E-S environments. Children from low-S-E-S homes also tend to live in environments that are overcrowded, with many siblings and many overall needs that must be met by their parents. This leads to less time for their parents, usually their mothers, to spend quality time working with them to teach them the basics needed for attending schools. Bradley & Corwyn also found that high S-E-S parents talk with their children more, engage them in more meaningful and deeper conversations read to them more, and provide many more teaching experiences. These parents generally try to get their children talk more, they encourage them to be engaged in conversations with adults, and they tend to use richer vocabulary with their children. Low S-E-S parents are less likely to purchase educational materials such as reading books or workbooks for their children. They also fail to regulate the amount and quality of television their children watch. Children from these homes are typically expected to sit for longer periods of time quietly, and are encouraged to not interrupt adults who are conversing (Bradley & Corwyn).

Adding to the issues of low S-E-S is the problem of chances in family structure and its affect on the home environment of children. Ram & Hou have found that parents’ martial conflict will often lead to less involvement in their children’s school activities and inconsistencies in their style of supervision. Parents who are going through a separation or divorce tend to inconsistently supervise, control, and discipline their children. They also found that the situations will most likely not be better off once the lone
parent is in charge of the family. “there is evidence to suggest that lone
parents make fewer demands on children, do not adequately monitor their
behavior, and utilize less effective disciplinary strategies” (Ram & Hou).
These parenting behaviors tend to be caused by longer work hours to make
up for large financial drops. All of these behaviors tend to have a negative
effect on the academic achievement of children. There has been some
research; however, that disputes the affects of divorce on academic
achievement (Battle & Lewis 2002). In his research Battle suggests that
once the marriage dissolves and the conflict is no longer inside the home, the
stress of the household goes down. With less conflict at home, students are
able to achieve more at school. In sum, nearly all of the researchers agree
that S-E-S does affect students’ overall cognitive development and academic
achievement. Where the literature is lacking however, is in the discussion of
students who come from low-S-E-S homes that tend to have high academic
achievement. Research is needed in understanding why these students
succeed in school, when so many of their peers are unable to. Specifically,
research is needed in identifying any common factors within the homes of
the academically successful students L.A. Engweiler Given the emphasis
of school evaluation through test scores in the No Child Left Behind
Legislation, it is imperative society understand what factors most influence
test score achievement. Using the National Educational Longitudinal Study
of 1998, approximately 21,000 eighth-grade students were examined to
determine the effects of socioeconomic status on standardized test scores.
Incorporating an analysis which broke down into three segments,
components such as student role performance, school structure and
resources, and family background were included. The multivariate regression results indicate that the strongest influence on a student’s academic achievement is their socioeconomic placement, creating a statistically effect of 334 upon test score achievement, net of other factors.

Socioeconomic Status (S-E-S) is often measured as a combination of education, income, and occupation. It is commonly conceptualized as the social standing or class of an individual or group. When viewed through a social class lens, privilege, power, and control are emphasized. Furthermore, an examination of S-E-S as a gradient or continuous variable reveals inequities in access to and distribution of resources. S-E-S is relevant to all realms of behavioral and social science, including research, practice, education, and advocacy.

Low S-E-S and its correlates, such as lower education, poverty, and poor health, ultimately affect our society as a whole. Inequities in wealth distribution, resource distribution, and quality of life are increasing in the United States and globally. Society benefits from an increased focus on the foundation of socioeconomic inequities and efforts to reduce the deep gaps in socioeconomic status in the United States and abroad. Behavioral and other social science professionals possess the tools necessary to study and identify strategies that could alleviate these disparities at both individual and societal levels. Families from low-S-E-S communities are less likely to have the financial resources or time availability to provide children with academic support. Children’s initial reading competence is correlated with home literacy environment, number of books owned, and parent distress (Aikens
However, parents from low-S-E-S communities may be unable to afford resources such as books, computers, or tutors to create this positive literacy environment (Orr, 2003). In a nationwide study of American kindergarten children, 36% of parents in the lowest-income quintile read to their children on a daily basis, compared with 62% of parents from the highest-income quintile (Coley, 2002) when enrolled in a program that encouraged adult support, students from low-S-E-S groups reported higher levels of effort towards academics (Kaylor & Flores, 2008). Research indicates that school conditions contribute more to S-E-S differences in learning rates than family characteristics (Aikens & Barbarin). Schools in low-S-E-S communities suffer from high levels of unemployment, migration of the best qualified teachers, and low educational achievement (Muijs, Harris, Chapman, Stoll & Russ, 2009). A teacher’s years of experience and quality of training is correlated with children’s academic achievement (Gimbert, Bol, & Wallace, 2007) yet, children in low income schools are less likely to have well-qualified teachers. In fact, of high school math teachers in low income school districts 27% majored in mathematics in college as compared to 43% of teachers who did so in more affluent school districts (Ingersoll, 1999). The following factors have been found to improve the quality of schools in low-S-E-S neighborhoods: a focus on improving teaching and learning, creation of an information-rich environment, building of a learning community, continuous professional development, involvement of parents, and increased funding and resources (Muijis et al.). Research continues to link lower S-E-S to lower academic
achievement and slower rates of academic progress as compared with higher S-E-S communities.

Children from low-S-E-S environments acquire language skills more slowly, exhibit delayed later recognition and phonological awareness, and are at risk for reading difficulties (Aikens & Barbarin). Children with higher S-E-S backgrounds were more likely to be proficient on tasks of addition, subtraction, ordinal sequencing, and math word problems than children with lower S-E-S backgrounds (Coley). Students from low-S-E-S schools entered high school 3.3 grade levels behind students from higher S-E-S schools. In addition, students from the low-S-E-S groups learned less over 4 years than children from higher S-E-S groups, graduating 403 grade levels behind those of higher S-E-S groups (Palardy 2008).\textsuperscript{79} In 2007, the high school dropout rate among persons 16-24 years old was highest in low-income families (16.7%) as compared to high-income families (3.2%) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008).\textsuperscript{80}

There are many relationships that can be found between socioeconomic status and academic achievements in students.\textsuperscript{81} There has been much research evidence found to show that high-S-E-S students of all ethnic groups display higher average levels of achievement and stay in school longer than low-S-E-S students. (Alwinn & Thornton, 1984\textsuperscript{82}; Goleman, 1988\textsuperscript{83}; White, 1982).\textsuperscript{84} Other research studies have found that when S-E-S is measured solely in terms of family atmosphere variables such as parents attitudes toward education, their aspirations for their children, or the intellectual activities of the family.\textsuperscript{85}
Woolfolk). Ultimately then, this shows that the actual attitudes and behaviours of the child family life is more important than the lack of income. On personal experience, I strongly agree with this finding. I do not come from a high-income family, but because my parents have always another theory of tracking, which occurs when low-S-E-S students experience a different academic socialization, in that they are actually taught differently (Woolfolk). Low expectations Vs low self-esteem is related to the teacher and classmates assuming that the student is not bright, due to wearing old clothes, speaking ungrammatically, or being less familiar with books and school activities. They are low expectations- low self esteem, learned helplessness, resistance cultures and tracking. Furthermore, they may feel it is normal to quit because they compare themselves to their friends and relatives who never finished school. Some such behaviors are studying, cooperating with teachers, or going to class. I can still recall from my childhood of my parents’ constant lectures on the importance of education, their efforts to take me to the library, or to enroll me in extra-curricular academics activities. Students who are tracked into Slow-ability or general classes may never be encouraged to think and create, but rather to memorize and be passive. Since low- S-E-S students receive and inferior education, their outcomes of academic skill are inferior and their life chances are limited. Resistance culture is another theory that explains the relationship between low socio-economic statuses is put at an unfair disadvantage causing them to acquire lower academic achievement. The final result leads the low-S-E-S student to have low self-esteem in which he she believes they are not good at schoolwork members who belong to this
culture will reject the behaviors that make them successful in school, the sole purpose to maintain their identity and their status within the group places a strong emphasis on the value of education, I feel it is the family atmosphere I was raised in that has allowed me to reach high academic achievements. Low -S-E-S students are affected by this if they fail continually and come to believe that it is hopeless for them to do well in school. In the classroom, the teacher may protect the low-S-E-S student from embarrassment of having the wrong answers by not calling on them, or because they make the teacher feel uncomfortable, leading to low expectations of the student.

Bradley & Corwyn also found that high-S-E-S parents talk with their children more, engage them in more meaningful and deeper conversations, read to them more, and provide many more teaching experiences. These parents generally try to get their children to talk more, they encourage them to be engaged in conversations with adults, and they tend to use richer vocabulary with their children. Low- S-E-S parents are less likely to purchase educational materials such as reading books or workbooks for their children. They also fail to regulate the amount and quality of television their children watch. Children from these homes are typically expected to sit for longer periods of time quietly, and are encouraged to not interrupt adults who are conversing. In sum, nearly all of the researchers agree that S-E-S does affect students’ overall cognitive development and academic achievement. Where the literature is lacking however, is in the discussion of students who come from low-S-E-S homes that tend to have high academic achievement. Research is needed in
understanding why these students succeed in school, when so many of their peers are unable to. Specifically, research is needed in identifying any common factors within the homes of the academically successful students. Many studies have been performed to measure the correlation between low socioeconomic status and test scores, reporting positive relationships from as young as infants. Rouse and Barrow (2006)\(^85\) state that socioeconomic status show effects on educational outcomes that include test scores, and continue to affect the child throughout their adulthood.

In most African Countries and the Western World, socio-economic status of a family is usually linked with the family’s income, parents’ educational level, parents’ occupation and social status among the kiths and kin and even at the global level. Ford and Harris (1997)\(^86\) followed this logic while examining parental influences on African American students’ level of education, marital status, and family income. It is generally believed that children from high and middle socio-economic status parents are better exposed to a learning environment at home because of provision and availability of extra learning facilities. This idea is supported by Becker & Tomes (1979)\(^87\) when they assert that it has become well recognized that wealthy and well-educated parents ensure their children’s future earning by providing them a favorable learning environment, better education, and good jobs. In contrast this belief, children from low socio-economic status parents does not have access to extra learning facilities; hence, the opportunity to get to the top of their educational ladder may not be very easy. Drummound & Stipek (2004)\(^88\) while discussing their “Low-
Parents indicated that their role in children’s academic learning” mentioned that a few of these parents indicated that their responsibilities were limited to meeting children’s basic and social emotional needs, such as providing clothing, emotional support, and socializing manners. So these parents’ shortsightedness toward their responsibilities in the educational processes of their children and scarcity of fund to intensify such processes could be a challenge to their children’s success.

But does the affirmed impact of low socio-economic status of the parents really account for students’ low academic performance? In and of themselves such socio-demographic variables do not fully account for the academic successes or failure of minority students. But previous studies in the same field have established that other factors in spite of S-E-S can boost academic success among students. Studies which examined African American parents recorded that parents who maintained positive views about the value of education and who hold high academic expectations have children who often experience higher levels of academic achievement (Ford and Harris).

1.5 ROLE OF PRIVATE SECTOR IN EDUCATION

According to current estimates, 80% of all schools are government schools making the government the major provider of education. However, because of poor quality of public education, 27% of Indian children are privately educated. According to some research, private schools often provide superior results at fraction of the unit cost of government school.
However, others have suggested that private schools fail to provide education to the poorest families, selective being only a fifth of the schools and have been in the past ignored Court orders for their regulation. In their favour, it has been pointed out that private schools cover the entire curriculum and offer extra-curricular activities such as science fairs, general knowledge, sports, music and drama. The pupil teacher ratios are much better in private schools (1:31 to 1:37 for government schools and more teachers in private schools are female. There is some disagreement over which system has better educated teachers. According to the latest DISE survey, the percentage of untrained teachers (Para-teachers) is 54.91% in private, compared to 44.88% in government schools and only 43.44% for government schools. The competition in the school market is intense, yet most schools make profit.

Even the poorest often go to private schools despite the fact that government schools are free. A study found that 65% of school children in Hyderabad’s slums attend private schools in New Delhi and could take years if done legally. However, operation of unrecognized schools has been made illegal under the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act which has also significantly simplified the process of obtaining recognition.

There are two types of private higher education colleges/donations. Private sector bill reimbursed. The unaided ones have no access to government funds and they run their colleges on higher tuition fees as well as grants/donations. Private sector initiatives in the business of providing education in critical disciplines of contemporary relevance have started
making their presence felt. Business Week of August 22-29, 2005 carries a special feature on the Manipal Institute of Technology (MIT) in Karnataka, India which is a leading name among the second tier engineering institutions of India consisting of some 2,240 engineering schools. 55 per cent of them are public institutions and others privately run but not nearly as exclusive as the IITs. While IITs produce 3000 engineers annually from its 7 campuses, these second tier institutes produced 207,200 graduates in 2005 fulfilling an important need. With overwhelming demand for engineering seats and dismal record of government expansion, the private sector now accounts for 84 percent of the seats. Similar increase is taking place in medicine as well. Pune in India, near Mumbai, is another attractive educational centre for students. Nearly 200,00 students from across India study in its educational institutes that are over a hundred in number and its nine Universities. It is rapidly developing into the educational capital of India. However, on the flip side, all this hectic activity has drawn the interest of Maharashtra’s most powerful politicians to the profitable arena of ‘edu-business’. There are instances of a single politician running over 140 educational institutes. All these institutes generate huge amounts of money. There are rampant cases of malpractice in the form of illegal charges to allocate seats from the management quota. These institutes have been subject to income tax raids which have revealed that seats are indeed sold for cash and a seat in the medical institute can fetch a handsome Rs 25 lakh from the candidate. The quantum of black money involved runs into thousand of millions of Rupees. Clearly, middle class India is willing to pay for educating its children and the private institutes can fill this gap provided proper standards are
maintained (Global IIT 2005). While private efforts in India are underway, some State Governments have also got into fray of edu-business. So far the southern States of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu have been encouraging institutions in the private sector to come into their State. Lately, the Government of Haryana, adjoining Delhi, which is a major educational centre for North India, has announced setting up of an “Educational City”. Although details of the proposed Educational city have not been divulged, Canada has already offered to assist. The Canadian High Commissioner to India has announced that Canada and the State of Haryana would have mutual cooperate on in areas like milk industry and environment technology. She has also suggested distance learning and exchange of faculties between the two countries. It has been reported that the State Government of Haryana is proposing a Private Universities’ Bill for the State. The issue of private sector initiative in education sector has been a matter of great controversy and debate in India. Of late the Government’s record in provisioning of higher education has been dismal. India is already a country of the largest body of illiterates in the world. Our tertiary education sector, which has set up institutes of excellence, has also a very poor record so far as government sector is concerned. The government has abdicated its responsibility to provide tertiary education to all those who desire and deserve. The southern states of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Kerala, however allowed private institution to come up, especially in Engineering and Medical disciplines. According to SS Gill (2005) out of 252 engineering colleges in Tamil Nadu only 14 were run by government. In
Andhra Pradesh this figure was 250 and 18. In Karnataka 125 and 1 while in Kerala 220 and 11 respectively. As a result out of 818 engineering colleges in these four southern states only 5 percent were run by state were unaided private institutions. It is these institutions, according to him, which spearheaded India’s information revolution. While these private investors has invested crores of rupees into these colleges, the government and legislative feel that they should be regulated so that they do not make profits out of these ventures. The Supreme Court had also initially taken a stand against them, but after the judgment in Inamdar case (2005) which gave them a free hand, the government has taken an exception and had introduced a bill to curb the activities of the private institutions with regard to fees and admission. If the Bill passes with an Act, it will lead to further deterioration in the growth of tertiary education in India as private investors will shy away from this area. Within the Asian and Pacific region, as in other parts of the world, shifts in the ownership, management and control of education institutions may be observed. In some cases this involves an increased role for governments; but in other cases it involves a reduced role. The latter is more common than the former. This is partly because the balance has shifted so markedly toward public ownership, management, and control during the last few decades, and the pendulum has begun to swing back. The few places where the government is playing an increased role include settings where the private sectors have been dominant and are considered to need regulation and/or support. Macau, China is one such place; though it is idiosyncratic in its long legacy of government neglect and laissez faire attitudes toward the private sector (Adamson and Li 1999) in neighbouring Hong Kong.
China had a much more prominent role for the government throughout the 20th century, but has also witnessed increased government support for and regulation of the private sector through its direct subsidy scheme for secondary schools and thorough subsidies and training for private kindergartens. More common, however, have been shifts toward privatization of education. An official ADB document has stated that “Support for the private sector in DMCs is an important part of ADB’s operational policy in achieving its strategic objectives” (ADB 1997a, 8). This general philosophy may be appropriate in the economic sphere. In education, however the role of the private sector is controversial. Privatization, by definition, is a process an organization rather than a state; and, as indicated above, the countries of the Asian and Pacific region display a wide range of starting points. The term may also encompass a wide array of models. In some systems, privatization has arisen as a result of deliberate policy; but in others, it is the result of unplanned changed. Four major models may be identified as follows (Bray 1998)93. Transfer of ownership of public schools. Deliberate transfer of ownership (and, by implication, control) of existing public schools to private hands is perhaps the most striking form of privatization. Such a move is especially radical when it involves a shift from not-for-profit to commercial operation, though this type of change is rare. Shifting sectoral balance without redesignating existing institutions. This form of privatization occurs through a more evolutionary shift in the balance of types of institution. Thus, the number and size of government schools might be held constant, but the number and size of parallel private schools might be permitted or encouraged to increase.
Alternatively, the government sector might expand, but the private sector might expand more. Or the government sector might contract, but the private sector might not contract so much, might remain constant, or might expand. Increased Government funding and support for Private schools. Governments may strengthen the private sector by giving financial and other support to private schools. Some governments are experimenting with systems of vouchers, in which families can choose to send children to private schools but meet some or all the costs from a financial allocation earmarked by the Government increased private financing and control of Government schools. In this form of privatization, schools remain nominally under government ownership but the proportion of finance and/or control by nongovernment place. These are forms of privatization within the government system. In some countries, the majority of private schools are elite alternatives to public schools. However, in other settings the majority of private schools may be “second-chance” institutions for individuals who have failed to gain places in public schools. Such private schools are commonly more expensive for the students and their parents, but this is not always the case.

Privatization of course has many effects economic, social, and political as well as educational. The full range of effects cannot be addressed here, though they are examined in other parts of the literature (e.g., James 1993\textsuperscript{94}; Cummings and Riddell 1994\textsuperscript{95}; Kitaev 1999)\textsuperscript{96}. From an economic perspective, question of major interest is whether privatization is able to increase the efficiency of education systems. Most of the evidence on this
matter appears positive, but more research is needed before statements can be completely firm.

Research on this topic has been conducted by Jimenez and colleagues on Colombia, Dominican Republic, Philippines, Tanzania and Thailand (Jimenez et al. 1991; Lockheed and Jimenez 1994). The findings of these studies, which focused on selected core academic subjects in secondary education. The researchers took care to control for the home background of students and for other effects, though the studies excluded household and other non institutional inputs, such as supplementary books, additional tutoring, and endowments. These inputs may be particularly high for private schools, and could therefore be important to the comparison. Nevertheless, on the data that were available, the studies suggested that private schools generally achieved better results at lower costs, and as such were more cost effective than public schools. However, one study in India seemed to contradict these findings. It focused on primary school mathematics and reading in Tamil Nadu, and indicated that fully private schools were the least cost effective. Government aided schools were the most cost effective, and fully government schools were intermediate (Bashir 1994). In contrast, another Indian studies on primary and secondary schools in Uttar Pradesh, produced findings more in line with those of Jimenez and colleagues. The magnitude of findings diverged considerably for junior and senior secondary schools; but in both types of institution private unaided schools were shown to be considerably more cost effective than aided and government schools (Kingdon 1994). To explain the differences in effectiveness, most authors highlight the importance of management practices. Lockheed and Jimenez
showed that head teachers in private schools generally have more control over school-level decisions that can affect student achievement. This includes selection of teachers, adaptation of the curriculum, improvement of instructional practice, and choice of textbooks. To identify cost factors, Lockheed and Jimenez conducted a small follow-up survey to their main research, in which they paired elite and non-elite private and public schools in each of the countries. This survey did not show dramatic differences in the resources and physical facilities in the pairs of schools, but the private schools appeared to use these inputs more cost effectively. Several studies have also observed that private schools are less constrained by the conditions of service and accompanying salaries that are mandatory in the public service. In India, for example, many private schools hire teachers with lower qualifications who are less costly but not necessarily less effective than their counterparts in the public schools (Kingdon). Cost-saving patterns are also evident in Japan, where many private schools employ teachers who have retired from the public sector, women who have been unable to secure career-track positions in large companies or the civil service, and part-time staff (James & Benjamin 1988).  

However, while the research seems on balance to show that private schools are more cost effective than public ones, most researchers still underlines the need for caution. Riddell (1993), following careful review of the work not only by Jimenez and colleagues but also by other researchers, stressed that “there is no overwhelming conclusion regarding the [cost effectiveness] advantages of private schools over public schools, notwithstanding statements to the contrary”.
Moreover, as noted by Lockheed and Jimenez, the fact that particular samples of private schools might appear more efficient than comparable samples of public schools is not necessarily in itself a strong argument for privatization. First, full-scale privatization would by definition remove some of the advantages which the private schools currently exploit: for example, there would not be enough retired teachers and people seeking part time jobs for every school to gain efficiencies to the extent that were previously demonstrated when only a few institutions were seeking such personnel. Second, some management practices can be improved within the public sector: head teachers can be given greater freedom to manage resources and adapt curricula, without their schools necessarily being privatized. It is also important to address the argument that the existence of private schools helps to improve the efficiency of public institutions. Presenting this argument in one country, a World Bank report (1993b) has stated that: A mixed system of government and private schools will not only reduce the financial burden on public resources, thereby freeing up the education budget to address teacher salary shortfalls, maintenance needs, and other operational improvements, but it will also improve the productivity and quality of public education, as government schools complete with private schools.

Such an outcome is far from generalizable or certain. Much depends on whether private schools respond to such competition. In most settings, private and public schools serve different schools respond to such competition. In most settings, private and public schools serve different markets. Elite private schools do not complete even with ordinary schools, because most people cannot afford the fees; alternative- curriculum private
schools do not compete with mainstream-curriculum public schools, because most people do not want the alternative curriculum; and second-chance private schools do not compete with the public sector, because the students in those private schools would rather be in public ones. The operation and impact of voucher schemes are also related to this discussion. Many models for voucher schemes have been proposed (J. Hakim et al. 1994104; West 1997)105, and the reform in Chile, where families have been given the opportunity to use public resources to pay for places in private schools, is among the best-known examples of the practice (Espinola 1994106; Rounds Parry 1997107; Carnoy 1998).108 The Chilean reform increased choice and permitted reduction of unit costs in the education system. However, information on the characteristics of different schools did not flow easily to parents, and urban families had greater choice than rural ones. Key factors in the Chilean reform were a setting which did not permit political opposition, and a capacity at both central and municipal levels to make accurate counts of students and to impose effective penalties for inaccurate reporting. West points out that cross-national experience with voucher schemes remains limited and that it is too early to reach firm general conclusions on their advantages and disadvantages. Nevertheless, policymakers in Asia as much as in other parts of the world may certainly find various models of Voucher schemes worth consideration.
1.6 PRESENT CHALLENGES IN EDUCATION

India, at present, is on the fast track of globalization and privatization. The decade of nineties have experienced the liberalization of the most areas of economic activity like energy generation, consumer goods, entertainment, aviation, infrastructure, highways, banking and insurance, communication and so many areas of activity have been opened for global market. A shift from Government sector to private sector is gaining momentum day by day. More and more Government Sector companies and undertakings are given to private sector. Day in and day out the disinvestments process is at supersonic speed. In such a global economic trend set education cannot remain unaffected, when the quality of education in government sector is already considered not up to mark. So in the field of education also, private sector seems to flourish due to its quality as perceived by most of the parents. Thus, “the present wide spread ideological shift towards privatization in education seems as a return towards earlier centre of gravity rather than a completely now privatization in education seems as a return towards earlier centre of gravity rather than a completely now phenomenon” (Bray Mark).

We at present are living in a global village where everyone has equal access to the workplaces or work places all over the globe are open to everybody, who is skillful, competent and knowledgeable, living on this planet. Only those are technically trained mentally broadened in their vision and have ability to keep them current with the latest information get absorbed. The rest have no room in the lucrative work places or job markets. Keeping such a technically oriented manpower requirements of 21st century
in view “Smart Schools” emerged in many countries like Australia, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore and the USA. In these schools latest technological infrastructural facilities and technical expertise are available to students. For example, classrooms are equipped with latest computers with internet and e-mail facilities, so that students keep themselves current with latest knowledge in any field of life. Naturally, those students will have more self-confidence, easy access to information in less time. “Another hallmark of such schools is that its students in their interaction are supportive to each other instead of being competitive.” (Maheshwari 1999).

As already mentioned above ‘Education’ is a service organization and the service a particular school provides depends upon the inbuilt system of the school, which means the availability of various facilities and the way of its functioning. But our schools both in private and Government sector are very poor in infrastructure, manpower facilities and in the curricular and co-curricular programmes with some exception in favour of private schools. In the present competitive world, we, on the whole in India and particularly in Maharashtra. State, are lagging behind in educational development. The state could not succeed in providing infrastructural and manpower facilities and other requisites for retaining the children in schools. Besides, the schools that are functioning seems to be inadequate as per the expectations of parents as they are not functioning seems to be inadequate as per the expectations of parents as they are not meeting the quality requirements of parents. This situation resulted in the mushroom growth of private schools in the recent years. The private affair of education is not a new idea for the
State. Private education was an orderly affair in the ancient and pre-independence periods.

According to the Census of 2011\(^1\), “every person above the age of 7 years who can read and write in any language is said to be literate”. According to this criterion, the 2011 survey holds the National Literacy Rate to be around 74%. Government statistics of 2001 also hold that the rate of increase in literacy is more in rural areas than in urban areas. Female literacy was at a national average of 65% whereas the male literacy was 82%. Within the Indian states, Kerala has showed the highest literacy rates of 93% whereas Bihar averaged 63.8% literacy. The 2001 statistics also indicated that the total number of ‘absolute non-literate’ in the country was 304 million. World Bank statistics found that fewer than 40 percent of adolescents in Indian attend secondary schools. The Economist reports that half of 10-year old rural children could not read at a basic level, over 60% were unable to do division, and half dropped out by the age 14. An optimistic estimate is that only one in five job-seekers in India have ever had any sort of vocational training.

1.7 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the academic achievement of students enrolled in Government and private secondary schools.

2. To study the academic achievement of Government and private secondary school students on gender basis.

3. To study the school inputs in Government and private secondary schools.
4. To study the socio-economic status (S-E-S) of parents of children enrolled in Government and private secondary schools.

5. To study the Teacher-pupil ratio in Government and private secondary schools.

1.8 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

1. There is no significant difference between achievement level of government and private secondary school students.

2. Government secondary school students do not differ in academic achievement on gender basis.

3. Private secondary school students do not differ in academic achievement on gender basis.

4. There is no significant difference between academic achievement of male students of Government and Private secondary school.

5. There is no significant difference between academic achievement of female students of Government and Private secondary School.

6. School entries (Admissions) to government and private schools are not significantly related to socio-economic status. (S-E-S).

7. There is no significant difference between academic achievement and socio-economic status(S-E-S) of parents of Government secondary school students.

7.1. There is no significant difference between academic achievements of High & Average S-E-S Government school students.
7.2. Average & Low S-E-S Government school students do not significantly differ in academic achievement.

7.3. There is no significant difference between academic achievements of High & Low S-E-S Government school students.

8. Socio-economic status (S-E-S) of parents of Private school students do not significantly related to academic achievement.

8.1. There is no significant difference between academic achievements of High & Average S-E-S Private school students.

8.2. Average & Low S-E-S Private school students do not significantly differ in academic achievement.

8.3. Academic achievement of High & Low S-E-S students do not significantly related to socio-economic status.

9. There is no significant difference between school inputs of government and private secondary school.

10. There is no significant difference between teacher-pupil ratio of government and private secondary schools.

1.9. DEFINITION OF THE KEY TERMS

1.9.1 GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

Government School means any Government managed secondary school fully controlled, financed, supported and administered by Local, State or Central government. Schools that are paid for by the government and provides free education to its student’s.
1.9.2 PRIVATE SCHOOL

Private school means any government recognized Privately Managed Secondary School without any financial support and administrative control of Local, State or Central Government. A school that receives no money from the government and where the education of the students is paid for by their parents.

1.9.3 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Is defined as excellence in all academic disciplines, in class as well as extracurricular activities. It includes excellence in sporting, behavior, confidence, communication skills, punctuality, assertiveness, Arts, Culture, and the like.

1.9.4 SCHOOL INPUTS

Resources such as people, raw materials, energy, information, or finance that are put into a school (such as an economy, manufacturing plant, computer system) to obtain a desired output. Inputs are classified under costs in accounting. School is a service organization and the service that school provides is the opportunity to learn. All services in the organization both instructional and instructional support services are provided to enhance learning opportunity for the students. The resources have been conceptualized in the following four dimensions in this study.

a. Academic and non-academic manpower facilities (qualification of teachers, teacher-pupil ratio, management and supporting staff).
b. Infrastructural facilities (school building, toilet facilities, play ground, medical facilities and hot and cold arrangements).

c. Curricular facilities (syllabus, audio-visual aids, methodology of teaching, assessment of achievement and communication of results).

d. Co-curricular activities (debates, cultural programmes, music, songs and sports events like indoor and outdoor games).

1.9.5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

It is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person’s work experience and of an individual and of an individual’s or family’s economic and social position relative to others, based on income, education, and occupation. When analyzing a family’s S-E-S, the household income, earners’ education, and occupation are examined, as well as combined income, versus with an individual, when their own attributes are assessed.

1.9.6 SECONDARY STAGE

It is the stage of education following primary school. Secondary education is generally the final stage of compulsory education. However, secondary education in some countries includes a period of compulsory and a period of non-compulsory education. The next stage of education is usually college or university. Secondary education is characterized by transition from the typically compulsory, comprehensive primary education for minors to the optional, selective tertiary, “post-secondary”, or “higher” education (e.g. university, vocational school).
1.10 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SCHOOLS UNDER GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE MANAGEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOOL INPUTS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PARENTS AT SECONDARY STAGE OF EDUCATION”.

1.11 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

It is not possible in single research study to cover every aspect of variables associated with the problem under investigation. Although, the problem is very natural and is prevalent everywhere yet due to shortage of time and resources all the aspects variables could not be covered and the study is limited in several ways. It had to be determined in terms of population covered, sample selected, scope of variables studied, and the scope of generalizability of findings and so on.

1. The study was conducted on the students of selected cities of Maharashtra state only. One cannot generalize the findings of this study to all the institutions of India due to number of differences in their conditions and circumstances.

2. The number of students included in the sample was limited to 1600.

3. The study was limited to class 9th only due to limitation of time and resources.
4. The study can be conducted taking difference variables which may contribute academic achievement but only school inputs & socio-economic status have been taken into consideration.

5. The results that have been reported reflect merely what students are like have and now. The findings may be quite different at another time or in cultural setting.

6. It is desirable that the researcher reaches first hand or original sources for the study, but as access to some material was not possible materials taken from available secondary sources has been used.

1.12 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Secondary education is of paramount significance for individual as well as for national development. As such, it is an area of major concern in India. Though secondary education, at present, it is a priority sector of education. This sector has remained neglected in educational research out of 1800 research abstracts, only 54 were found to be carried on secondary education. The areas that were researched upon include, History, drop-outs, pupil achievement, evaluation, teacher training etc. but the school resources in relation to other variables like S-E-S, Expenditure and Achievement have not been extensively researched upon in India especially taking into considerations the involvement to private sector in secondary education. A good number of empirical studies in developed countries were conducted on school resources (Wilson Kathryn, 1996\textsuperscript{111}: Magdalena Mok & Marcellin, 1997\textsuperscript{112}: Heyneman and Loxley, 1983: Richard David, 1992\textsuperscript{113}: Jere. R.

In India, except the studies conducted by Sajitha, Bashir (1994) and Kingdon, (1994) No other study makes a comparative analysis of achievements directly between private and Government school students. At present, there is a general trend of privatization, which has given rise to establishment of private schools both in urban as well as in rural areas. Taking into consideration the general paucity of research activity in resources education on the whole in India and particularly in Maharashtra, where private schools are growing on an accelerated speed both in rural urban areas. Still the parents perceived better quality in those schools. Thus the investigator was inspired to conduct a study in the three districts of Maharashtra state to see the efficacy of these schools in relation to Government schools managed by government. A number of studies have been conducted on variables that affect academic achievement like, intelligence, creatively, S-E-S, teacher-pupil ratio, evaluation techniques, giftedness, use of educational technology etc. but the question of quality has not been researched upon, neither alone nor with other variables like funding, S-E-S etc. only one comparative study between private and Government schools was conducted by Dhar Reeta (1986) in the Srinagar City. This study compared the academic achievements of students belonging to private and Government school on the basis of Secondary School Examination conducted by Jammu and Kashmir State Board of Secondary
Education (1985). One more study was conducted with the aim to know the administrative structure and functioning of private schools in the Yaripara Zone of District Anantnag. This study too was not an extensive study.

The studies so far conducted on school resources, expenditure and S-E-S as correlates of academic achievement, either in India or outside are mostly based on survey reports. Besides, “in the contemporary educational research, there exists a lack of research activity regarding involvement of private sector in education especially at educational secondary stage” in this backdrop, the investigator keeping such a background of educational research on view, felt that there are solid reasons to conduct a study that will attempt to give a clear picture about the comparative status of private and Government schools.
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