Chapter-1
INTRODUCTION

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

According to Indian sages and saints, education\(^1\) liberates man from all bondages, i.e. SA Vidya Ya Vimuktaya. Such bondages may be worldly or all kinds of evils and ignorance. Education enables an individual to proceed towards light from darkness and towards immortality from mortality (Tamso Ma Jyotirgamay, Mrutor Ma Amrutamgamay). Education is the means of self-realisation and self-expression. It helps bringing out the best in a person. In brief, it promotes physical, intellectual, social, emotional and spiritual development of human beings.

Education is felt essential for success of democracy and for bringing about desirable changes for all-round development. However, at the time of independence, India inherited a system of education which had many shortcomings and imbalances. Only 14% of India population was literate and one child out of three was going to a primary school. This low level of participation in education was further aggravated by regional and gender disparities.

In addition, there were number of social & economic inequalities. The rural scenario, especially, presented a very bleak picture of the schooling system in rural India. A Chinese saying\(^2\) rightly points out:

“If you are planning for one year, plant grains,
If you are planning for ten years, plant trees,
If you are planning for a hundred years, plant men”

\(^2\) Ibid. p. 259
This proverb indicates that man is the measure of all things, and he is the key to development. Manpower planning is always a long-term one and of far-reaching significance. With a view to bringing about lasting improvement of a society, it is felt imperative to develop its human resources at first.

Pierre Bourdieu\textsuperscript{3} in an article on 'The Forms of Capital' gives maximum weightage to education which is the real source for cultural, economic and social development of the State. Discussing about three different forms of cultural capital, he lays special emphasis on the gain of students through their class background which is highly influenced by educational system. It implies that since education is the key tool for development of a family, class, society and a nation, there ought to be commensurate investment in this vital area for around social cultural and economic development of the State.

India has a rich cultural and social heritage. The framers of the Constitution gave due importance to education as a major tool of development. The Directive Principles of State policy (Article 45) clearly state that “the State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children while they complete the age of fourteen years.” Although, Universal Elementary Education is mandate, it has become a Fundamental Right in December, 2002 when the Parliament finally approved 83rd Constitutional Amendment bill, making another history in the educational scenario. This is really a very important social goal. It was with enactment of 42nd amendment (1976) that “education” as a subject was transferred to Concurrent list to facilitate greater

participation of Central Government in support of primary education. Central Government since 1986 is responsible for developing many aspects of policy and has accordingly been funding centrally sponsored plan schemes in primary education.

Though substantial gains have been made in providing access to primary education to Indian children over past five decades, much remains to be done. Forty eight percent of India's population was still illiterate as per Census of India, 1991 and number of illiterates increased from 302 to 324 million between 1981 and 1991. While nearly all children have physical access to schooling the holding and teaching capacity of most of the rural primary schools is very weak. About 75% of the 102 million children reported to be enrolled in primary schools (as per 1991 census) had been attending one of the 565,000 schools and the balance were enrolled in upper primary section. Besides about 250,000 Non-Formal Education (NFE) centres were also providing equivalent primary education in India for an estimated 7 million children in 9-14 age group who either did not enter or who had dropped out of schools.

Despite lot of interventions by Union Government since 1986, the outcome of primary education through literacy statistics, dropouts and learning achievements vary both between and within states leading to regional inequalities. In many States, the Constitutional Directive of Universalization of Elementary Education is still far away to be realized and in some States the number of children outside the schools is increasing. Disparities in education among States, between rural and urban, between boys and girls, between general and SC/ST sections of the society are increasing, inspite of various attempts by the Government.

4 In Haryana alone, 7 districts were below national average in female literacy. (Source: Census of India, 1991).
The nation is witnessing growing illiteracy, unabated dropout rates, huge non-attendance of students in primary classes in backward areas mostly inhabited by Schedule Caste/Schedule Tribe people on the one hand, overcrowding of students in urban areas on the other. The performance of non-formal education sectors has not helped adequately in this venture. The problem is getting aggravated than solved.

J.S. Rajput5 rightly suggests that for countries like India, the best response and preparation to counter many national problems would be to provide basic education to every child, prevent dropouts and ensure relevance of education.

The latest PROBE (Public Report On Basic Education) Report, 19966 too brings out that the schooling system is nowhere near ready to provide education of decent quality to every child. The report based on survey presents an authentic picture of schooling system as parents, children and teachers experience it. There is a vicious circle of neglect. The problems appear to be quite vexed. The ultimate victims are the children. The report laments that contrary to common notion that poor parents are not interested in education, there is a massive popular demand for schooling.


The survey was conducted in five northern states of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Himachal during September to December, 1996. This survey covered all schooling facilities and a sample of 1376 households in 234 randomly selected villages of these five states. In fact, except Himachal Pradesh, these states are the worst performing in terms of elementary education.
Nobel laureate Amartya Sen while releasing the Public Report on Basic Education in India on 2nd January, 1999 even pertinently remarked, “Resource is not a problem for India to ensure compulsory education for all its children. If every other poor country can ensure education for its children, why can’t India?”

R. Govinda in his recently edited ‘India Education Report’ (2002)\(^7\) has commented that the share of education in GNP is one of the standard indicators of national efforts for development of education in a given society. Similar recommendations were made way back in 1966 by the Education Commission appointed by the Union Government. The Govt. is now endeavouring to raise budgetary allocations for education from 3.7% of GDP to 6% in the 10th Five Year Plan.

GENESIS & GROWTH

Since the topic of research deals with study of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) - a World Bank assisted programme with special reference to Haryana, let us understand its genesis and growth in details.

Ever since dawn of Independence in 1947, India has been trying to achieve the goal of Universalization of Elementary Education (UEE). This has been in accordance with the constitutional commitment to provide education to children in the age group 6-14 years. Primary education has been one of the focus areas in successive Five Year Plans.

According to Statistical Division of Govt. of India, enrolment at the primary stage has increased about five times from 19.2 million in

---

1950-51 to 110.4 million in 1996-97. Though the gross enrolment ratios (GER) at the primary stage in the country as a whole and in most of its states exceed 100 per cent, the ratio is considerably lower in Northern and Eastern States. Similarly, inspite of fact that girl’s enrolment has grown at the primary stage from 5.4 million in 1950-51 to 47.4 million in 1995-96 and their rate of growth has been higher than that of boys, gender disparities still persist as girls account for only 43.2% of enrolment at the primary stage. Besides, access to schools has increased considerably with 95 percent of the rural population living in 8.25 lakh habitation having a school within a walking distance of one kilometert.

Despite such improvement in access at primary level, a large number of children in the primary school age group are still out of school. The participation of girls, scheduled caste and scheduled tribe children remains a challenge. These groups of children comprise a large proportion of the dropouts. Low levels of learning achievement in many schools, particularly in the rural areas and urban slums, is a matter of concern. 53rd round of the National Sample Survey, 1997 indicates that though considerable progress has been made in terms of provision of facilities and enrolment of children in the relevant age group, the goal of Universalization of Elementary Education continues to be illusive largely on account of inability of the system to enrol and retain girls and children from the disadvantaged groups.

A. Vaidyanathan and P. R. Gopinathan Nair while discussing about strategies for Human Development in rural India have stated that as per Survey\textsuperscript{11}, the age at the entry into school system is considerably higher than 5 years. The enrolment rate in early stages of school is relatively low and builds up subsequently. Non-enrolment rates in the 5-9 age group and discontinuation rates in the 10-14 age group are, in general, high. At all stages, the students are behind schedule. The survey further reveals that sex, caste and religion are the other household attributes that have a significant influence on school enrolment and dropout. There is a universal tendency for the education of female children to be given lower priority than male children. Christians, do better than Hindus, who in turn do better than Muslims. Schedule Castes fare worst.

Marlaine Lockheed and others in their World Bank Publication\textsuperscript{12} (1997) on Indian educational system have summed up their observations by stating that more than 80\% of eligible children were attending primary schools and out of them about 70\% attend schools regularly. About 15\% to 20\% children enrolled do not attend school regularly and 35\% of those who enrol, drop out before completing the primary school cycle. It was further reported that there were severe shortage of teachers and classrooms, especially in the most populous States.

\textsuperscript{11} A. Vaidyanathan & P. R. Gopinathan Nair, Strategies for Human Development in India, Vol. 2 - Elementary Education in Rural India, (New Delhi : Sage Publications India (P) Ltd.), 2001, p.32 & p.42
\textsuperscript{12} Marlaine Lockheed and others, Primary Education in India – Development in Practice, (New Delhi : World Bank Publication, Allied Publishers Ltd.), 1999, p.4
Keeping in view the overall educational scenario, various systemic issues needed urgent attention to improve the situation. Some such issues were:

- Poorly functioning schools.
- Inadequate facilities-infrastructure in school education.
- High teacher absenteeism specially in primary classes.
- Rationalization of teacher deployment.
- Teacher competence, motivation, performance, pedagogy and training.
- Academic support structures for teachers & trainers.
- Textbooks and classroom processes-syllabus, curriculum, teaching-learning material (TLM).
- Community mobilization and involvement in School management.
- Inadequate financial resources.

However, due to several developments since 1986, academic environment had been created which opened opportunities for reform in the primary education sector. The National Policy on Education (NPE), 1986 and the Programme of Action (POA), 1992, provided fresh insights and directions for achieving Universalization of Elementary Education, viz.

- Universal access and enrolment.
- Universal retention of children upto 14 years of age.
- Substantial improvement in the quality of education to enable all children to achieve essential levels of learning.
The National Policy on Education and Plan of Action further outlined strategies for the educationally disadvantaged children as also those with special needs. It further stressed the need for concerted efforts to expand and improve basic education formal and non-formal. This called for an integrated and decentralized approach, with a focus on building capacities, particularly at district and sub-district levels, to plan and manage primary education. Education being a concurrent subject, the policy framework recognized the proactive role of the Central Govt. in this regard. This was a great beginning in right perspective.

Though Universalization of Elementary Education has always been rated as a priority programme of the country and has been a key issue in all the policy documents including that of NPE - POA, 1992 yet during all these years, the maximum emphasis had been on Universalization of Primary Education (UPE). To begin with, it was decided that the district might be considered as a unit for planning and management for the development of Primary Education. This idea came through a revision of NPE, 1986 by the Central Advisory Board on Education (CABE) in 1992. This 'home grown' idea has actually been the basis for the emergence of the District Primary Education Programme. Consequently, the Union Government established DPEP as a Cabinet approved Centrally sponsored programme.

According to J.S. Rajput\(^\text{13}\) several initiatives and interventions of this type had become visible in developing countries including India after the well known World Summit on 'Education for All' held in Jomtein in 1990. The inputs with element of international funding

and collaboration have been accepted in elementary education for the first time in India. But there existed distinct school of thought which firmly believed that basic education should be handled essentially by community through its own resources. However, the ground realities were quite different and community had withdrawn itself from the established system of basic education and dependence on Govt. or other agencies had increased gradually. The Panchayati Raj Act too envisaged handing over the management and supervision of elementary education to Panchayati Raj bodies to be in conformity with the indigenous perception of making basic education accessible to all. Even Mahatma Gandhi, as early as 1931, had predicted that none could achieve Universalization of Primary/Elementary Education over the next 100 years following the British model and he was confident of his alternative, of creating a network of schools, in every village managed by Community. The vision thus represented the socio-cultural ethos of the country.

The District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) thus emerged in 1994 as a response to various challenges in the primary education sector. It adopted a holistic approach and had the essential ingredients required to universalize access, retention and improve learning achievement and reduce disparities among social groups. The programme sought to remove inefficiencies in primary education by revitalizing the existing system. It provided for identifying and tackling inefficiencies by integrating innovative practices and approaches. Adopting an ‘area-specific approach’, with district as the unit of planning, the key strategies of the programme have been to retain the contextuality and sensitivity to local conditions and ensuring full participation of the community. There has been marked focus on sustainability, equity and
local ownership. The emphasis on participative planning and management and capacity building was laid with the intention to make the programme flexible and dynamic in nature, providing room for experimentation and accommodating felt needs through innovations. Enough scope was kept in the programme for affecting various changes as and when required during the progress of the Programme.

District Primary Education Programme aims at increased enrolment, retention and quality in primary education. The programme targets investment in districts with below average female literacy rates and encourages popular participation. Although DPEP finances some new school constructions, it emphasizes investments in quality of primary instruction, in-service teacher training, improved teaching and learning materials and improved school facilities. The programme is trying to strengthen the school organisation and replacing Operation Blackboard materials approach. The programme also visualises enhancing State education support programmes including textbook development and publication, planning and management, research and evaluation, and teachers’ training.

ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP AND COVERAGE

DPEP is managed at the national level by a DPEP Bureau in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Deprt. of Education). The Bureau serves as a financial and technical organ for supervising State and district action programmes. It finances 85% of State and district expenditure while the balance 15% is provided by the State budget on the basis of 7 years investment plans. When the programme was initially launched in 1994, it was spread over 42 districts in 7 States - Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu (1994-2001). During Phase-II (1996-2002), it was further extended to
eight more States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujrat, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. At present, the programme covers major portion of child population in the country, spread over 219 districts in 15 States. The coverage was likely to go up to 240 districts out of 536 district in the country by the end of Ninth Plan period. Haryana is one of those Seven States which were covered under Phase-I. Initially four districts viz. Hisar (now bifurcated into Hisar and Fatehabad districts), Sirsa, Kaithal & Jind were selected. Subsequently three more districts viz. Gurgaon, Mahendergarh & Bhiwani have been covered under Phase-II. These districts were selected for District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) coverage on the basis of their average female literacy percentage being lesser than national average female literacy percentage, as per 1991 Censes. Thus 8 out of 19 districts are within the purview of DPEP in Haryana. The intensive coverage of these backward districts is likely to reduce the wide disparities compared to well off districts in achieving the goal of Universalization of Primary Education within a time frame.

The State Government has set up an autonomous registered society, namely Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojna Parishad for implementation of DPEP Project. This Society has two bodies; the General Council and the Executive Committee. While the General Council, consisting of 32 members14, is headed by the C.M., the Executive Committee with a membership15 of 22 for day-to-day operations works under the direct supervision and control of the Chief Secretary. The main functions of these bodies are to provide direction and guidance for project implementation.

15. Source : Membership of Executive Committee, Haryana Prathmik Shiksha Pariyojna Parishad - Annexure-1.2.
DPEP covered District
OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS

The main objective of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) is reconstruction of Primary Education as a whole in the districts instead of piecemeal implementation of schemes. DPEP specially aims at:

- Universalization of quality primary education.
- Reduction of existing disparities in educational access.
- Provision of alternative system of comparable standards.
- Substantial improvement in quality of schooling facilities.
- Genuine community involvement in running of schools.
- Building of local capacity to ensure effective decentralization of educational planning.
- Creation of a system of training and technical resource support.

In order to achieve the above stated general goals, DPEP aims at accomplishment of the following targets\(^{16}\) within a stipulated time-frame:

- To reduce overall primary drop out rates for all students to less than 10%.
- To increase average primary learning achievement by 25% over measured baseline levels in Minimum Level of Learning subjects i.e. Languages, Mathematics, Environmental Sciences.
- To provide access to all children to primary schooling wherever possible or its equivalent non-formal education according to national norms.

\(^{16}\) Govt. of India, Ministry of HRD, DPEP Guidelines, (New Delhi : Publication Division, Deptt. of Education), 1995.
Since 1994, District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) in Project districts has undertaken the following activities:

i) Village Education Committees (VEC) have been set up in all the villages for community involvement.

ii) Rs.2000/- per school per year is given for welfare activities with the involvement of VEC.

iii) Rs.500/- per teacher per year is given for preparing Teaching/Learning material development.

iv) Training Workshops have been organised for Head Teachers/Teachers for motivational activities; Development of Teaching-Learning Material; School Mapping and Micro-planning and content enrichment.

v) Training Programmes/Workshops for Coordinators have been held at Block Resource and Cluster Resource Centres.

vi) The Pedagogy/Strategies used in workshops/training programmes are Participatory Approach; Child Centred Approach; Effective use of educational technology; Hand on training for Teaching-Learning Material development and its display; Motivational games/activities etc. and Master Trainers being equipped with Teaching Aids/Material.

vii) Maa-Beti Melas are organised to remove gender disparities and to motivate parents to send their girl child to school.

viii) Text books based on Minimum Level of Learning for all primary classes, have been developed.

ix) Basic physical facilities in schools like drinking water, toilets, boundary walls and clean campuses have been provided.

x) Additional school rooms have been added wherever students enrolment had increased.
Additional teachers were also provided wherever student enrolment had considerably improved.

Prior to launching the programme, Baseline Assessment Survey (BAS) were conducted in 1994 by National Council for Education Research and Training (NCERT) in all the project districts to generate the benchmark data on access, retention and achievement. Based on the findings of the BAS, necessary interventions were designed and implemented. In order to assess the real impact of intervention on students' achievement, an in-depth Mid-term Assessment Survey (MAS) was conducted during middle of 1997 viz. after a gap of 3 years. The analysis showed that there were miles to go before a satisfactory situation could be reached with respect to participation and retention of Scheduled Cast/Schedule Tribe students in primary education. However, competency levels of achievements improved favourably but achievement gaps in genders, in respect of area & category witnessed in some of the districts, needed further probe. In Haryana, another study was conducted by SCERT in 2000 to analyze further achievements after MAS. The study is known as Terminal Assessment Survey (TAS).

INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPATION

The loftiness of the objectives, the nature and intensity of the planning process, the integration of professional inputs, participative planning and management and the emphasis on capacity building have together rendered DPEP\textsuperscript{17} an exciting idea not only in the country but all over the World. District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) has

\textsuperscript{17} Dr. Digumurti Bhaskara Rao, District Primary Education Programme, (New Delhi : Discovery Publishing House), 1998, p.8
broken new paths in international participation and co-operation. It belongs to new genre of the developmental co-operation with emphasis on sustainability, equity, local ownership and execution in support of national policies in the education sector.

The 1990 World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien (Thailand) followed by review of Post-Jomtien development organized at Jordan in 1995 was of great significance. The conference resolved that all children born on this planet must find a place in school. India was one of the signatories to these historic declarations. These conferences were significant, for they brought on the same platform, along with the country governments, the United Nation agencies, bilateral and multi-lateral donors and lending agencies. Ever since, a large number of international agencies like the World Bank, CFDA, Canadian International Development Authority (CIDA), Swedish Internal Development Authority (SIDA), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF), Asian Development Bank (ADB) and others have rendered a helping hand either with grants/loans or both to enhance primary education.

Initially, the Government of India resisted the concept of borrowing from the international lending agencies (the World Bank for example) for Primary Education till the late 1980s, although such agencies were lending money for Indian higher and professional education. But

Earlier assisted by donor agencies, States also initiated basic education projects. Building from experience with Andhra Pradesh Education Project which began in the early 1980s with the support of U.K’s Overseas Development Administration (ODA), Bihar (UNICEF), Rajasthan (Swedish International Development Authority) and Uttar Pradesh (International Development Association) started projects between 1990 and 1993. Although these projects vary substantially in design, they all share the objectives and strategies of the 1986 policy.
later on, a new mechanism was instituted to pull together all international funds under one central Kitty and then redistribute it to the States and districts under District Primary Education Programme (DPEP).

Interestingly, inspite of the fact that the actual international investment is barely less than 5% of the total expenditure in primary education, it always occupies the major attention of the State/District administration. That’s why, this meagre external funding has been receiving varied reactions. While frequent monitoring by external agencies hinders the State/District administration from concentrating on actual development work, it also relegates Non-DPEP districts to the background.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Haryana, one of the constituents of Indian Union is quite small both in terms of area and population. It is spread over 44212 sq. kms. and had population of 16.3 million as per 1991 Census and out of which 47% were women. It is one of those States which has made phenomenal progress, almost in all fields in a short span of over 3 decades. Despite the fact that the State has been making continuous and strenuous efforts to improve the quality of education for getting a prominent place on the educational map of India, it has still a long way to achieve the goal of Universalization of Primary/Elementary Education. The State has set up a separate Directorate of Primary Education with a view to concentrate on this important sector of education.

Despite the fact that the decade of eighties (1980s) gave encouraging results in respect of education/literacy percentage, raising it from 36.14 in 1981 to 55.33 in 1991, there is still an imperative need to continue these efforts till Haryana achieved the goal of total literacy. As per 1991 Census, Haryana’s literacy percentage of males (69.10) and
females (40.47) was higher than the All India literacy rate of 63.86% and 39.42% respectively. However, female literacy percentage in following seven districts of Haryana was still lower than the National average female literacy rate necessitating intervention through District Primary Education Programme (DPEP):

Table-1.1
District-wise female Literacy Percentage as per 1991 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Name of the District</th>
<th>Female literacy percentage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kaithal</td>
<td>22.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jind</td>
<td>24.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hisar (including Fatehabad)</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gurgaon</td>
<td>27.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bhiwani</td>
<td>28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mohindergarh</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>40.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>All India</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of India, 1991.

As per 1997 Educational Survey conducted through 53rd round of National Sample Survey Organisation, Haryana’s literacy rates were 76% males, 52% females and 65% all persons as compared to All India literacy rates of 73%, 50% & 62% respectively. Meanwhile, Census of India, 2001 has since been completed and the literacy rate of Haryana are 79% males, 56% females, 68% all persons as compared to All India literacy rates of 75%, 54% and 65% respectively. Further, the female literacy rates of DPEP districts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Female Literacy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaithal</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jind</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisar</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirsa</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurgaon</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhiwani</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohindergarh</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The educational statistics of Haryana at primary stage in respect of many indicators viz. total enrolment, total projected population, enrolment ratio, drop out rate, availability of educational facilities & teacher pupil, indicate the gravity of the problem which the State is facing in tackling the problem of providing primary education to all eligible children:

**Table – 1.2**

Total Enrolment at Primary Stage (Class I-V) as on 30.09.98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Scheduled Caste Only.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Schools</td>
<td>882496</td>
<td>830972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Govt. School</td>
<td>230303</td>
<td>163645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1112799</td>
<td>994617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table – 1.3**

Projected Population 6-11 age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (Including SC)</th>
<th>Scheduled Caste Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 Actual</td>
<td>1209117</td>
<td>1072616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1336000</td>
<td>1162000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1345000</td>
<td>1173000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table - 1.4
Enrolment Ratio in corresponding Age group 6-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (Including SC)</th>
<th>Scheduled Caste Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>84.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>82.57</td>
<td>84.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table - 1.5
Availability of educational facilities in the State (Radius in Kms.)

As on 01.11.96 | As on 30.09.93 | As on 30.09.94 | As on 30.09.95 | As on 30.09.96 | As on 30.09.97 | As on 30.09.98
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1.60 | 1.24 | 1.23 | 1.22 | 1.20 | 1.18 | 1.16

Table - 1.6
Drop out Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (Including SC)</th>
<th>Scheduled Caste Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table - 1.7

Teacher-pupils ratio at Primary Stage (Classes I-V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.09.94</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.09.95</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.09.96</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.09.97</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.09.98</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data compiled in Tables 1.2 to 1.7 is a testimony that the enrolment rate as compared to projected population in the age group of 6-11 years was far from satisfactory. In terms of total enrolment, out of total estimated population of 25.01 lacs in this age group, only 21.07 lacs children (83.54%) were school going. The enrolment of girls was 84.65% as compared to 82.57% of boys at primary stage. The enrolment of S.C. children as compared to general and other categories was, however, much higher. Against projected population of 4.97 lacs S.C. children at primary stage, the enrolment was around 5.66 lacs (114.06%). This achievement was against national norm of 120% since a lot of children (below 6 years and above 11 years) along with repeaters are also added to the gross enrolment.

Thus turn out of both boys and girls from SC category was much higher than their counter parts in general and other categories. As regards accessibility of educational facilities, the State was behind (1.16 KMS) the national norm of 1 KM distance for a primary school.
Although drop out rate in 1998-99 as compared to 1997-98 had gone down significantly (i.e. 7% to 9%) both amongst general and Schedule Caste category, it was still quite higher amongst SC category. Further, it was almost near to national norm of 10% amongst general category and double the national norm amongst SC children. Similarly, Teacher-pupils ratio of 1 : 45 was also on the higher side as compared to national norm of 1 : 40.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A number of studies have been conducted under the auspices of Union and State Governments in addition to institutional efforts and contributions of individual scholars in the area of Primary Education. These are briefly discussed in the succeeding paras:

COMMISSIONS & COMMITTEES SET UP BY UNION & STATE GOVERNMENTS

Independent India inherited the 1944 Sergeant Committee Report on Education. It was a long term perspective on education. This perspective was, however, not accepted by the Government of independent India. The University Education Commission, better known as Radhakrishnan Commission (1948), laid emphasis on higher education and not on basic or school education. The Directive Principles of State Policy as enshrined in Part-IV of the Constitution (1950), however, shifted the focus to basic education. The Education Commission under the Chairmanship of Prof. D.S. Kothari (1964-66), dealt with primary education though not exclusively. This was first indication of national concern for educational development and was reflected through first National Policy on Education, 1968. The National Policy on Education (1979) under the Janta Government, assigned first priority to primary education, followed by Adult education and Secondary Education.
The most important event in Primary Education was framing of National Policy on Education, along with a Programme of Action (1986). This Policy covering all sectors of education recommended review of the existing policy and progress every five years. Accordingly, on the recommendations of Ramamurthy Committee, Programme of Action was revised in 1992.

Besides these formally enacted national policies, the ‘Common Minimum Programme’ of the United Front Government (1996) and the ‘National Agenda for Governance’ of the caretaker Govt. (1998), amply proved the concern on Education for all and eradication of illiteracy, free and compulsory primary education and progressive enhancement of financial allocation to education, raising it to 6% of Gross Domestic Product.

As regards contribution of State Governments in Primary Education, most of the northern States including Punjab & Haryana did not evince much interest except declaring Primary Education compulsory and providing penal provisions for those violating it. However, the States did set-up State Council of Education Research & Trainings (SCERTs) and recently State Institute of Education Management and Trainings (SIEMTs) on the pattern of National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT) and National Institute of Education Planning and Administration (NIEPA) to constantly engage in various studies and researches on Primary Education according to their local needs.

The National and State level institutions like Central Advisory Board on Education, NCERT, NIEPA, NLM, SCERTs, DIETs etc. have on the contrary put concerted efforts on different aspects of Primary Education. There have also been regular reports on All India Educational Surveys by NCERT.
It may be pertinently mentioned that with the exception of National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT), National Institute of Education Planning and Administration (NIEPA), Kurukshetra University and State Council of Education Research and Training (SCERT), Haryana, the various other Universities and other research Institutions in the States of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Jammu & Kashmir and Haryana have not evinced much interest in encouraging Research Scholars especially in the discipline of Public Administration, Education, Management etc. to undertake studies on the efficacy of District Primary Education Programme launched since 1994.

However, SCERT, Haryana on behalf of Education Consultants India Ltd. (Ed.CIL), New Delhi (to whom the project was assigned by DPEP Bureau of Ministry of Human Resource Development) conducted a survey on Elementary Education in the State. This Report\(^{20}\) (1992-97) highlighted that 89 studies in Elementary Education had so far been undertaken in the State through its Universities, Colleges of Education, other institutions and the individuals. The Researcher dealing with Department of Education at that time, had also been associated for providing necessary administrative and pedagogical support to the Study Group. The Studies can be classified into four broad areas - Curriculum, Textbooks and other material; Teacher Education & Training; Society, Economics & Education; and Educational Planning and Management.

A close perusal of these 89 studies further revealed that 11 of them specifically pertained to DPEP, the proposed topic for Research. It would, therefore, be relevant to review the literature pertaining to DPEP studies under seven heads:

Training

There are as many as 4 separate studies exclusively dealing with Training aspect. V.P. Aggarwal, in his study “Evaluation of Teacher Training Programme, first Cycle under District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) in Hisar and Sirsa Districts” (RIE, Ajmer, 1996) emphasized the need for a heterogeneous group of participants with an upper limit of 40, preparation of Low-cost teaching aids, joyful educational group activities etc.

M.C. Chutani, in his research on “A Study on the Identification of Training Needs of Primary School Teachers in Mathematics” (SCERT, Haryana, Gurgaon, 1997) appreciated the usefulness of the contents and participatory method of training programmes. On the contrary, causes of low achievements in Mathematics for primary students was partly due to non use of Mathematic kits by the teachers, higher pupil teacher ratio and disinterest of students in the subject.

H.N. Hota, in his study on “Attitude of Primary School Teachers Towards in-service Training programme in DPEP” (Kurukshetra University, 1997) concluded that both male and female primary teachers in rural or urban primary schools were found to be alike in their attitude towards in-service training.

J.N. Joshi, in his research project “Improving Competency of Primary School Teachers; An Evaluation of on going Training Programme under DPEP” (Institute for Development & Communication, Chandigarh, 1997), observed that visits of District level officials to training centres were infrequent and a mere formality. More so, their interventions were mostly non-academic. The study lamented that although Training of master
trainers was content oriented, there was little concern how the same would be effectively transmitted to target group.

**Drop-outs**

Subash Chander in his Doctoral work on “Study of Socio-Psychological Stresses Experienced by School Drop-outs Belonging to Scheduled Castes” (Kurukshetra University, 1995) observed negative attitude of teachers towards SC students and their low status in the society, as a significant factor of school drop-outs. Besides, 80% of the cases were identified as students of low intelligence on the basis of their academic performances and annual results which again contributed a major cause of drop outs.

**Community Mobilization**

The (Ed.CIL) (Delhi, 1997) in its study of “Community Mobilisation and Participation in DPEP districts of Kaithal and Hisar” highlighted that while most of Village Education Committees (VECs) had representation from weaker sections and women, there was an ample scope to provide continuous inputs and support to VECs to develop linkages with the community, community groups, Panchayats and DPEP staff to become effective.

**Gender Disparities**

The NCERT in its various DPEP gender studies pertaining to Distt. Hisar (1994), Jind (1994) and Sirsa (1994) observed discriminatory attitude towards girls in as much as not to send the girls to schools due to pressure of household & field work or not deputing them to single male teacher schools or in co-educational schools largely because of mass illiteracy of parents (especially women). Absence of Non-Formation Education Centre (NFE) centres for girls and Adult Education Centres for women, early marriage of girl child, lack of incentive schemes for girls
(especially SCs), absence of NFE centres for girls, Adult Education centres for women and ineffective or non-functional Parents Teacher Associations etc., were cited as reasons for general bias against the girls in almost every social, educational, religious and cultural activity.

Child Activities

Vanita Kaul, in her study on “Early Childhood Care and Education in DPEP-I Districts” (NCERT, 1997), commenting on lack of coordination between Anganwari centres and primary schools emphasized the need for convergence of activities between Integrated Child Development Service and DPEP by synchronizing timings of the two. She also suggested for an improved class room management, child participation and group activities for the success of children’s education.

School Grants

B.K. Kuthiala, in his study on “Utilization and Effectiveness of School Grant and Teacher Grant in DPEP-I Schools of Jind and Kaithal Districts, Haryana” (Ed.CIL, 1997) lamented that some schools did not have their own buildings; grants were released very late and teachers were skeptical about the utility of NCERT kits supplied to them. Besides, the quality of teachers employed vis-à-vis their qualifications and experience, was not up to the mark in as much as that 80% teachers were merely JBTs and majority of them had little job experience.

DPEP Approach

Sneh Prabha, in her NIEPA sponsored project entitled “A Comparative Study of Enrolment and Retention in DPEP Block and Non-DPEP Block of Haryana” (NIEPA, Delhi, 1998) carried out comparative research in a DPEP Vs. Non-DPEP block of Hisar and Rohtak Districts respectively. The study affirmed that DPEP project has been quite successful in as much as that in DPEP block, enrolment and retention rate
of students was on higher side while the dropout rate was on lower-side as compared to a Non-DPEP block. Besides, gender-based disparities in DPEP block both in terms of enrolment and retention were noticed as insignificant.

From the above review of Haryana specific literature, it would be seen that scholars have attempted to go into in-depth examination of some of the relevant aspects of primary education (viz. curriculum development, enrolment, retention, drop-out, infra-structure development, teachers’ training, learning achievements etc.). However, efforts in studying and analysing the administrative and organizational aspects of primary education have not at all attracted the attention of any researcher. More so, despite of the interventions through World Bank assisted District Primary Education Programme in two phases, no in-depth effort has so far been made to evaluate impact of this maiden effort vis-à-vis the traditional approach of imparting primary education. It was, therefore, very relevant to conduct this study at this juncture as to how DPEP has been successful in achieving its objectives of universalization of quality primary education, reduction of existing disparities in educational access, provision of alternative system of comparable standards, substantial improvement in quality of schooling facilities, genuine community involvement in running of schools, building up of local capacity and creation of training and technical resource support etc. Hence, the Doctoral Research on “An Analysis of District Primary Education Programme in Haryana” is a befitting study to fill the void on the nascent literature in analysing the true impact of this World Bank assisted Project.
OBJECTIVES
1). To understand and examine DPEP organizational structure in Haryana and its inter-relationship with the existing departmental structure.

2). To analyse infrastructural facilities available for Primary Education in DPEP districts.

3). To study the involvement of DPEP functionaries in the programme.

4). To examine DPEP activities and compare it with those being carried out by Education Department.

5). To examine the financial arrangement for implementation of DPEP activities with special reference to external funding.

6). To review community participation in DPEP activities.

HYPOTHESES
1) The existing organizational structure without adequate delegation to field functionaries is not conducive to the growth of DPEP.

2) Inadequate infrastructural facilities for Primary Education result in the lack of retention power and incidence of heavy drop outs.

3) DPEP functionaries lack missionary zeal in achieving the goal of Primary Education.

4) The manpower deployed have not evinced any interest to orient themselves with the changing educational techniques and strategies.

5) Introduction of latest learning techniques in DPEP districts have not led to advancement of primary education.
6) Lower allocation of financial resources in non-DPEP districts vis-à-vis DPEP districts has led to disparities in promotion of Primary Education.

7) Arrangement of external funding has not brought about optimum results.

8) The community in general have not evinced interest in achieving Primary Education targets.

9) DPEP efforts have not changed the educational status of the population during the project period.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey method of research was used in the present study. The study has made use of the following tools:

Study of documents and related literature

All documents and literature related to the theme of Administration of Primary Education (DPEP) as mentioned in review of literature have been studied in depth for carrying out the proposed study. Similarly, publications of World Bank, UNESCO, Government of India, State Government & Research Institutions like NCERT, NIEPA, SCERT, SIEMT have been reviewed to have a clear vision of the issues involved. Unpublished record in the form of official files, mimeographs and other material have also been examined and referred to wherever found relevant.

To analyse the existing and potential problems in proper perspective, 7 different Questionnaires designed, to elicit information on important aspects like involvement of personnel in the programme.

21. Questionnaires – Annexure 1.3 to 1.9
community participation, infrastructural facilities, DPEP activities, teaching learning techniques, adequacy of finances and DPEP impact on primary education, were used to collect views and information from the target group.

**Informal Interviews and Observation**

Some informal interviews with Government functionaries, voluntary organizations, PRIs and beneficiaries were also arranged. The organizations covered are NIEPA, IGNOU, State Council of Educational Research & Training, Gurgaon, the State Institute of Educational Management and Training, Bhiwani, District Institutes of Education and Training, Block Resource Centres, Cluster Resource Centres, Village Education Committees and Panchayati Raj Institutions viz. Gram Panchayats, Block Samities and Zila Parishads. The Researcher, being a senior Government functionary, and dealing with most of these issues at the State level, has also utilized his knowledge of the problem and his experience as a tool of observation in arriving at conclusions.

**Sampling**

The following categories of officials, non-officials and beneficiaries from DPEP districts have been interviewed. The universe consisted of 248 respondents, the break-up of which is given below:

- **DPEP Districts**
  - District Project Coordinators (4)
  - Block Resource Coordinators (13)
  - Cluster Resource Centres (17)
  - Head Teachers/Teachers (60)
  - Village Education Committees (49)
  - (Non-officials)
  - Parents (46)
  - Students (59)

The sampling has been drawn on random basis.
Case Study

An in-depth case study taking Hisar from the Project districts under District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) and Rohtak from amongst non-DPEP districts was undertaken on crucial aspects affecting Primary Education viz. gross enrolment, growth rate of enrolment, retention and dropouts. Hisar District represents the educationally backward areas of the State (covered under DPEP) while Rohtak is a non-DPEP district but has geographical, social and culture proximity to Hisar. Thus, both Hisar and Rohtak have many similarities and are placed evenly in political awakening also. Therefore, other things being almost equal, the study of introduction of DPEP in Hisar district would provide a true comparison between a DPEP & Non-DPEP district in the matter of traditional and new approach towards achieving the goal of primary education.

Processing of Data

The data has been processed, analysed and interpreted with the help of a number of statistical tools (percentage, growth rate, cohort analysis etc.) both manually and through electronic processing. The data so analysed has been duly edited and supported by tables, charts, graphs etc. depicting various trends and highlights.

CHAPTERISATION

The study has been divided into 8 main chapters. The Introductory Chapter explains the significant of Primary Education, statement of problem, review of literature, objectives, hypotheses and the research methodology. The 2nd chapter describes organizational set up at all levels, role of General Council, Executive Committee and State Project
Director at Headquarters and field administration at District, Sub-district and village level. The third chapter on Personnel Training describes training policy and strategy under District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), assessment of training needs for different functionaries, training practices, institutional network for training and various training modes. The fourth chapter on DPEP Financing gives insight into financial health of Haryana State and its contribution towards primary/elementary education vis-à-vis other States, external funding through DPEP and financial achievements in pedagogical activities, civil works and project management etc. The fifth chapter on DPEP Activities gives details of some of the major activities like infrastructure development, activities introduced to bring equity amongst socially disadvantaged groups, quality education measures and steps taken for institutional capacity building. Sixth chapter on Community Participation explains community participation in educational affairs, efforts made for community mobilization, constitution of various community bodies and their interaction with various DPEP functionaries. The seventh chapter on Case Study compares the impact of DPEP inputs in DPEP covered Hisar district with non-DPEP Rohtak district and derives conclusions through various performance indicators like gross enrolment, enrolment growth, retention and dropout rates etc. The eighth chapter on Conclusions and Recommendations analyses the interpretations and findings discussed in various chapters and finalizes the conclusions, the main findings, implications of the study and recommendations and suggestions for further improvement in implementation of the District Primary Education Programme.
Limitations

- Names of the respondents have not been disclosed in deference to their wishes.
- Some of the confidential data was not accessible.
- The Study period has been confined from Sept., 1994 to March, 2001.

It is hoped that the present humble attempt would make a modest contribution to the fast changing knowledge in the field of Educational Administration especially in an era when education up to age of 14 years has been confirmed as a fundamental right by our Constitutional makers.