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## Foreword

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, the flagship scheme of the Government of India for universalisation of elementary education, has achieved significant success and has demonstrated positive trends in several key indicators. These include enrolment of children, provision of physical infrastructure in schools, reaching out to children from special focus groups, reducing gender and caste disparities and provisioning for creation of basic conditions for quality schooling.

The challenge today is to ensure universal participation, without which the goals of universal elementary education cannot be met. This means that all children should not only be enrolled in schools, but should also be attending regularly. Frequent absence of students from schools can have an adverse impact on learning. Therefore, the Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD commissioned a major research study in 2006-07 covering 20 States, for an accurate assessment of the attendance rate of students.

The study was expected to provide estimates of students' and teachers' attendance in primary and upper primary schools based on their actual presence, during three unannounced visits to schools. The study was also expected to throw light on the reasons for students' absence from schools.

The findings of the study are presented in this report. In this study, students' attendance rate was found to be $68.5 \%$ at the primary and $74.4 \%$ at the upper primary stage. $18.3 \%$ teachers in primary schools were not in the school on a typical working day. The teacher absence rate was found to be about $19.2 \%$ for upper primary schools. This reflects in very broad terms an improvement of about $5 \%$ in teacher attendance rates over 2004 , when the teacher absence rate was found to be $25 \%$ according to a Harvard University - World Bank study. Government of India has advised States to monitor students' and teachers' attendance in elementary schools and put in place mechanisms to improve teacher presence and accountability.

This study was conducted by 11 different agencies at the State level. They submitted State reports on completion. The study was coordinated by Dr. A.B.L.Srivastava, Dr. R.R.Saxena and Dr. Neeru Bala of the Research, Evaluation and Studies Unit of Ed.CIL's Technical Support Group for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. They provided all the agencies the necessary technical guidance in sampling of schools, preparation of tools and analysis of data. They have prepared this report on the basis of individual State reports and the synthesis report prepared by Prof. G.L.Arora. I am grateful to all of them as well as to the agencies and Principal Investigators of the study at State level whose efforts Ied to the successful completion of this major study for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. I am sure the State Governments will continue to obtain such third party feedback on the critical issue of student and teacher attendance.


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Background

The goal of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) is universalisation of elementary education, which entails (i) universal access and enrolment, (ii) universal retention of children upto the age of 14 years, and (iii) a substantial improvement in the quality of education to enable all children to achieve essential levels of learning. In order to realize the goal of SSA, it is imperative on the part of teachers to remain available in the school and teach what they are supposed to teach. On the other hand, it is imperative on the part of students to attend school regularly and punctually and remain in the class when teaching is going on. However, the available feedback suggests that the situation with regard to students' and teachers' attendance in schools is far from being satisfactory in different parts of the country. In order to obtain authentic data on students' attendance from different states, MHRD decided to commission a study, and entrusted the responsibility to the Technical Support Group (TSG) in the Educational Consultants of India Limited (Ed.Cil.). The study conducted in 19 major states and NCT of Delhi, had the following objectives:

## Objectives

(i) To assess the students' attendance on the basis of head count of students present in the school.
(ii) To find out the difference between attendance rate of boys and girls and students belonging to different social groups and rural/urban areas at primary and upper primary stages.
(iii) To find out the reasons of students missing classes and remaining absent from school as perceived by teachers, parents and community.
(iv) To assess how students' attendance is related to quality as indicated by repetition and drop out rates and achievement in examination results.
(v) To identify school and home related factors largely responsible for child's absence from school.
(vi) To suggest measures for improving attendance rate of students where it is low.

## Sample

The study was conducted in major states of the country to assess the students' attendance rate and teachers' absence rate by visiting schools on three different occasions and actually counting the students and teachers who were present. A representative sample of 300 to 400 schools in each state was selected for this study. The total sample was of 6715 schools drawn from 286 districts of 20 states . Out of these, 4988 schools were primary schools and 1727 were upper primary schools. In all, 5549 schools were from rural area and 1166 schools from urban area.

## Main Findings

1. It was found that overall average attendance rate of students was $68.5 \%$ and $75.7 \%$ at primary and upper primary levels respectively.
2. For teachers, the average attendance rate was $81.7 \%$ and $80.5 \%$ respectively in primary and upper primary schools.
3. The attendance rate of girls was a little higher than that of boys. The average attendance rate of boys and girls at primary level in the first hour was $69 \%$ and $70.6 \%$ respectively, and at upper primary level, $75.2 \%$ and $78.7 \%$ respectively.
4. The average attendance rate in first hour was a little lower for SC and Muslim students at primary level ( $68.7 \%$ and $66.4 \%$ respectively) compared with that of overall but at upper primary level there is not much difference between attendance rates of different social groups; these were between $76 \%$ and $79 \%$.
5. The lowest attendance rate was in class I, (65.6\%) it increased gradually after that by 2 to 3 percentage points from one class to the next; only there was no such increase from class IV to V.
6. The overall average attendance was a little lower in rural schools than urban schools ( $68.0 \%$ and $71.2 \%$ respectively at primary level), but in some states, the opposite was the case. Similar was the trend at upper primary level ( $73.7 \%$ in rural schools and $79.9 \%$ in urban schools).
7. The main reasons for children absenting from schools given by head teachers, teachers and VEC members were (a) lack of adequate facilities in school, (b) Teacher shortage and overcrowded classrooms, (c) children being required for household work or sibling care at home and (d) children required to help parents in agriculture or occupational work or participation in other income generating activity and (e) parents' indifference or lack of interest in child's education.
8. Parents mostly felt that lack of facilities in school and child's unwillingness to go to school were main reasons for child's frequent absence from school.
9. Among the measures suggested by the community for improving students' attendance rate are (1) motivating parents to send children to school and (2) providing incentives for regularity in attendance and (3) improvement in teachinglearning at school.
10. The remedial measures to be taken for reducing absence rate of students would include improvement in school facilities, school environment and teaching-learning in classrooms, making parents aware of the importance of sending children to school regularly and ensuring that children are not much involved in household work and income generating activity at home, which requires poverty alleviation measures to be taken in rural areas.

Average Attendance Rate of Students and Teachers based on headcount in 2006-07
a) State wise Average Attendance Rate of Students and Teachers

| States | Students |  | Teachers |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary <br> Stage | Upper Primary <br> Stage | Primary <br> Schools | Upper Primary <br> Schools |
| Andhra Pradesh | 72.7 | 76.6 | 78.1 | 77.3 |
| Assam | 81.3 | 84.5 | 79.2 | 55.2 |
| Bihar | 42.2 | 36.8 | 75.8 | 74.9 |
| Chhattisgarh | 67.7 | 75.0 | 75.7 | 73.5 |
| Delhi | 73.1 | NA | 95.0 | NA |
| Gujarat | 75.0 | 78.6 | 70.0 | 87.6 |
| Haryana | 82.2 | 85.1 | 86.9 | 91.9 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 94.6 | 93.2 | 80.0 | 88.0 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 78.5 | 77.5 | 80.8 | 83.1 |
| Karnataka | 86.2 | 86.9 | 83.9 | 84.0 |
| Kerala | 91.4 | 92.0 | 84.5 | 85.3 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 72.1 | 69.8 | 70.4 | 67.0 |
| Maharashtra | 89.0 | 89.0 | 87.8 | 87.1 |
| Orissa | 66.8 | 69.0 | 87.4 | 86.6 |
| Punjab | 81.7 | 74.7 | 83.5 | 78.1 |
| Rajasthan | 62.7 | 78.9 | 81.1 | 79.8 |
| Tamil Nadu | 88.3 | 87.8 | 86.6 | 89.6 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 57.4 | 60.5 | 77.8 | 82.6 |
| Uttarakhand | 80.0 | 83.2 | 83.0 | 77.7 |
| West Bengal | 74.2 | 70.2 | 96.3 | 98.1 |
| Overall | $\mathbf{6 8 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 . 5}$ |
| NA = Not available |  |  |  |  |

NA = Not available
b) Overall Average attendance rate of students and teachers in first hour and last hour

|  | Students |  | Teachers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | First hour | Last hour |
| Primary | 69.9 | 67.2 | 81.5 | 81.9 |
| Upper primary | 76.8 | 74.7 | 81.2 | 80.3 |

c) Attendance Rate of students by gender, social group (during first hour) and Rural/Urban

|  | Boys | Girls | SC | ST | Muslim | Rural | Urban |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | 68.9 | 70.6 | 68.7 | 70.5 | 66.4 | 68 | 71.2 |
| Upper primary | 75.2 | 78.7 | 76.5 | 76.5 | 79.1 | 73.7 | 79.9 |

Students’ Attendance at Primary Level


Students' Attendance at Upper Primary Level


Teachers' Attendance at Primary Level


Teachers' Attendance at Upper Primary Level
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## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Universalisation of Elementary Education (UEE) is the goal of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA).Under this programme the focus is on universal access and enrolment, universal retention of children up to the age of 14 years, and improvement in the quality of education to enable all children to achieve essential levels of learning.

The objective of SSA is to achieve the goal of UEE by the year 2010. With the efforts of two decades aimed at Education for All (EFA) involving processes like community mobilisation, district level planning, enrolment drives, door to door surveys of un-enrolled children, and provision of schools / EGS/AIE centers within one km from every habitation, the universal access to elementary education has almost been achieved in majority of the states. Enrolment rate in most of the states is now very close to $100 \%$. Therefore, it is now high time to give more importance to retention and achievement, as these are more difficult to achieve in comparison to the objective of universal enrolment.

In order to provide education of satisfactory quality, it is imperative on the part of teachers to remain available in school to teach. On the other hand, the students are expected to remain in the class when teaching is going on as studies have shown that any lapse in the process of learning on account of students' absence from school, particularly of a longer duration, has adverse effect on their learning. It leads to accumulation of the load of noncomprehension over a period of time, which in turn leads to lower attainment and higher repetition and drop out rates. In other words, the level of learners' achievement is highly correlated with the time spent by the teachers on teaching and by students on learning.

Students' punctuality and regularity in attendance in school is dependent on several homerelated factors. Also there are school related factors, which influence not only students' attendance but also learning at school. Students' attendance is supposed to be recorded in the attendance registers daily but in many cases it is not done systematically and regularly. It has also been reported that in some cases the presence or absence of students in the attendance register is not marked correctly and is sometimes influenced by some extraneous factors.

As such, the need was felt for a study that provides more reliable data on students' and teachers' attendance. Ministry of Human Resource Development decided to commission such a study in all major states. The responsibility for planning and commissioning the study was entrusted to the Technical Support Group (TSG) of the Ed.CIL India Limited. It was decided to conduct the study in all major states having population exceeding 5 million. These were Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhatisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and National Capital Territory of Delhi. The study was eventually conducted in all these states except Jharkhand.

### 1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the study were:
i. To assess the students' and teachers' attendance on the basis of head count of students and teachers present in school.
ii. To find out the difference between attendance rate of boys and girls and of students belonging to different social groups and rural /urban areas at primary and upper primary stages.
iii. To find out the reasons of students missing classes and remaining absent from school as perceived by teachers, parents, and community.
iv. To assess how students' attendance is related to quality as indicated by repetition and drop out rates and achievement in annual examination.
v. To identify school and home related factors largely responsible for child's absence from school
vi. To suggest measures for improving attendance rate of students where it is low.

### 1.3 Commissioning of the Study

As the study was to be conducted simultaneously in 20 states by different agencies, it was necessary to put in place a suitable mechanism for coordination, supervision and monitoring of the study at the central level. The Research, Evaluation and Studies Unit (RESU) of Ed.CIL's Technical Support Group for SSA, coordinated the study and developed the sampling design, tools of data collection and data analysis plan in order to ensure that uniform approach and methodology is followed for conducting the study in all the states. RESU selected the sample of schools and made the same available to all the agencies selected for conducting the study in the different states along with the set of schedules, detailed guidelines for organization of fieldwork and conduct of focused group discussion as well as data analysis plan. RESU also oriented the representatives of these organizations/agencies.

### 1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in the study.
i) What is the overall and class-wise attendance rate of boys and girls, students of different social groups (SC, ST, OBC, Muslims, Others) at primary and upper primary levels?
ii) What is the attendance rate of teachers?
iii) What is the percentage of students who arrive late at school or leave early?
iv) Is there seasonal variation in attendance rate?
v) Which are the school and home-related factors that affect students' attendance?
vi) What are the reasons of absence as perceived by parents, teachers and community?
vii) What are the interventions of VECs for improving attendance?
viii) Is there any effect of students' attendance on repetition and dropout rates and students' achievement?

The sampling design along with guidelines for selection of sample of schools, description of various data collection tools and the guidelines for organization of fieldwork and focused group discussion are discussed in greater detail under Methodology in Chapter 2.

## CHAPTER- 2 METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the study and the research questions have already been reported in Chapter 1. The present chapter includes a brief description of sampling design, tools developed for data collection, guidelines for the organization of field work and plan for statistical analysis of data.

### 2.1 Sampling Design and Sample Size

The target population of the study was of government, local body, and government aided primary and upper primary schools in the 20 states, including Delhi. The database of the $7^{\text {th }}$ All India School Education Survey (AISES) conducted in 2002 was used as sampling frame for the purpose of selection of schools.

## Stratification

On the basis of census 2001 data, each state has been divided into Socio-cultural regions which consist of a few contiguous districts. The sample of schools in each state was drawn by stratified two stage sampling procedure with Socio-cultural regions within each state as strata. The SCR regions were then divided into the following sub-strata.
o Rural
o Urban-1: cities with 1million or more population, if any
o Urban-2: all the cities or towns within the SCR region having less than 1 million population. In the case of Delhi, there are only two strata (1) Rural (2) Urban

## Allocation of Sample Size to Different Strata in States

In a large state a sample of 400 schools was considered adequate. In smaller states, the sample was less, but not less than 300 in any state. The sample included some primary and some upper primary schools. In order to decide the number of primary schools and upper primary schools in the sample, the ratio of primary to upper primary schools in the state was computed for the purpose of allocation of the sample size. In the states having up to $4: 1$ ratio, the allocation was done proportionately. In the case of states having the ratio 6 to 10 primary schools per upper primary school, the allocation was done using the ratio as $3: 1$, and for the remaining states, the allocation was done in the ratio $2: 1$. Following table shows the sample size decided for different states.

| Category | Sample size | State/s |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1. | 400 | Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, <br> Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal |
| 2. | 360 | Assam, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh and Tamil Nadu |
| 3. | 320 | Kerala, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Punjab, <br> Uttrakhand. |
| 4. | 300 | Delhi |

For drawing the sample of schools in a state, within each SCR of the state, the first stage sampling units for rural schools were sub-districts, which were selected by using Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) with replacement. The second stage units, schools, were selected by using simple circular systematic sampling within each sub-district. In urban areas, cities/towns were further divided into two sub strata: (1) cities with one million or more population (Urban 1) and (2) cities/towns with less than one million population (Urban 2). Selection of schools for Urban 1 sub-stratum was done by using simple circular
systematic sampling from the list of all schools belonging to this sub stratum. In the case of Urban 2, from the list of all urban schools of those districts to which sampled sub-districts belonged, the sample of schools was selected by using simple circular systematic sampling. Besides schools, the other sampling units were teachers and parents. The teachers teaching the sampled classes constituted the sample of teachers.

Information on parents' education, occupation and of students' marks in examinations was also recorded from a sample of maximum $\mathbf{2 0}$ students of each class in each school. Further, from each sampled class six students were selected in such a way that three of them had the lowest attendance and the other three students had the highest attendance during 2005-06; their parents constituted the sample of parents who were interviewed. For that, a sample of 2 classes of primary level or two of upper primary level were drawn in each school by adopting circular systematic sampling procedure. Thus the investigators had to interview maximum 12 parents per schools. The two classes were so selected in different schools that all the schools together provided equal representation to all the classes in the total sample. It was thus ensured that all classes were represented equally in the total sample of schools. These parents were interviewed for getting their views on reasons of children's absence.

## Sample of Schools

The suggested state-wise break up of the primary and upper primary schools selected from rural and urban areas and the number of schools finally covered in the sample is given in Table 2.1 and 2.2 respectively.

Overall, 7260 schools were selected, of which 5614 were primary schools and 1646 were upper primary schools; 5871 were rural schools and 1389 were urban schools.

Table 2.2 shows that against the number of 7260 , the participating states could cover only a total of 6715 schools. These were distributed over 286 districts of the 20 states. Among them, 5549 schools were from rural areas and 1166 from urban areas.

Table 2.1 Number of primary and upper primary schools selected for the study

| Sl. <br> No. |  | Primary |  |  | Upper Primary |  |  | Over all <br> Total |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |  |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 240 | 70 | 310 | 60 | 30 | 90 | 400 |
| 2 | Assam | 252 | 23 | 275 | 72 | 13 | 85 | 360 |
| 3 | Bihar | 250 | 49 | 299 | 75 | 26 | 101 | 400 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 264 | 24 | 288 | 60 | 12 | 72 | 360 |
| 5 | Delhi | 24 | 201 | 225 | 6 | 69 | 75 | 300 |
| 6 | Gujarat | 240 | 43 | 283 | 60 | 17 | 77 | 360 |
| 7 | Haryana | 210 | 52 | 262 | 42 | 16 | 58 | 320 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 234 | 10 | 244 | 72 | 4 | 76 | 320 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 234 | 16 | 250 | 52 | 18 | 70 | 320 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 270 | 53 | 323 | 60 | 17 | 77 | 400 |
| 11 | Kerala | 180 | 48 | 228 | 72 | 20 | 92 | 320 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 260 | 60 | 320 | 60 | 20 | 80 | 400 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 260 | 60 | 320 | 60 | 20 | 80 | 400 |
| 14 | Orissa | 260 | 40 | 300 | 80 | 20 | 100 | 400 |
| 15 | Punjab | 210 | 38 | 248 | 60 | 12 | 72 | 320 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 256 | 23 | 279 | 96 | 25 | 121 | 400 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 240 | 45 | 285 | 60 | 15 | 75 | 360 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 260 | 50 | 310 | 60 | 30 | 90 | 400 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 240 | 15 | 255 | 60 | 5 | 65 | 320 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 260 | 50 | 310 | 60 | 30 | 90 | 400 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{4 6 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 6 0}$ |

Table 2.2 Number of primary and upper primary schools covered in the study

| Sl.No. States | Primary |  |  | Upper Primary |  |  | Over all | \% <br> Total | covered |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$|$|  |  | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | To

Except Delhi and Jammu \& Kashmir where the coverage was a little less than $50 \%$, there was no state in which less than $90 \%$ schools were covered. In Delhi, upper primary schools could not be covered and in Jammu \& Kashmir, Ladakh region having 23 sampled schools was left out completely. The Low coverage of schools in Jammu and Kashmir was due to schools being closed during the stipulated time of data collection because of early start of winter vacation. In Delhi, low coverage of primary schools and omission of upper primary schools was mainly due to administrative bottlenecks in data collection.

## Teachers in the Sampled Schools

Table 2.3 gives the total number of teachers in position in the sampled schools as well as the number of teachers who were interviewed.

The total number of teachers in the sampled schools was 28462 , of whom 17016 were in primary schools and 11446 in upper primary schools. Information about how many of them were found present on the days of visit to the schools was collected by the investigators.

Out of these teachers, those teaching the sampled classes constituted the sample of teachers. There were 20225 teachers. They were interviewed for getting information about their educational and professional qualifications, teaching experience, working days spent on different kind of activities and type of class taught etc.

In addition, data on reasons of dropping out of school was collected from 6559 VEC members and 65,557 parents.

Table 2.3 Total number of teachers in position in the sampled schools

|  |  | Teachers (Total) |  |  | Teachers interviewed |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | State | Pr. | Up.Pr. | Total | Pr. | Up.Pr. | Total |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 821 | 633 | 1454 | 780 | 540 | 1320 |
| 2 | Assam | 788 | 533 | 1321 | 631 | 289 | 920 |
| 3 | Bihar | 926 | 756 | 1682 | 1435 | 1926 | 3361 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 662 | 315 | 977 | 529 | 268 | 897 |
| 5 | Delhi | 1370 | - | 1370 | 600 | - | 600 |
| 6 | Gujarat | 208 | 1586 | 1794 | 102 | 720 | 822 |
| 7 | Haryana | 814 | 201 | 1015 | 814 | 201 | 1015 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 602 | 322 | 924 | 245 | 75 | 797 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 775 | 320 | 1095 | 361 | 120 | 600 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 641 | 504 | 1145 | 635 | 1240 | 1875 |
| 11 | Kerala | 1289 | 1110 | 2399 | 208 | 147 | 355 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 1045 | 667 | 1712 | 624 | 252 | 876 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 875 | 446 | 1321 | 777 | 363 | 1140 |
| 14 | Orissa | 762 | 485 | 1247 | 300 | 100 | 400 |
| 15 | Punjab | 735 | 309 | 1044 | 1293 | 338 | 1631 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 733 | 857 | 1590 | 574 | 599 | 1173 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 910 | 590 | 1500 | 657 | 229 | 886 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 1138 | 364 | 1502 | 952 | 288 | 1240 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 568 | 233 | 801 | 469 | 156 | 625 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 1354 | 1215 | 2569 | 310 | 78 | 388 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 4 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 4 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 5}$ |

### 2.2 Tools Used

The data required to address different research questions were collected, using the following seven tools:
i. (a) Investigators Observation Schedule (SA 1): The schedule was to be filled by the investigators on the day of visit to sampled school. The investigators were requested to visit school just before the opening time of the school and they had to remain there or come again about an hour before the closing time. Besides the name, address and type of the school, the investigator had to record date and time of visit, number of teachers in position and found present in the first and last period, number of students enrolled in different classes and found present in the first and last hour, number of students belonging to different social groups found absent in the first hour. The investigators were also instructed to check attendance register of one randomly selected section to find out if the attendance was recorded properly and regularly or not.
(b) List of students for conducting Parents' Interviews: This sheet was meant for recording the names of 5 students from each selected class/section whose attendance as
per the attendance register was the lowest and also of 5 students whose attendance was highest in the year 2005-06. In other words, ten students for each class /section (5 with lowest attendance and 5 with highest attendance) were identified from each class. Along with the name of the students, their sex and social group was also recorded. This information was collected from teachers and the attendance register during the first visit. The purpose of collecting this information was to identify students whose parents (3 out of 5 in each group) needed to be interviewed to elicit their views regarding reasons of students low attendance in schools.
ii. (a) School Schedule (SA 2): The investigators used this schedule to obtain information from the head teacher of the school on management, the school type and classes, location- rural/urban, distance from the nearest Bus stop, type of building and availability of basic facilities, equipment available in the school, number of classrooms, number of teaching posts required and teachers in position, students' achievement in final examination, class-wise total enrolment and number of students promoted to next class, repeaters and dropouts, number of working days, months of low attendance, reasons of students' low attendance or absence and steps taken to improve attendance.
(b) Attendance Record (SA 2.1): In this sheet, investigators with the help of head teacher entered separately the average number of students marked present in each class for each month of the academic session 2005-06. Average attendance in a month is the sum of students present on the working days in a month divided by the number of working days
(c) Attendance Record of Students (SA 2.2): In this record sheet, the information similar to that of SA 2.1 was recorded in respect of the current academic session, that is the year 2006-07, till the date of data collection.
iii. (a) Record of Students Enrolled as on 30-9-2005 (SA 3.0 and SA 3.1): The tools SA 3.0 and SA 3.1 were meant for recording information about primary and upper primary students respectively. Besides the information on total working days in school, detailed information for 20 students randomly selected from each class was also collected on such variables as student's gender, social class, attendance (\%) in the year 2005-06, disability if any, whether repeater in the session 2005-06 and 2006-07 and marks obtained (\%) in final examination (Language, Mathematics and Total).
(b) Dropout Students Record (SA 3.2): In this sheet information about students who discontinued their studies during the session 2005-06 was recorded. The information recorded in respect of each child was on class last attended, gender of the student, disability, if any, social group, whether repeater in 2005-06, number of working days before discontinuing and number of days the student attended the school.
iv. Teacher's Schedule (SA 4): This form was filled for the teacher who taught the sampled class or section in the year 2005-06. The information thus obtained pertained to type of class being taught by the teacher (mono grade or multi-grade class), gender, age, educational \& professional qualification and total teaching experience, number of working days, number of days spent on various activities along with common as well as school related reasons for the students' absence. Details of subjects taught were taken from teachers teaching the upper primary classes. In case the concerned teacher was not present in the school at the time of the investigator's visit, information regarding school related causes of students' absence was provided by the teacher who was currently teaching the sampled class.
v. Parents' Interview Schedule (SA 5): During the first visit to the school the investigator in each school prepared a list of 10 students (SA 1.1) 5 with lowest and 5 with highest attendance rate in last year. Parents of six such children, 3 out of 5 from each group were to be interviewed during the subsequent visits. The information sought from the parents through this schedule pertained to their occupation, educational level, their visits to school or meeting with the teacher to enquire about child's progress or problems, frequency of the child's absence from school and the reasons thereof.
vi. Interview Schedule for VEC or SMC (SA 6): This schedule was filled by the investigator after interviewing the chairperson or a member of the concerned VEC/ SMC. The information obtained through interviews of members of VECs or SMCs pertained to their activities with specific reference to students' attendance.
vii. Guidelines for the Organization of Focus Group Discussion (SA 7): The guidelines were for the field staff who were to conduct Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with representatives of the community. Besides providing a workable definition, the guidelines outlined specific questions on the issues in hand. They were advised to put forth questions in third person, strive to elicit opinions, make use of maximum time in discussing the questions related to students' absence, note down important information thus obtained and audio-tape the discussion, if possible.

### 2.3 Data Collection Strategy

Eleven agencies, were assigned the task of conducting the study at state level. Two of these agencies conducted the study in 5 states each. Tools to be used for data collection, lists of sampled schools and data analysis plan which were prepared by Research Evaluation \& Studies Unit of Ed.CIL's Technical Support Group for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan with the help of an Experts Group, were supplied to all the agencies.

For collecting data on attendance, investigators made 3 unannounced visits to schools at intervals of 2 to 4 weeks to record attendance by actual head count of students and teachers. However, due to some constraints in Gujarat only 2 visits to schools were made and in Kashmir valley only 1 visit was made. Counting was done two times on the day of visit one soon after opening of the school and the other about half hour before closing time. Data on students' attendance was also collected from attendance registers for the year 2005-06. Data collection for this study took place during $2^{\text {nd }}$ half of 2006 in most states.

### 2.4 Data Analysis

Average attendance rates were calculated by dividing the number of students who were found present in their classes during the three visits to schools by the number of students who were enrolled in the relevant class or level of education. These have been expressed in the form of percentage. For the students of any particular category, the data on the number of students found present and the number of those who were enrolled in that category, was used.

## Over all Average Attendance Rate

For calculating the overall average attendance rates of students (based on the total of all the states) weighted average of state-wise attendance rates of students was calculated in which
the weights were the total state level enrolment figures of the relevant category of students. For calculating the average attendance rate of teachers, the weights used were the number of teachers in primary and upper primary schools in the state.

Given below is the formula for calculation of weighted average for the total of all the 20 states:

If $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is total enrolment at primary level in the state $\mathrm{i}\left(\mathrm{i}=1\right.$ to 20 ) and $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the average attendance rate at primary level derived from the data on enrolment and students found present during the three visits to the sampled schools, then the weighted average for the total of all the states is
$\sum \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}} / \sum \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$
To obtain the average attendance rate for any particular category of students such as SC students at primary level, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$ to be used for weighting is the number of SC students at primary level in the entire $i^{\text {th }}$ state.

## Effect of other Factors on Students' Attendance

In order to study how the school and teacher variables and students' variables, such as gender, social class, parents' education affected students' attendance, correlations were calculated and also regression analysis was carried out. Similarly, regression analysis was used to study the relationship between students' attendance rate and their repetition rate, dropout rate and achievement in examinations.

In the case of repetition and dropout, the school was the unit of analysis whereas in the case of achievement of students, students were the units of analysis. To study the contribution of attendance rate to their achievement in annual school examination, regression analysis was done in which the scores of students in mathematics and language and the total, were dependent variables, while their attendance during 2005-06, age, gender, repetition status, father's occupation and education, mother's education and social class were independent variables.

## CHAPTER - 3 Schools and Teachers

Schools are expected to impart education to the children to enable them to become future citizens of the country who can live amicably with others, face life challenges effectively and preserve and add to the existing knowledge, skills, good practices and culture of the society.

Children coming to these institutions bring with them variety of their own family back ground and social experiences. Within the school premises they influence school environment and also get influenced by the school environment which is to certain extent carefully structured to provide learning experiences to them. School factors, both physical and behavioural along with the school /class level processes influence, child's attitude towards learning and motivation to come to school to learn.

The schools selected for this study were mostly government schools but included few private aided schools also. In this chapter we shall discuss the characteristics of these schools and physical facilities available in them.

### 3.1 Approach Road and Surroundings of Schools

Students attendance in schools can be low if the schools are difficult to reach. Clear and well kept surroundings instill confidence in the parents to send their wards to schools. Information on these aspects was collected from sampled schools which is being presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Percentage of schools with good approach road and clean surroundings.

| States | Schools with good <br> approach road (\%) |  | Approachable during <br> rainy season (\%) |  | With clear and well <br> kept surroundings (\%) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. |  |
| U.Pr |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 73.8 | 82.8 | 64.1 | 69.9 | 75.5 | 84.9 |
| Assam | 61.5 | 62.8 | 61.1 | 61.5 | 74.6 | 82.1 |
| Bihar | 50.0 | 67.0 | 53.0 | 66.0 | 60.0 | 72.0 |
| Chhattisgarh | 56.0 | 66.0 | 71.0 | 72.0 | 87.0 | 84.0 |
| Delhi | 95.2 | - | 87.9 | - | 90.3 | - |
| Gujarat | 58.6 | 80.5 | 56.9 | 60.3 | 91.4 | 85.7 |
| Haryana | 83.4 | 88.7 | 78.5 | 77.4 | 82.3 | 90.6 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 58.4 | 58.7 | 56.3 | 65.3 | 85.3 | 81.3 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 54.7 | 83.9 | 55.8 | 56.9 | 66.7 | 50.8 |
| Karnataka | 65.4 | 78.9 | 58.3 | 71.8 | 72.9 | 88.7 |
| Kerala | 88.2 | 93.3 | 81.1 | 82.2 | 99.1 | 100.0 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 68.0 | 65.0 | 66.0 | 65.0 | 81.0 | 79.0 |
| Maharashtra | 69.0 | 85.0 | 71.0 | 80.0 | 95.0 | 99.0 |
| Orissa | 64.3 | 74.0 | 61.7 | 68.0 | 67.7 | 82.0 |
| Punjab | 99.6 | 100.0 | 84.1 | 98.5 | 98.7 | 98.5 |
| Rajasthan | 53.4 | 76.9 | 61.7 | 79.3 | 78.0 | 86.0 |
| Tamil Nadu | 83.3 | 86.1 | 74.7 | 66.7 | 92.2 | 86.1 |
| Uttrakhand | 55.6 | 52.4 | 66.5 | 57.1 | 88.7 | 85.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 79.0 | 88.4 | 72.5 | 86.0 | 78.0 | 86.0 |
| West Bengal | 48.1 | 57.7 | 52.2 | 55.1 | 58.4 | 65.4 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{6 2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 . 7}$ |

Table 3.1 shows wide variation across states in terms of approachability of schools. Good approach road to school was reported by almost all schools ( $99.6 \%$ for primary and $100 \%$ for upper primary schools) in Punjab to nearly half ( $48.1 \%$ for primary and $57.7 \%$ for
upper primary ) of the schools in West Bengal. Only fifty to sixty percent of primary schools in Bihar, Rajasthan, Jammu \& Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh and Gujarat have good approach road; upper primary schools were better situated in this respect with fewer states falling in this category -Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh and West Bengal.
Less than $60 \%$ of the primary schools in West Bengal, Bihar, Jammu \& Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and Gujarat reported that their schools are approachable in rainy season; whereas at upper primary stage the situation was observed to be similar only on West Bengal, Jammu \& Kashmir and Uttarakhand.

Clean and well kept surroundings were reported by less than $75 \%$ schools in West Bengal, Bihar, Jammu \& Kashmir, Orissa, Karnataka and Assam at primary stage and Jammu \& Kashmir, West Bengal and Bihar at the upper primary stage. Lack of clean surroundings is particularly serious in primary schools of Bihar and West Bengal where about $40 \%$ schools do not have clean and well kept surroundings.

### 3.2 School Infrastructure

Good physical infrastructure is a basic pre-requisite of a school. This may not guarantee better quality of learning but lack of it can certainly hamper the process of teaching learning.
a) Condition of School Building

Information with regard to condition of school building is presented in Table no. 3.2 for schools at primary and upper primary stage.

Wide variation was observed among states in respect of condition of school buildings. While Over $65 \%$ of the school buildings appear to be well maintained in states like Kerala, Punjab, Gujarat, Rajasthan , Madhya Pradesh and Haryana, more than $20 \%$ of primary and upper primary schools were reported to be in need of major repair in Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal. Maximum upper primary school buildings needing repair are in Orissa (51\%). In Assam, Bihar and West Bengal also a large number of schools need major repair (over 30\%).
Table 3.2 Percentage of schools according to condition of school building

| State | Primary schools |  |  | Upper Primary schools |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Building <br> Well - <br> maintained | Needs <br> minor <br> repair | Needs <br> Major <br> repair | Building <br> Well - <br> Maintained | Needs <br> minor <br> repair | Needs <br> Major <br> repair |
| Andhra Pradesh | 46.0 | 33.8 | 13.9 | 56.1 | 29.6 | 13.3 |
| Assam | 38.5 | 29.8 | 31.7 | 26.9 | 42.3 | 30.8 |
| Bihar | 32.6 | 38.4 | 22.9 | 18.0 | 41.6 | 38.2 |
| Chhattisgarh | 44.9 | 33.2 | 18.7 | 47.6 | 40.2 | 9.8 |
| Delhi | 66.1 | 21.5 | 12.3 | --- | -- | ---- |
| Gujarat | 70.7 | 22.4 | 6.9 | 67.6 | 22.3 | 10.1 |
| Haryana | 65.2 | 19.8 | 14.6 | 67.9 | 20.08 | 11.3 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 25.7 | 52.2 | 21.2 | 37.9 | 41.3 | 17.3 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 49.3 | 45.9 | 4.9 | 50.8 | 39.5 | 9.7 |
| Karnataka | 48.5 | 39.0 | 11.9 | 45.1 | 38.0 | 16.9 |
| Kerala | 81.6 | 17.1 | 0.9 | 82.2 | 15.6 | 2.2 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 66.0 | 25.0 | 8.0 | 68.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 |
| Maharashtra | 58.5 | 30.5 | 11.0 | 62.5 | 22.6 | 15.3 |
| Orissa | 25.5 | 39.8 | 34.0 | 16.0 | 33.0 | 51.0 |
| Punjab | 77.1 | 22.0 | 0.9 | 91.2 | 5.9 | 2.9 |
| Rajasthan | 66.4 | 25.9 | 6.9 | 66.9 | 26.5 | 6.61 |
| Tamil Nadu | 47.7 | 38.4 | 13.5 | 45.8 | 31.9 | 22.2 |
| Uttarakhand | 46.8 | 34.8 | 18.4 | 34.5 | 37.9 | 27.6 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 53.2 | 30.8 | 14.1 | 58.0 | 26.1 | 15.9 |
| West Bengal | 29.3 | 43.2 | 26.7 | 26.9 | 37.2 | 35.9 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{4 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 8}$ |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases

## b) Over Crowded Classrooms

Details about adequacy of sitting space available for the children in the class room were collected and have been compiled in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Percentage of overcrowded classrooms

| States | Primary |  |  | Upper Primary |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Some | All | None | Some | All |
| Andhra Pradesh | 50.3 | 29.1 | 16.9 | 44.9 | 42.9 | 12.2 |
| Assam | 56.3 | 12.7 | 31.0 | 33.3 | 32.1 | 34.6 |
| Bihar | 19.4 | 35.1 | 42.3 | 12.4 | 25.8 | 61.8 |
| Chhattisgarh | 59.7 | 30.0 | 9.9 | 62.2 | 28.0 | 9.8 |
| Delhi | 82.0 | 13.1 | 4.9 | -- | -- | -- |
| Gujarat | 72.4 | 5.2 | 22.4 | 60.3 | 22.0 | 17.8 |
| Haryana | 77.7 | 17.8 | 4.0 | 71.7 | 22.6 | 3.8 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 84.9 | 11.4 | 3.7 | 77.8 | 16.0 | 6.7 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 70.5 | 19.2 | 10.3 | 69.9 | 25.1 | 5.0 |
| Karnataka | 73.6 | 18.6 | 7.1 | 53.5 | 33.8 | 12.7 |
| Kerala | 93.9 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 60.0 | 26.0 | 14.0 | 58.0 | 30.0 | 11.0 |
| Maharashtra | 88.5 | 10.5 | 1.0 | 73.2 | 18.5 | 9.3 |
| Orissa | 39.0 | 29.0 | 32.0 | 41.0 | 47.0 | 12.0 |
| Punjab | 95.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 92.6 | 7.4 | 0.0 |
| Rajasthan | 72.6 | 18.4 | 8.7 | 63.6 | 27.3 | 9.1 |
| Tamil Nadu | 81.1 | 16.0 | 2.8 | 68.1 | 23.6 | 8.3 |
| Uttarakhand | 80.2 | 12.1 | 7.8 | 82.5 | 7.9 | 9.5 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 65.1 | 21.5 | 10.9 | 76.1 | 14.8 | 8.0 |
| West Bengal | 38.7 | 42.3 | 18.4 | 37.2 | 43.6 | 18.2 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{6 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9}$ |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases
The problem of overcrowded classroom was particularly serious in primary and upper primary schools of Bihar and Orissa.

## c)Ventilation in classrooms

The condition with regard to ventilation and light was poor in all classrooms in over $30 \%$ of primary and upper primary schools in Assam and Bihar. In West Bengal, the percentage of such schools was large. Schools in Punjab were best in this regard. The information on this aspect is presented in table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Percentage of schools with adequate light and ventilation in class rooms

| State | Classrooms with good ventilation \& sufficient natural light |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary |  |  | Upper Primary |  |  |
|  | All | Some | None | All | Some | None |
| Andhra Pradesh | 77.2 | 14.2 | 4.3 | 80.6 | 14.3 | 4.1 |
| Assam | 9.1 | 59.5 | 31.3 | 20.5 | 50.0 | 41.7 |
| Bihar | 19.4 | 35.1 | 45.5 | 12.4 | 25.8 | 61.8 |
| Chhattisgarh | 90.8 | 7.1 | 2.1 | 92.7 | 4.9 | 2.4 |
| Delhi | 95.1 | 4.1 | 0.8 | -- | -- | -- |
| Gujarat | 93.1 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 90.9 | 8.1 | 1.0 |
| Haryana | 94.3 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 86.8 | 11.3 | - |
| Himachal Pradesh | 76.3 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 82.6 | 9.4 | 8.0 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 85.2 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 77.4 | 15.0 | 7.5 |
| Karnataka | 82.4 | 13.6 | 3.4 | 87.3 | 8.5 | 4.2 |
| Kerala | 98.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 94.4 | 4.4 | 1.1 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 94.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 90.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 |
| Maharashtra | 87.6 | 11.6 | 0.8 | 75.0 | 21.0 | 4.0 |
| Orissa | 7.9 | 14.3 | 6.7 | 78.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 |
| Punjab | 97.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Rajasthan | 89.5 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 87.6 | 10.7 | 1.7 |
| Tamil Nadu | 94.7 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 90.3 | 9.7 | 0.0 |
| Uttarakhand | 86.3 | 11.0 | 2.7 | 77.4 | 14.5 | 8.1 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 90.4 | 5.1 | 2.2 | 92.0 | 8.0 | -- |
| West Bengal | 62.6 | 22.3 | 14.5 | 61.5 | 29.5 | 9.0 |
| Over all | 73.8 | 14.2 | 7.7 | 77.8 | 13.7 | 8.6 |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases

## d) Toilets in Schools

Lack of toilet facilities in school discourages children particularly girls, from going to school. Table 3.5 shows percentage of schools having usable toilet facilities.

In more than $20 \%$ of schools common toilets were not available in primary and upper primary schools in Andhra Pradesh ( $34.4 \%, 36.7 \%$ ), Bihar ( $57.7 \%$, 40.5\%), Chhattisgarh ( $57.29,43.9 \%$ ), Himachal Pradesh ( $59.2 \%, 33.3 \%$ ), Orissa ( $66.4 \%, 40 \%$ ), Jammu \& Kashmir $(39.2 \%, 25.6 \%)$, Maharashtra ( $33.5 \%, 20 \%$ ), Tamil Nadu ( $37 \%, 30.5 \%$ ) and Uttar Pradesh $(23.1 \%, 23.9 \%)$. The situation was better at upper primary stage but poor at primary stage in two states, Karnataka (30.5\%) and Madhya Pradesh (22\%).

Table 3.5 Percentage of schools having Common toilet facilities

|  | Common toilets in Primary <br> schools |  |  | Common toilets in Upper primary <br> Available <br> and used | Available, <br> not used | Not <br> available |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Available <br> and used | Available <br> not used | Not <br> available |  |  |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 36.4 | 15.9 | 34.4 | 39.8 | 19.4 | 36.7 |
| Assam | 73.4 | 20.6 | 6.0 | 82.1 | 17.9 | 0.0 |
| Bihar | 24.4 | 17.9 | 57.7 | 43.8 | 15.7 | 40.5 |
| Chhattisgarh | 18.4 | 24.0 | 57.2 | 36.6 | 19.5 | 43.9 |
| Delhi | 97.5 | 0.8 | 1.6 | - | - | - |
| Gujarat | 74.2 | 10.3 | 15.5 | 76.7 | 7.7 | 15.6 |
| Haryana | 86.2 | 3.6 | 8.1 | 86.8 | 3.8 | 9.4 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 29.0 | 11.8 | 59.2 | 57.4 | 9.3 | 33.3 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 49.4 | 11.3 | 39.2 | 54.7 | 19.7 | 25.6 |
| Karnataka | 55.3 | 14.2 | 30.5 | 85.9 | 2.8 | 11.3 |
| Kerala | 92.1 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 95.6 | 3.3 | 1.1 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 54.0 | 18.0 | 22.0 | 60.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| Maharashtra | 61.1 | 5.4 | 33.5 | 76.5 | 3.5 | 20.0 |
| Orissa | 22.7 | 13.7 | 66.4 | 35.0 | 25.0 | 40.0 |
| Punjab | 97.8 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Rajasthan | 69.3 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 89.3 | 4.1 | 6.6 |
| Tamil Nadu | 50.5 | 12.5 | 37.0 | 51.4 | 18.1 | 30.5 |
| Uttarakhand | 74.6 | 15.5 | 9.9 | 80.6 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 43.9 | 24.7 | 23.1 | 56.8 | 12.5 | 23.9 |
| West Bengal | 65.5 | 12.9 | 21.0 | 71.8 | 19.1 | 9.0 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{5 5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3}$ |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases

## e) Toilet facilities for girls

Separate toilets for girls are important for retention and regularity of attendance of girls in schools particularly so at upper primary level. Table 3.6 shows the position of availability of toilet facilities specifically for girls.

The scenario with regard to availability of toilets for girls was more dismal. Such toilets were not available in more than $25 \%$ of schools in all the states except Delhi, Haryana, Kerala and Punjab in primary and upper primary schools. Separate toilets for girls are particularly needed in upper primary schools, but over $60 \%$ of such schools did not have this facility in Assam, Bihar and Orissa.

Table 3.6 Percentage of schools having separate toilets for girls

| State | Separate toilet for girls in primary schools |  |  | Separate toilet for girls in upper primary schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Available and used | Available, not used | Not available | Available and used | Available, not used | Not available |
| Andhra Pradesh | 28.8 | 12.6 | 42.4 | 34.7 | 14.3 | 42.9 |
| Assam | 11.5 | 32.9 | 55.6 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 78.2 |
| Bihar | 10.4 | 13.3 | 89.6 | 31.5 | 11.2 | 68.5 |
| Chhattisgarh | 9.5 | 25.8 | 62.5 | 34.1 | 18.3 | 45.1 |
| Delhi | 89.3 | 5.7 | 4.9 | -- | -- | -- |
| Gujarat | 46.6 | 8.6 | 44.8 | 63.4 | 5.9 | 30.7 |
| Haryana | 72.5 | 3.6 | 17.4 | 81.1 | 9.4 | 7.5 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 22.4 | 7.8 | 69.8 | 44.0 | 10.7 | 45.3 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 31.6 | 6.8 | 61.5 | 44.4 | 2.5 | 53.1 |
| Karnataka | 41.0 | 14.6 | 44.4 | 69.0 | 1.4 | 29.6 |
| Kerala | 84.2 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 93.3 | 5.6 | 1.1 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 39.0 | 21.0 | 31.0 | 38.0 | 20.0 | 33.0 |
| Maharashtra | 44.6 | 3.3 | 52.1 | 61.0 | 4.2 | 34.8 |
| Orissa | 14.3 | 7.3 | 78.3 | 24.0 | 12.0 | 64.0 |
| Punjab | 95.2 | 0 | 4.8 | 97.1 | 0 | 2.9 |
| Rajasthan | 50.9 | 18.8 | 29.9 | 71.1 | 11.6 | 17.4 |
| Tamil Nadu | 44.5 | 11.7 | 43.8 | 62.5 | 11.1 | 26.4 |
| Uttarakhand | 44.5 | 16.6 | 38.9 | 62.9 | 9.7 | 27.4 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 32.4 | 18.9 | 33 | 46.6 | 13.6 | 26.1 |
| West Bengal | 42.3 | 9.7 | 47.4 | 67.9 | 11.5 | 20.6 |
| Over all | 36.5 | 15.0 | 46.2 | 51.6 | 10.2 | 37.1 |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases

## f) Furniture and Drinking Water Facility

Table 3.7 shows the position of schools in respect of availability of furniture/ tat patti for children and facility of safe drinking water.

In Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu only 20 to $25 \%$ schools had adequate furniture /tat patties for students at primary stage. The situation was better at upper primary stage in all states except Andhra Pradesh.

Safe drinking was not available in majority of the sampled primary schools in Assam and Andhra Pradesh and in majority of upper primary schools of Assam, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Karnataka.

Table 3.7 Percentage of schools having adequate furniture/tat patti \& Safe drinking water

| State | Primary |  | Upper Primary |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Adequate furniture / tat patties for students | Safe drinking water | Adequate furniture/ tat patties for students | Safe drinking water |
| Andhra Pradesh | 24.1 | 6.6 | 1.1 | 76.3 |
| Assam | 74.2 | 39.3 | 51.3 | 44.9 |
| Bihar | 22.2 | 70.3 | 78.7 | 51.7 |
| Chhattisgarh | 80.2 | 82.3 | 84.1 | 84.1 |
| Delhi | 96.8 | 98.4 |  |  |
| Gujarat | 51.7 | 62.1 | 76.3 | 63.8 |
| Haryana | 89.9 | 80.6 | 86.8 | 77.4 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 93.1 | 78.4 | 70.7 | 90.7 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 86.3 | 65.8 | 80.6 | 92.8 |
| Karnataka | 45.1 | 65.8 | 85.9 | 54.9 |
| Kerala | 85.5 | 86.4 | 95.6 | 88.9 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 92.0 | 64.0 | 74.0 | 89.0 |
| Maharashtra | 79.7 | 69.0 | 73.6 | 75.5 |
| Orissa | 20.3 | 76.3 | 77.0 | 51.0 |
| Punjab | 87.2 | 99.6 | 97.1 | 98.5 |
| Rajasthan | 77.6 | 73.3 | 82.6 | 81.8 |
| Tamil Nadu | 39.5 | 77.9 | 81.9 | 41.7 |
| Uttarakhand | 94.2 | 76.7 | 63.5 | 93.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 85.4 | 85.4 | 81.4 | 88.4 |
| West Bengal | 35.8 | 64.2 | 66.4 | 43.6 |
| Over all | 65.5 | 65.3 | 71.7 | 72.7 |

Note: \%ages may not add to 100 due to non response cases

### 3.3 TEACHERS

Teachers' role is crucial in a school as on their shoulder rests the responsibility of knowledge transaction. They interact with children almost every day and are greatly responsible for child's interest in learning as well as learning achievement. In the present study more than 20,000 teachers were interviewed. In the following table information on, percentage of para-teachers and female teachers and their qualifications and experience are being presented. It may be observed that this information is for the teachers in the sampled schools and may not be true for the teachers of the entire state.

Table 3.8 shows the variation across the states with regard to percentage of female teachers in primary and upper primary schools. On one hand there were states like Bihar, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal with less than $30 \%$ female teachers in primary schools, on the other hand there was Kerala with nearly $80 \%$ of female teachers closely followed by Tamil Nadu ( $69.5 \%$ ), Delhi ( $66 \%$ ), Uttarakhand ( $63 \%$ ). At upper primary stage, Chhattisgarh (20.6\%) and Himachal Pradesh (24.9\%) were the two states with less than $30 \%$ of female teachers.

Table 3.8 Teachers' profile in the sampled schools

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { SI. } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | State | Teachers in Primary schools |  |  |  | Teachers (\%) in Upper Primary schools |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Female } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Para } \\ \text { Teachers } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | Untrained (\%) | H/S or less <br> Quali- <br> fication <br> $(\%)$ | Female (\%) | Para Teachers (\%) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Untrained } \\ (\%) \end{array}$ | H/S or <br> less <br> Quali- <br> fication <br> $(\%)$ |
| 1 | Andhra <br> Pradesh | 44.5 | 11.8 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 39.6 | 13.5 | 10.6 | 3.5 |
| 2 | Assam | 34.9 | 4.6 | 11.7 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 1.00 | 13.5 | 40.5 |
| 3 | Bihar | 28.3 | 54.4 | 39.4 | 9.3 | 7.4 | 29.4 | 18.8 | 8.0 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 24.9 | 12.3 | 32.6 | 5.3 | 20.6 | 12.2 | 8.4 | 35.1 |
| 5 | Delhi | 66.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | Gujarat | 45.1 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 42.5 | 29.9 | 1.0 | 4.6 |
| 7 | Haryana | 53.6 | 15.6 | 4.5 | 17.2 | 46.3 | 11.4 | 4.5 | 10.0 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 34.6 | 23.7 | 17.6 | 24.9 | 28.0 | 21.3 | 8.0 | 21.3 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 47.0 | 28.3 | 30.2 | 1.4 | 42.9 | 32.4 | 36.5 | 4.3 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 44.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.01 |
| 11 | Kerala | 79.7 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 8.2 | 72.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 45.0 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 25.0 | 43.0 | 17.0 | 2.0 | 22.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 35.0 | 10.0 | 72.0 | 18.0 | 32.0 | 13.0 | 74.0 | 28.0 |
| 14 | Orissa | 31.7 | 25.0 | 16.3 | 33.0 | 36.0 | 23.0 | 4.0 | 13.0 |
| 15 | Punjab | 30.5 | 7.2 | 1.2 | 0.50 | 30.2 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 0.00 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 37.3 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 3.50 | 33.2 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 3.7 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 69.5 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 11.7 | 65.7 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 39.2 | 30.7 | 31.6 | 9.2 | 33.7 | 2.1 | 19.1 | 3.8 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 63.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 26.5 | 3.5 | 22.9 | 20.6 | 28.2 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Over all | 44.1 | 14.0 | 15.5 | 12.3 | 36.4 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 10.6 |

$\mathrm{N}=20595$ teachers

Similarly the percentage of para teachers in primary schools ranged from less than $2 \%$ in Karnataka, Tamil Nadu \& Delhi to more than $50 \%$ in Bihar (54.4\%) and between $25 \%$ and $50 \%$ in Uttar Pradesh (30.7\%), Jammu \& Kashmir(28.3\%) and Orissa (25\%). At the upper primary stage the proportion of para teachers was less than that at primary stage; still there were states having more than $25 \%$ of para-teachers such as Jammu \& Kashmir (32.4\%), Gujarat (29.9\%) and Bihar (29.4\%).

The percentage of untrained teachers was observed to be high in Madhya Pradesh (72\%), Bihar (39.4\%), Chhatisgarh (32.6\%), J\&K (30.2\%) and Uttar Pradesh(31.6\%) at primary stage and in Madhya Pradesh (74\%) and J\&K (32.4\%) and Uttar Pradesh (19.1\%) at upper primary stage. The problem of untrained teachers was quite serious in the states of J\&K and Madhya Pradesh. The problem could be tackled by prescribing teacher training as the essential qualification for initial recruitment and by making provision for in-service education of untrained teachers who are already in the system.

The minimum academic qualification prescribed for upper primary stage in most of the states is now senior secondary ( +2 ). As such, the teachers with High school or lower qualification are not adequately qualified for teaching at the upper primary stage.

Also the minimum academic qualification prescribed for primary stage teachers in most of the states is senior secondary ( +2 ) and as such teachers with High school or less qualification are considered under-qualified teachers. Since the minimum academic qualification from high school and higher secondary has been raised at different points during the past two decades, the teachers with lower academic qualification recruited prior to the revision of qualifications are still in the system. Besides, the minimum qualification is still high school in some of the states.

The proportion of under-qualified teachers at primary stage was more than $20 \%$ in Assam, (37.1\%), Orissa (33\%), Himachal Pradesh (24.9\%), Maharashtra (25\%) and West Bengal ( $20.6 \%$ ). The percentage of under-qualified teachers was also substantial at the upper primary stage in Assam (40.5\%) Chhattisgarh (35\%), Himachal Pradesh (21.3\%) Maharashtra ( $22.0 \%$ and Madhya Pradesh (28.0\%).

The table 3.9 shows the number of days on which teachers were present in school and number of days on which they were on leave or were deputed for training or given other non-teaching duty.

Table 3.9 Average number of days spent by teachers on different tasks during 2005-06

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sl. } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | State | Primary stage |  |  |  |  | Upper Primary stage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Teachi } \\ \text { ng } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Non- } \\ \text { teaching } \end{array}$ | Trg. | Leave | Total | Teaching | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non- } \\ \text { teaching } \end{gathered}$ | Trg. | Leave | Total |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 170.0 | 3.3 | 7.4 | 23.0 | 203.7 | 167.2 | 3.8 | 8.5 | 26.5 | 205.5 |
| 2 | Assam | 239.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 12.6 | 256.7 | 239.6 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 12.8 | 257.5 |
| 3 | Bihar | 169.0 | 20.0 | 23.0 | 28.0 | 240.0 | 172.0 | 19.0 | 28.0 | 24.0 | 243.0 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 192.0 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 215.0 | 197.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 11.0 | 221.00 |
| 5 | Delhi | 195.0 | 3.0 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 210.2 | - | - |  | - |  |
| 6 | Gujarat | 190.6 | 0.4 | 18.2 | 10.5 | 219.7 | 193.4 | 0.9 | 18.4 | 10.8 | 223.50 |
| 7 | Haryana | 220.0 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 9.9 | 239.5 | 201.1 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 9.9 | 222.70 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 209.0 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 10.0 | 236.0 | 207.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 238.00 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 213.2 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 11.7 | 227.9 | 215.5 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 10.7 | 228.60 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 203.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 231.0 | 203.0 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 16.0 | 233.00 |
| 11 | Kerala | 164.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 16.0 | 186.0 | 163.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 15.0 | 185.00 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 194.0 | 4.0 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 217.0 | 198.0 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 224.00 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 226.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 5.8 | 233.3 | 225.8 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 5.7 | 238.30 |
| 14 | Orissa | 191.9 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 215.6 | 193.8 | 5.9 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 216.60 |
| 15 | Punjab | 229.8 | 2.9 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 235.1 | 231.7 | 2.5 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 245.30 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 177.3 | 3.1 | 8.8 | 12.7 | 201.9 | 175.0 | 3.8 | 9.3 | 16.1 | 204.20 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 172.0 | 4.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 200.0 | 172.0 | 4.0 | 11.0 | 14.0 | 201.00 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 183.9 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 203.1 | 197.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 10.3 | 216.10 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 180.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 17.0 | 229.0 | 183.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 | 235.00 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 221.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 235.7 | 220.0 | 5.3 | 3.3 | 7.3 | 235.90 |
|  | Over all | 197.1 | 4.7 | 8.6 | 11.9 | 222.0 | 197.6 | 5.1 | 9.2 | 13.1 | 225.0.0 |

On the average, the working days for upper primary school teachers were slightly more than those of primary school teachers. However, the average number of days spent on academic, non-academic duties, training and leave were nearly the same at primary and upper primary stages.

At the primary stage, teachers in the states of Assam, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and West Bengal spent more than 200 days in a year on teaching work, while the number of days spent on teaching work is less in Bihar (169) and Kerala (164). The number of days spent on non-teaching work is the highest in Bihar (20) followed by Uttarakhand (16). The number of days spent on training is the highest in Bihar (20) followed by Gujarat (18), Uttarakhand (16) and Himachal Pradesh (14). Leave taken by teachers was quite high in Bihar (28), Andhra Pradesh (23) Uttrakhand (17) and Kerala (16)

On the average, the working days for upper primary school teachers were slightly less than those of primary school teachers. However, the average number of days spent on academic, non-academic duties, training and leave were nearly the same at primary and upper primary stages.

At the primary stage, teachers in the states of Assam, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and West Bengal spent more than 200 days in a year on teaching work, while the number of days spent on teaching work is less in Bihar (169) and Kerala (164). The number of days spent on non-teaching work is the highest in Bihar (20) followed by Uttarakhand (16). The number of days spent on training is the highest in Bihar (20) followed by Gujarat (18), Uttarakhand (16) and Himachal Pradesh (14). Leave taken by teachers was quite high in Bihar (28), Andhra Pradesh (23) Uttrakhand (17) and Kerala (16).

At the upper primary stage, the number of days spent on non-teaching work was quite substantial in the states of Bihar (19) and Uttarakhand (17). The time spent on training was negligible (less than 5 days) in the states of Assam, Jammu \& Kashmir, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. Leave taken by teachers was high in the Andhra Pradesh (26), Bihar (24) and Uttrakhand (19).

### 3.4 Quality Indicators 2005-06

Academic progress of the students as judged by their repetition and dropout rates, is commonly used for assessing the quality of schools/ schooling system. Information was collected at school level. This included number of students who were enrolled in classes at primary and upper primary stage, number of students who got promoted to next class, number of students who repeated the class and number of students who dropped out of the school. The information thus collected has been presented in Table 3.10 for primary and upper primary stages in the form of percentage of repeaters and dropouts .

Table shows that the percentage of students repeating the same class is 9.3 at primary stage and 8.1 at upper primary stage and the percentage of those dropping out is 3.3 at primary and 0.1 at upper primary stage. The states in which the percentage of repeaters at primary stage was large (over 10\%) were Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttarakhand. At the upper primary stage, the percentage of repeaters was over $10 \%$ in all these states (except Uttarakhand) and West Bengal. The percentage of Dropout at primary stage was low (below 5\%) in all the states except Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh where it was between $5 \%$ and $10 \%$. At upper primary stage, the percentage of dropouts was negligible ( $0.5 \%$ or less) in every state.

Table 3.10 Repeater and Dropout rates record at primary \& upper primary stage (2005-06)

| State | Primary |  |  | Upper Primary |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> students | Repeaters <br> $(\%)$ | Drop <br> Outs (\%) | Total <br> students | Repeaters <br> $(\%)$ | Drop <br> out (\%) |
| Andhra Pradesh | 38911 | 4.54 | 6.42 | 5821 | 1.9 | 0.03 |
| Assam | 15959 | 7.13 | 0.69 | 9240 | 8.6 | 0.09 |
| Bihar | 75132 | 6.90 | 5.16 | 15400 | 10.5 | 0.07 |
| Chhattisgarh | 30432 | 21.38 | 1.45 | 7778 | 22.2 | 0.28 |
| Delhi | 51239 | 7.02 | 4.75 | - | - | - |
| Gujarat | 49646 | 9.62 | 2.35 | 16104 | 5.2 | 0.03 |
| Haryana | 38062 | 11.36 | 2.06 | 5489 | 13.1 | 0.24 |
| Himachal <br> Pradesh | 11703 | 3.44 | 0.22 | 4800 | 7.6 | 0.16 |
|  <br> Kashmir | 10956 | 7.6 | 0.5 | 5008 | 7.7 | 0.50 |
| Karnataka | 26570 | 6.26 | 1.37 | 5418 | 1.3 | 0.02 |
| Kerala | 46832 | 3.41 | 0.55 | 12572 | 7.4 | 0.06 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 35894 | 19.24 | 0.54 | 8396 | 20.7 | 0.25 |
| Maharashtra | 44555 | 6.41 | 1.17 | 9896 | 5.8 | 0.06 |
| Orissa | 39728 | 9.63 | 2.20 | 8409 | 6.4 | 0.08 |
| Punjab | 27642 | 6.67 | 0.62 | 4637 | 7.3 | 0.16 |
| Rajasthan | 45085 | 14.24 | 4.45 | 11460 | 12.8 | 0.11 |
| Tamil Nadu | 36856 | 1.65 | 0.86 | 9760 | 1.6 | 0.02 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 61842 | 4.29 | 8.97 | 13752 | 1.3 | 0.01 |
| Uttarakhand | 17665 | 11.75 | 1.00 | 4165 | 5.1 | 0.12 |
| West Bengal | 39717 | 7.65 | 0.88 | 21902 | 15.1 | 0.07 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{7 4 4 4 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |

### 3.4.1 Performance in the Final Examination of the Terminal Class at primary and upper primary stage.

Students' performance at the terminal class at any stage is an important indicator of quality of schooling for that particular stage. Table 3.11 presents information about the percentage of students passing the final examination for that stage with $50 \%$ and above marks at primary and upper primary stage respectively.

The data presented in the table shows that at the primary level, less than $50 \%$ students scored above 50\% in Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Punjab ; 50 to $70 \%$ students scored above 50\% marks in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhatisgarh, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. In Delhi, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh more than $70 \%$ students scored above $50 \%$ marks. The lowest percentage of students scoring over $50 \%$ marks was in Madhya Pradesh -only $35.7 \%$.

In the examination at the end of Upper Primary level, more than $70 \%$ students scored above $50 \%$ marks in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and 50 to 70 \% students did so in Jammu \& Kashmir, Rajasthan, Bihar, Tamil Nadu and Uttarakhand. In Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, the performance of students was poor as less than $40 \%$ students scored over $50 \%$ marks.

Table 3.11 Percentage of students securing $50 \%$ or above marks in the final examination of terminal class at primary and upper primary stages

| SI.No. | State | Primary |  | Upper Primary |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total <br> Candidates | Students <br> securing 50\% <br> and above | Total <br> candidates | Students securing <br> $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ and above |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 8335 | 61.0 | 2323 | 77.0 |
| 2 | Assam | 4185 | 55.9 | 3353 | 42.9 |
| 3 | Bihar | 6687 | 52.0 | 4268 | 56.0 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 4304 | 51.0 | 2380 | 31.0 |
| 5 | Delhi | 9656 | 77.3 | - | - |
| 6 | Gujarat | 8638 | 86.2 | 6779 | 88.6 |
| 7 | Haryana | 6921 | 53.0 | 1904 | 48.2 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 2339 | 81.8 | 1628 | 49.3 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 1054 | 66.9 | 630 | 61.4 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 5016 | 53.0 | 2428 | 86.0 |
| 11 | Kerala | 12097 | 76.0 | 6345 | 85.0 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 8260 | 83.0 | 2563 | 76.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 5476 | 35.7 | 2624 | 37.7 |
| 14 | Orissa | 4770 | 40.6 | 4383 | 26.1 |
| 15 | Punjab | 4608 | 46.4 | 1819 | 48.0 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 7013 | 72.0 | 2887 | 69.0 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 7294 | 93.0 | 3156 | 59.0 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 8405 | 78.0 | 3438 | 86.0 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 2681 | 64.0 | 1189 | 64.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 10927 | 55.3 | 4599 | 46.1 |
|  | Over all | $\mathbf{1 2 8 6 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 6 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 0}$ |

## CHAPTER-4

## Attendance Rates of Students and Teachers

This chapter discusses students' attendance rate based on head count during unannounced visits to schools for different categories of students and also for schools categorized according to their location (rural/urban) and level of education (primary/ upper primary). In all the states, except Gujarat and Jammu \& Kashmir schools were visited thrice and students were counted twice during each visit (in the first hour and in the last hour of school). In Gujarat, schools were visited only twice and in Kashmir region of Jammu \& Kashmir, only once. In Delhi, only primary schools were covered as no data could be collected from upper primary schools.

The students' attendance data was also obtained from attendance registers for the full academic session 2005-06 and for a part of 2006-07(from the beginning of academic session till the last complete month prior to third visit). Further, this chapter also includes teachers' attendance rate on the basis of head count.

Before we come to the attendance rate of students it is important to have a look at the number of school working days in different states.

### 4.1 Working Days in Schools

The following table shows the number of working days of schools according to the state government and also the average number of working days derived from the information supplied by schools head teachers.

Table 4.1 Working days: State norm and as reported by teachers

| S.No | States | State norm | Reported Average working days |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Working days | Primary | Upper Primary |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 222 | 219.8 | 221.9 |
| 2 | Assam | 258 | 262.8 | 262.4 |
| 3 | Bihar | 226 | 228 | 230 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 220 | 223 | 221 |
| 5 | Delhi | 210 | 211.1 | NA |
| 6 | Gujarat | 220 | 219.1 | 221.4 |
| 7 | Haryana | 233 | 222.2 | 219.8 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 245 | 236.5 | 238.2 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | NA | 228 | 229 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 245 | 231 | 228 |
| 11 | Kerala | 200 | 187 | 190 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 236 | 228 | 229 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 210 | 232 | 229.8 |
| 14 | Orissa | 230 | 212.5 | 216 |
| 15 | Punjab | 247 | 246.5 | 245.8 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 240 | 202 | 206 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 220 | 208 | 212 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 226 | 219.8 | 214.1 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 233 | 209 | 209 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 248 | 235.2 | 235.9 |
|  | Over all | $\mathbf{2 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 4 . 0}$ |

The number of average prescribed teaching days ranges from 200 in Kerala to 258 in Assam. The overall average is 230 days. The average number of working days derived from the information supplied by the teachers ranges from 187 in Kerala to 263 in Assam at the primary stage and from 190 in Kerala to 262 days in Assam at the upper primary stage.

In general, schools reported fewer working days than those prescribed by the state, but in some states (e.g. Assam, Bihar and Chhattisgarh) these are more than the state prescribed working days. Either the school heads do not have correct information on the prescribed number of working days or the actual working days are decided more at local level taking into consideration local festivals or events.

### 4.2 Attendance Rate of Students at Primary and Upper Primary Stage

The overall students' attendance rates reported in this chapter were derived by computing weighted average of the attendance rates of different states using appropriate state level enrolment figures as weights, as explained in the previous chapter . The state-wise attendance rates and overall attendance rates derived from the state attendance rates are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Average attendance (\%) in 2006-07 as per head count at primary and upper primary stage

|  | Primary |  |  |  | Upper primary |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | First <br> hour | Last hour | Average <br> (P) | First <br> hour | Last <br> hour | Average <br> (UP) |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 73.3 | 72.0 | 72.7 | 77.5 | 75.7 | 76.6 |  |
| Assam | 82.2 | 80.4 | 81.3 | 84.6 | 84.4 | 84.5 |  |
| Bihar | 44.0 | 40.4 | 42.2 | 38.4 | 35.3 | 36.8 |  |
| Chhattisgarh | 68.4 | 67.1 | 67.7 | 75.3 | 74.7 | 75.0 |  |
| Delhi | 74.1 | 72.1 | 73.1 | - | - | - |  |
| Gujarat | 76.5 | 73.6 | 75.0 | 80.2 | 77.1 | 78.6 |  |
| Haryana | 83.1 | 81.3 | 82.2 | 88.0 | 82.2 | 85.1 |  |
| Himachal Pradesh | 95.1 | 94.1 | 94.6 | 93.6 | 92.8 | 93.2 |  |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 80.9 | 78.1 | 78.5 | 79.2 | 75.8 | 77.5 |  |
| Karnataka | 86.3 | 86.1 | 86.2 | 87.2 | 86.7 | 86.9 |  |
| Kerala | 91.7 | 91.1 | 91.4 | 92.4 | 91.6 | 92.0 |  |
| Madhya Pradesh | 73.3 | 70.9 | 72.1 | 70.8 | 68.9 | 69.8 |  |
| Maharashtra | 90.0 | 89.0 | 89.0 | 90.0 | 89.0 | 89.0 |  |
| Orissa | 67.8 | 65.8 | 66.8 | 69.5 | 68.6 | 69.0 |  |
| Punjab | 80.9 | 82.5 | 81.7 | 74.2 | 75.1 | 74.7 |  |
| Rajasthan | 66.3 | 59.1 | 62.7 | 81.1 | 76.6 | 78.9 |  |
| Tamil Nadu | 89.1 | 87.6 | 88.3 | 88.2 | 87.5 | 87.8 |  |
| Uttrakhand | 81.1 | 79.0 | 80.0 | 83.1 | 83.2 | 83.2 |  |
| Uttar Pradesh | 59.6 | 55.2 | 57.4 | 61.8 | 59.2 | 60.5 |  |
| West Bengal | 74.0 | 74.5 | 74.2 | 69.9 | 70.6 | 70.2 |  |
| Over all | $\mathbf{6 9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 7}$ |  |

The overall attendance rate of students at primary level is $68.5 \%$. The states having less than $65 \%$ attendance rate are Bihar ( $42.2 \%$ ), Rajasthan ( $62.7 \%$ ) and Uttar Pradesh (57.4\%). Further, the states having over $90 \%$ students' attendance rate are Himachal Pradesh (94.6\%) and Kerala ( $91.4 \%$ ). Chart 1 shows students' attendance rate at primary level for all the 20 states as well as the overall average of all states.


At the upper primary level, the overall attendance rate is $75.7 \%$, which is higher than that of primary stage by 7.2 percentage points. Bihar (36.8\%) and Uttar Pradesh (60.5\%) have very low attendance rate. The states having more than $90 \%$ attendance rate are Himachal Pradesh $(93.2 \%)$ and Kerala ( $92.0 \%$ ). Chart 2 shows students' attendance rate at Upper Primary stage for the different states as well as the overall average of all states.


### 4.3 Difference between Attendance Rates of Students in First and Last Hours of School

It was found that some children leave school early and hence the attendance rate in the last hour of school was lower than that of the first hour at both primary and upper primary levels, except in Punjab and West Bengal. The lower attendance in the second half in some of the states may be due to students' fatigue, loss of interest, unattractive class work in afternoons or being required to leave early because of some engagements or work at home. The students whose primary motivation for attending the school is mid-day meal, are likely to play truant in the second half of the school duration.

The average gap in attendance rate between the first and the last hour of school working hours is 2.7 percentage points at the primary stage and 2.1 percentage points at the upper primary stage. In Punjab state the first hour attendance at primary stage is lower by $1.6 \%$ points than that of the last hour but in West Bengal the difference between the two is negligible. Apparently, the problem of late arrival exists in the states of Punjab and West Bengal. The gap between the first and last hour attendance rates at primary stage is large in the case of Bihar ( $3.6 \%$ points), Rajasthan ( $7.2 \%$ points) and U.P. ( $4.4 \%$ points). At the upper primary level, the difference between attendance rates of the first and last hours is large in Haryana ( $5.8 \%$ points), J\&K ( $3.4 \%$ points) and Rajasthan ( $4.5 \%$ points). In all other states, the difference is less than $3 \%$ points at both primary and upper primary levels. Table 4.2 shows the attendance rate of students in the first hour and last hour of school in different states. Chart 3 shows comparison of attendance rates of the first hour and last hour for the total of all the states.


### 4.4 Difference between Attendance Rates of Boys and Girls

Table 4.3 shows state-wise attendance rate of boys and girls and also different social groups at primary stage based on the observations of the first hour in school. The strategy adopted for checking the attendance of students belonging to different social groups was to mark the students who were found absent in the attendance register and then ascertain the social group to which they belonged. In Orissa, information on whether non SC/ST student belonged to OBC or 'others' category was not available

Table 4.3 Attendance rate of students by gender and social group at primary stage

| State | Percentage of Students found present in first hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boys | Girls | SC | ST | OBC | Others | MM | Total |
| Andhra Pradesh | 73.3 | 73.4 | 73.1 | 72.1 | 75.4 | 81.4 | 69.9 | 73.3 |
| Assam | 82.5 | 82.0 | 82.9 | 77.6 | 78.3 | 81.5 | 86.3 | 82.2 |
| Bihar | 43.8 | 44.3 | 46.4 | 61.6 | 46.6 | 74.6 | 45.3 | 44.0 |
| Chhattisgarh | 68.0 | 68.5 | 69.2 | 67.9 | 69.3 | 84.8 | 80.3 | 68.4 |
| Delhi | 74.6 | 73.7 | 74.7 | 78.4 | 73.0 | 70.6 | 70.3 | 74.1 |
| Gujarat | 76.5 | 76.5 | 79.7 | 73.1 | 79.4 | 79.7 | 76.0 | 76.5 |
| Haryana | 82.7 | 83.5 | 83.6 | 91.3 | 81.8 | 83.7 | 82.9 | 83.1 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 95.0 | 95.3 | 94.1 | 95.1 | 97.4 | 95.4 | 90.8 | 95.1 |
| J\&K | 80.4 | 81.6 | 77.3 | 94.7 | 79.8 | 81.2 | 81.2 | 80.9 |
| Karnataka | 86.4 | 86.3 | 85.1 | 78.7 | 86.9 | 92.9 | 87.8 | 86.3 |
| Kerala | 91.5 | 92.0 | 90.1 | 85.9 | 91.9 | 96.6 | 91.8 | 91.7 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 72.8 | 73.9 | 73.3 | 69.5 | 75.5 | 78.5 | 75.6 | 73.3 |
| Maharashtra | 90.0 | 90.0 | 87.9 | 85.1 | 92.8 | 92.4 | 88.7 | 90.0 |
| Orissa | 67.3 | 68.2 | 63.2 | 62.8 |  | 72.6 | 65.2 | 67.8 |
| Punjab | 82.4 | 79.2 | 79.9 | 90.6 | 84.0 | 80.6 | 83.0 | 80.9 |
| Rajasthan | 68.5 | 64.2 | 65.3 | 57.8 | 69.4 | 69.6 | 67.8 | 66.3 |
| Tamil Nadu | 88.6 | 89.5 | 88.3 | 82.9 | 90.6 | 100 | 88.1 | 89.1 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 58.2 | 61.0 | 59.6 | 48.6 | 63.3 | 71.6 | 56.1 | 59.6 |
| Uttarakhand | 80.5 | 81.5 | 81.5 | 88.5 | 77.7 | 89.4 | 76.1 | 81.1 |
| West Bengal | 73.2 | 75.2 | 72.1 | 69.2 | 81.1 | 82.3 | 68.8 | 74.0 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{6 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 5}$ | - | - | $\mathbf{6 6 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 9}$ |



Chart 4 shows the average attendance rate of boys and girls at primary and upper primary stages for the total of all the states based on the data of the first hour only. Overall, girls attendance rate is higher than that of boys by 1.7 percentage points at primary stage and by 3.5 percentage points at upper primary stage. However, the difference between attendance rate of boys and girls is negligible in most of the states. The only state in which girls attendance rate is higher than that of boys by more than 2 percentage points at primary stage is Uttar Pradesh where the difference is $2.8 \%$ points. On the other hand, Rajasthan is the only state where attendance rate of boys exceeded that of girls and that too by $4.3 \%$ points.

Table 4.4 Attendance rate of students by gender $\&$ social group at upper primary stage

| State | Percentage of students found present in first hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boys | Girls | SC | ST | OBC | Others | Muslims | Total |
| Andhra Pradesh | 77.4 | 79.4 | 76.2 | 72.5 | 81.4 | 84.4 | 76.1 | 77.5 |
| Assam | 83.0 | 86.0 | 85.6 | 85.5 | 83.9 | 89.1 | 80.4 | 84.6 |
| Bihar | 36.1 | 41.8 | 42.2 | 84.0 | 43.3 | 61.9 | 42.7 | 38.4 |
| Chhattisgarh | 70.5 | 80.7 | 74.9 | 74.6 | 77.5 | 90.7 | 79.6 | 75.3 |
| Gujarat | 79.9 | 80.8 | 82.5 | 77.5 | 82.2 | 83.07 | 77.5 | 80.2 |
| Haryana | 88.1 | 88.0 | 86.8 | 87.5 | 88.6 | 89.6 | 84.1 | 88.0 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 93.1 | 94.1 | 92.4 | 94.6 | 94.0 | 94.1 | 94.0 | 93.6 |
| J\&K | 80.0 | 78.0 | 74.8 | 38.5 | 85.8 | 78.2 | 80.9 | 79.2 |
| Karnataka | 84.4 | 89.9 | 89.1 | 79.3 | 88.6 | 92.8 | 90.4 | 87.2 |
| Kerala | 92.2 | 92.7 | 94.8 | 89.8 | 94.5 | 97.3 | 93.7 | 92.4 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 69.6 | 72.0 | 71.4 | 67.4 | 73.0 | 78.6 | 74.6 | 70.8 |
| Maharashtra | 90.0 | 91.1 | 88.5 | 89.8 | 92.2 | 91.0 | 90.1 | 90.0 |
| Orissa | 66.7 | 72.5 | 65.3 | 64.2 |  | 72.9 | 62.1 | 69.5 |
| Punjab | 74.4 | 74.0 | 76.1 | 99.4 | 74.6 | 72.2 | 77.2 | 74.2 |
| Rajasthan | 81.2 | 81.1 | 80.2 | 70.8 | 83.6 | 86.3 | 83.3 | 81.1 |
| Tamil Nadu | 88.0 | 88.2 | 88.2 | 86.2 | 81.5 | 90.3 | 99.5 | 88.2 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 61.4 | 62.3 | 62.8 | 75.0 | 65.2 | 70.0 | 65.9 | 61.8 |
| Uttrakhand | 82.8 | 83.3 | 83.0 | 79.2 | 80.2 | 89.9 | 77.1 | 83.1 |
| West Bengal | 71.1 | 68.9 | 66.2 | 71.0 | 77.6 | 73.9 | 66.4 | 69.9 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{7 5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 5}$ | - | - | $\mathbf{7 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8}$ |

At the upper primary level, the states in which girls' attendance rate exceeded that of boys by more than 5 percentage points are Bihar, Karnataka and Orissa. In all other states, the gender difference was less than 3 percentage points at upper primary level. Only in two states, Jammu \& Kashmir and West Bengal, the attendance rate of boys exceeded that of girls by about 2 percentage points.

### 4.5 Attendance Rate of Students belonging to different Social Groups

Tables $4.3 \& 4.4$ show attendance rate of students belonging to different social groups in different states at primary and upper primary stages respectively. The social groups for which attendance rates are reported are Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes(ST), Other Backward Classes (OBC), Muslims (M) and Other (i.e. non-SC, non-ST class). Muslims are generally included among 'others' and OBC.

Chart 5 shows the average attendance rate of children belonging to SC, ST, Muslim categories along with that of total students at primary and upper primary levels. These rates are based on the attendance data of the first hour only for the total of all the states.

At primary stage, the average attendance rate of SC and Muslim students is slightly lower ( $68.7 \%$ and $66.4 \%$ respectively) than that of total ( $69.9 \%$ ) students. At the upper primary stage, there is not much difference between attendance rate of children of different social groups.

The states in which the attendance rate of SC students at primary stage is more than 5\% points lower than that of 'others' are Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, J\&K, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. At upper primary stage, this statement is true in the case of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. (see state data sheets).


The states in which the attendance rate of ST students at primary stage is lower by more than 5\% points than that of 'others' students are Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. The maximum difference of over $10 \%$ points is in Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Kerala, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. However, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Tamil Nadu have very low (below 2\%) ST Child population. In a few other states like Haryana and Punjab, the attendance rate of ST children is significantly higher than that of 'others' but these states have negligible ST population. The ST children are perhaps of ST officers and others who are working there but do not belong to these states.

At upper primary stage, the states in which attendance rate of ST students is much lower than that of 'other' students (that is, by more that $10 \%$ points) are Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Rajasthan, all of which have substantial ST population.

So far as Muslims are concerned, the attendance rate is at par or slightly lower than that of others in most states. Only in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal the attendance rate of Muslim children is lower that of 'other' children by 5 or more percentages. points at primary stage. At upper stage, the attendance rate of Muslims is less than that of 'other' children by more than 5 percentage points in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Orissa, Uttarakhand, and West Bengal.

### 4.6 Class-wise Attendance Rates

Table 4.5 shows class-wise attendance rate of students in different states as well as for all states based on the pooled up data of all the 20 states.

Table 4.5 Class-wise attendance rate of students

| State | Percentage of students found present in different classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII |
| Andhra Pradesh | 69,5 | 73.7 | 75.0 | 71.6 | 70.7 | 76.4 | 77.9 |
| Assam | 86.3 | 83.0 | 83.9 | 86.7 | 84.1 | 76.6 | 78.5 |
| Bihar | 43.5 | 41.8 | 41.8 | 41.3 | 41.8 | 86.3 | 83.0 |
| Chhattisgarh | 60.6 | 66.4 | 69.7 | 71.2 | 75.5 | 38.1 | 35.1 |
| Delhi | 66.5 | 71.7 | 74.0 | 75.1 | 76.4 | - | - |
| Gujarat | 70.3 | 74.0 | 77.8 | 78.5 | 75.4 | 74.2 | 73.7 |
| Haryana | 81.5 | 80.8 | 81.9 | 84.5 | 84.5 | 79.8 | 78.9 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 93.1 | 94.4 | 96.3 | 96.9 | 95.2 | 70.3 | 74.0 |
| J\&K | 78.6 | 76.5 | 72.5 | 75.4 | 76.2 | 81.5 | 80.8 |
| Karnataka | 84.9 | 85.2 | 86.8 | 87.0 | 87.0 | 78.7 | 77.1 |
| Kerala | 90.9 | 91.5 | 91.7 | 91.6 | 92.0 | 88.7 | 85.3 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 88.0 | 89.0 | 90.0 | 91.0 | 89.0 | 91.3 | 92.7 |
| Maharashtra | 69.2 | 71.6 | 73.4 | 73.7 | 73.3 | 89.0 | 88.0 |
| Orissa | 63.8 | 65.03 | 67.3 | 67.8 | 69.8 | 88.0 | 70.3 |
| Punjab | 76.2 | 78.5 | 83.2 | 79.2 | 77.2 | 68.2 | 69.9 |
| Rajasthan | 55.6 | 59.1 | 63.9 | 67.4 | 70.8 | 76.2 | 74.1 |
| Tamil Nadu | 86.0 | 87.2 | 89.0 | 90.0 | 89.3 | 88.3 | 78.5 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 56.4 | 55.8 | 56.9 | 58.8 | 60.5 | 61.7 | 86.4 |
| Uttrakhand | 78.1 | 79.2 | 78.2 | 80.2 | 85.6 | 82.7 | 60.1 |
| West Bengal | 72.5 | 74.9 | 74.8 | 75.7 | 70.2 | 71.3 | 81.9 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{6 5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 8}$ |

Chart 6 shows the attendance rate of students studying in different classes for the total of all 20 states. The attendance rate is lowest in class I ( $65.6 \%$ ). It increases gradually from class I to VII where it is $78.8 \%$. Class VIII is not shown as five states (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Kerala and Maharashtra) did not have class VIII in upper primary schools. As such meaningful average for class VIII that could be compared with that of other classes could not be derived.


### 4.7 Students' Attendance in Rural and Urban Schools

Students' attendance rates at primary and upper primary stages for rural and urban schools are shown in the following table.

Table 4.6 : Comparison of average attendance rate based on head count with those derived from attendance registers of 2006-07 in primary schools

| Sl. <br> No | State | Rural |  | Urban <br> Register |  | Head <br> Count | Attendance <br> Register |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Head <br> Count | Attendance <br> Register | Head <br> Count |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 86.9 | 75.1 | 77.4 | 68.7 | 84.1 | 72.7 |
| 2 | Assam | 80.8 | 81.2 | 81.2 | 82.0 | 80.8 | 81.3 |
| 3 | Bihar | 63.9 | 41.9 | 58.2 | 43.9 | 62.8 | 42.2 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 74.9 | 69.2 | 72.8 | 66.2 | 74.8 | 67.7 |
| 5 | Delhi | 73.0 | 74.6 | 73.1 | 73.1 | 73.1 | 73.1 |
| 6 | Gujarat | 86.3 | 74.8 | 76.9 | 75.7 | 84.3 | 75.0 |
| 7 | Haryana | 79.1 | 82.7 | 77.2 | 80.7 | 78.6 | 82.2 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 95.4 | 94.9 | 94.6 | 92.0 | 95.3 | 94.6 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 75.8 | 84.7 | 82.4 | 78.2 | 75.9 | 78.5 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 90.2 | 85.6 | 87.3 | 86.7 | 89.8 | 86.2 |
| 11 | Kerala | 96.7 | 90.3 | 94.0 | 92.5 | 96.3 | 91.4 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 96.0 | 87.0 | 97.0 | 92.0 | 96.0 | 89.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 93.8 | 72.2 | 91.8 | 71.8 | 93.3 | 72.1 |
| 14 | Orissa | 67.9 | 67.7 | 64.1 | 64.0 | 67.0 | 66.8 |
| 15 | Punjab | 93.4 | 82.3 | 91.8 | 80.1 | 93.0 | 81.7 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 73.1 | 62.6 | 69.5 | 63.3 | 72.5 | 62.7 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 93.0 | 89.3 | 90.0 | 86.3 | 92.0 | 88.3 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 72.3 | 58.3 | 71.2 | 53.2 | 72.1 | 57.4 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 92.0 | 76.0 | 94.0 | 79.0 | 92.1 | 80.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 70.5 | 75.6 | 64.8 | 65.5 | 69.5 | 74.2 |
|  | Over all | $\mathbf{7 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 9}$ |

Table 4.6 shows the attendance rate of students in rural and urban primary schools for different states. The attendance rate in rural primary schools is less than that of urban schools in 8 states.

The overall attendance rate in rural primary schools was $68.0 \%$ as against $71.2 \%$ in urban primary schools as per head count. There is, however, not much difference between rural and urban primary schools in respect of attendance rate. Only in Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir and West Bengal the attendance rate in rural primary schools is more than that of urban schools by 5 or more percentage points, in Maharashtra, it is just opposite, where the attendance rate is more in urban areas by 5 percent points.


Table 4.7 shows the attendance rate of students in rural and urban upper primary schools for different states as per attendance register and as per head count.

Table 4.7 Comparison of average attendance rate based on headcount with those derived from attendance registers of 2006-07 in upper primary schools

|  | State | Rural |  | Urban |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Attendance Register | Head Count | Attendance Register | Head Count | Attendance Register | Head Count |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 85.8 | 77.2 | 84.0 | 76.4 | 84.8 | 76.6 |
| 2 | Assam | 84.9 | 84.3 | 87.3 | 85.4 | 85.3 | 84.5 |
| 3 | Bihar | 56.3 | 36.6 | 53.5 | 37.3 | 55.5 | 36.8 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 74.1 | 73.4 | 68.1 | 76.6 | 72.9 | 75.0 |
| 6 | Gujarat | 91.0 | 77.5 | 81.6 | 81.7 | 88.5 | 78.6 |
| 7 | Haryana | 80.6 | 86.5 | 77.1 | 82.7 | 79.3 | 85.1 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 90.5 | 93.1 | 94.0 | 94.7 | 90.6 | 93.2 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 76.4 | 74.6 | 77.8 | 79.5 | 77.1 | 77.5 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 84.0 | 83.6 | 85.0 | 90.2 | 84.3 | 86.9 |
| 11 | Kerala | 95.8 | 91.4 | 85.2 | 92.6 | 94.2 | 92.0 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 94.0 | 88.0 | 99.0 | 89.0 | 96.0 | 89.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 89.1 | 68.7 | 94.7 | 71.8 | 91.1 | 69.8 |
| 14 | Orissa | 63.0 | 68.7 | 63.9 | 69.9 | 63.2 | 69.0 |
| 15 | Punjab | 96.7 | 76.1 | 76.9 | 70.8 | 91.5 | 74.7 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 73.1 | 78.8 | 69.5 | 79.7 | 72.5 | 78.9 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 89.1 | 87.5 | 87.6 | 88.1 | 88.8 | 87.8 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 71.0 | 59.7 | 76.5 | 62.7 | 72.6 | 60.5 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 96.0 | 84.2 | 99.0 | 68.8 | 96.2 | 83.2 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 59.9 | 72.1 | 63.0 | 64.0 | 60.8 | 70.2 |
|  | Over all | 80.7 | 73.7 | 84.1 | 79.7 | 81.8 | 75.6 |

At the upper primary stage the overall students' attendance rate as per head count was lower in rural schools and the difference was fairly large ( 6 percentage points) between attendance rates of rural and urban schools. In Punjab, Uttarakhand and West Bengal, the attendance rate in rural schools exceeded that of urban schools by more than 5 percentage points.


The states in which attendance rate of students at upper primary stage in rural schools is higher are Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. In all other states, the attendance rate in urban areas exceeds that of rural areas.(Table 4.7)

### 4.8 Average Attendance Rate of Students as per Attendance Register vis-a-vis Head Count

Students' attendance rates derived from Attendance registers for the whole year 2006-07, were compared with the students attendance rate obtained from Head count to check the difference, if any. Table 4.6 presents the average attendance (\%) of students from the two sources in rural and urban schools of different states at the primary stage.
In most of the states, students' attendance rates as per head count were lower than those derived from attendance register. The difference was not large (less than $5 \%$ points) in 11 states: Assam, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala Orissa, Tamil Nadu \& West Bengal. In rural areas, the difference exceeded 10 percentage points in 8 states: Andhra Pradesh (11.8\%), Bihar (22.0\%), Madhya Pradesh (21.6\%), Uttar Pradesh (14.0\%), Gujarat (11.5\%), Uttarakhand (16\%), Punjab (11.1\%) and Rajasthan (10.5\%).

In urban areas, the difference between head-count based attendance and the average attendance derived from school register of 2006-07, was observed to be $10 \%$ or more in 5 states: Madhya Pradesh (20.0\%), Uttar Pradesh (18.0\%), Uttarakhand (15.0\%), Bihar (14.3\%) and Punjab (11.1\%). In Assam, Delhi, Karnataka, Haryana, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Orissa difference was marginal between the two attendance rates. In West Bengal, the attendance rate based on head-count was more than that derived from school register:

In majority of states, it appears that teachers, by and large, mark more students as present than those who are actually present.

Table 4.7 presents students' attendance rates based on head count as well as attendance marked in attendance registers at the upper primary level.. The average attendance rate based on head-count was $75.6 \%$ against $81.8 \%$ derived from school registers. The difference
in attendance rate was observed to be more than $10 \%$ in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. The difference was between 5 to 10 percentage points in Andhra Pradesh (8.2\%) and Maharashtra (7.0\%).
The attendance rate based on head-count was not less than that obtained from school attendance registers in every state. In 8 states (Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, J\&K, Karnataka, Orissa, Rajasthan and West Bengal), the attendance rate based on headcount exceeded that derived from attendance registers.

### 4.9 Seasonal Variation in Attendance

It is a matter of common observation that students' attendance in school does not remain uniform across months doing an academic session. There are months in which the students' attendance is low or less than average year after year. In order to provide empirical evidence for this common perception, the schools were asked to provide average attendance rates in different months during the academic sessions 2005-06 and 2006-07. Besides, the head teachers were requested to indicate months of low attendance along with reasons thereof. The following table shows the percentage of head teachers who said that attendance gets reduced in certain months of the year.

Table 4.8 Number and percentage of head teachers reporting low attendance in certain months of the year

| Sl.No. | States | Primary schools |  |  | Upper Primary schools |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Reported <br> low <br> attendance | \% | Total | Reported <br> low <br> attendance | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 302 | 191 | 63.2 | 98 | 65 | 66.3 |
| 2 | Assam | 252 | 252 | 100.0 | 78 | 78 | 100.0 |
| 3 | Bihar | 279 | 243 | 87.1 | 89 | 86 | 96.6 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 283 | 250 | 88.3 | 82 | 75 | 91.5 |
| 5 | Delhi | 124 | 95 | 76.6 | - | - | - |
| 6 | Gujarat | 53 | 43 | 81.1 | 292 | 224 | 76.7 |
| 7 | Haryana | 247 | 219 | 88.7 | 53 | 46 | 86.8 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | 245 | 102 | 41.6 | 75 | 37 | 49.3 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | 122 | 99 | 81.1 | 28 | 24 | 85.7 |
| 10 | Karnataka | 295 | 295 | 100.0 | 71 | 71 | 100.0 |
| 11 | Kerala | 228 | 73 | 32.0 | 90 | 30 | 33.3 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | 306 | 140 | 45.8 | 94 | 47 | 50.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | 290 | 275 | 94.8 | 85 | 77 | 90.6 |
| 14 | Orissa | 300 | 263 | 87.7 | 100 | 85 | 85.0 |
| 15 | Punjab | 227 | 181 | 79.7 | 68 | 51 | 75.0 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | 277 | 242 | 87.4 | 121 | 112 | 92.6 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | 281 | 141 | 50.2 | 72 | 47 | 65.3 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | 311 | 261 | 83.9 | 89 | 73 | 82.0 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | 257 | 257 | 100.0 | 63 | 63 | 100.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | 310 | 268 | 86.5 | 78 | 66 | 84.6 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{4 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 6}$ |

In all the states except Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu more than $60 \%$ head teachers of Primary schools said that attendance was relatively low in certain months. In all states, except Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu, over $60 \%$ head teachers were of the view that the attendance was low in certain months. Overall, about $78 \%$ head teachers reported that there were some lean months in which the attendance was relatively less in their schools.

Table 4.9 shows the average attendance in different months of 2005-06 derived from school registers. The months of low attendance are not the same across states.

No major variation across the months in attendance rate was observed at both primary and upper primary stages in 9 states Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal as per the attendance registers.

In 3 states Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, June was the month with lean attendance at both primary and upper primary stages: In Uttarakhand, the lean month was April and in Assam, both March and April were the months with lean attendance.

Table 4.9 Average attendance in different months of academic session -2005-06

| State | Stage | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra <br> Pradesh | Primary | 79.9 | 78.5 | 77.8 | 77.0 | 78.3 | 78.6 | 79.5 | 79.2 | 80.7 | 83.1 |  | 75.2 |
|  | U.Primary | 78.3 | 83.8 | 84.8 | 81.0 | 83.1 | 85.6 | 82.1 | 84.3 | 83.5 | 86.9 | - | 75.9 |
| Assam* | Primary | 61.3 | 63.7 | 65.0 | 60.6 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 64.1 | 64.8 | 51.0 | 52.6 | - | 59.3 |
|  | U.Primary | 58.6 | 56.2 | 62.5 | 56.8 | 54.3 | 54.3 | 56.0 | 59.5 | 46.9 | 45.1 | - | 57.4 |
| Bihar | Primary | 63.4 | 65.2 | 66.3 | 64.3 | 65.1 | 64.9 | 63.8 | 65.2 | 65.3 | 65.6 | 64.3 | - |
|  | U. Primary | 55.3 | 52.7 | 51.9 | 51.8 | 54.0 | 52.7 | 54.3 | 53.7 | 56.9 | 55.3 | 56.5 | - |
| Chhattis Garh | Primary | 71.9 | 74.0 | 73.8 | 73.7 | 73.6 | 75.7 | 75.5 | 74.6 | 75.7 | 70.4 | - |  |
|  | U.Primary | 70.2 | 76.2 | 76.9 | 76.3 | 78.1 | 78.8 | 76.9 | 78.3 | 77.4 | 77.8 | - |  |
| Delhi | Primary | 68.4 | 73.9 | 79.7 | 73.3 | 74.9 | 80.6 | 76.5 | 78.7 | 82.9 | 68.9 | - | - |
| Gujarat | Primary | 76.3 | 77.1 | 79.9 | 82.0 | 82.7 | 74.9 | 81.0 | 80.8 | 79.7 | 82.2 | - | 81.3 |
|  | U.Primary | 73.8 | 78.9 | 77.5 | 78.1 | 79.5 | 74.1 | 77.7 | 78.3 | 77.1 | 78.8 | - | 86.8 |
| Haryana | Primary | 78.0 | 80.0 | 80.7 | 78.5 | 78.5 | 79.0 | 77.2 | 75.9 | 78.0 | 75.9 | 79.0 | - |
|  | U. Primary | 78.1 | 81.1 | 81.1 | 79.3 | 79.7 | 79.5 | 79.5 | 78.5 | 77.3 | 76.3 | 80.2 |  |
| Himachal Pradesh | Primary | 94.4 | 95.4 | 95.0 | 95.3 | 96.1 | 96.4 | 96.1 | - | - | 91.9 | 93.2 | 94.8 |
|  | U. Primary | 86.8 | 87.9 | 87.8 | 87.4 | 87.9 | 88.4 | 88.8 | - | - | 84.6 | 86.9 | 88.1 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | Primary | - | 76.7 | 76.0 | 75.2 | 76.4 | 75.5 | 75.3 | 75.4 | 77.2 | 73.6 | 76.7 | - |
|  | U. Primary | - | 75.4 | 75.1 | 74.2 | 75.1 | 75.4 | 75.1 | 74.4 | 76.1 | 73.1 | 75.4 | - |
| Karnataka | Primary | 94.9 | 94.6 | 94.9 | 91.2 | 94.1 | 93.5 | 94.6 | 93.9 | 95.1 | 94.7 | - | 91.5 |
|  | U.Primary | 92.8 | 92.5 | 96.3 | 89.1 | 92.1 | 91.8 | 90.4 | 89.3 | 91.6 | 92.5 | - | 91.7 |
| Kerala | Primary | 95.3 | 96.2 | 96.0 | 96.4 | 95.7 | 96.2 | 95.9 | 95.9 | 97.1 | 95.4 | - | - |
|  | U. Primary | 93.9 | 94.8 | 94.7 | 94.9 | 94.8 | 95.3 | 94.8 | 94.8 | 95.6 | 94.3 | - | - |
| Maharashtra | Primary | 79.8 | 81.0 | 80.8 | 81.8 | 78.2 | 80.9 | 80.6 | 80.4 | 80.7 | 80.2 | - | 73.3 |
|  | U. Primary | 88.6 | 89.0 | 89.8 | 91.9 | 87.4 | 91.6 | 94.1 | 90.8 | 91.5 | 92.3 | - | 83.5 |
| Madhya Pradesh | Primary | 86.4 | 86.3 | 87.7 | 86.6 | 86.8 | 87.6 | 87.7 | 87.1 | 89.4 | 90.6 | 0.0 | 42.3 |
|  | U. Primary | 79.5 | 84.3 | 85.9 | 83.9 | 85.8 | 86.8 | 84.9 | 83.8 | 84.7 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 58.8 |
| Orissa | Primary | 76.1 | 77.2 | 74.8 | 75.5 | 76.1 | 77.4 | 78.2 | 77.4 | 76.5 | 73.1 | - | 70.0 |
|  | U. Primary | 74.4 | 76.6 | 70.3 | 78.0 | 72.7 | 71.2 | 71.1 | 70.5 | 67.9 | 64.4 | - | 64.1 |
| Punjab | Primary | 75.1 | 75.1 | 79.5 | 78.0 | 80.2 | 79.1 | 78.0 | 77.0 | 78.1 | 76.2 | 80.6 | - |
|  | U. Primary | 73.5 | 75.0 | 79.2 | 77.0 | 78.8 | 78.8 | 78.4 | 77.9 | 80.0 | 77.7 | 79.4 | - |
| Rajasthan | Primary | 73.1 | 77.4 | 76.6 | 75.5 | 73.8 | 77.8 | 75.1 | 74.3 | 75.0 | 76.1 | - | - |
|  | U. Primary | 81.9 | 88.3 | 83.8 | 87.0 | 83.2 | 90.6 | 87.1 | 84.2 | 84.6 | 68.5 | - | - |
| Tamil Nadu | Primary | 92.8 | 93.5 | 92.9 | 92.1 | 90.2 | 93.2 | 92.6 | 92.3 | 92.6 | 94.5 | - | - |
|  | U. Primary | 91.8 | 90.9 | 89.4 | 87.7 | 86.5 | 90.1 | 87.1 | 89.6 | 89.5 | 92.0 |  |  |
| Uttar Pradesh | Primary | 60.8 | 71.5 | 69.9 | 74.8 | 73.9 | 67.7 | 71.9 | 70.7 | 68.3 | 68.9 | 72.2 | - |
|  | U.Primary | 44.7 | 55.7 | 52.1 | 59.4 | 61.5 | 46.5 | 55.0 | 54.7 | 55.9 | 55.8 | 71.7 | - |
| Uttarakhand | Primary | 90.3 | 90.5 | 90.3 | 91.6 | 90.6 | 89.6 | 91.7 | 91.4 | 91.3 | 74.9 | - | - |
|  | U. Primary | 87.5 | 88.2 | 86.5 | 89.7 | 85.4 | 82.7 | 85.8 | 85.2 | 92.0 | 55.6 | - | - |
| West Bengal | Primary | 68.6 | 71.0 | 71.3 | 69.9 | 69.4 | 70.5 | 70.9 | 71.4 | - | - | 66.4 | 65.7 |
|  | U. Primary | 59.1 | 59.4 | 62.2 | 63.1 | 61.2 | 60.3 | 61.4 | 63.3 | - | - | 55.7 | 58.1 |
| Average | Primary | 71.8 | 76.2 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 76.1 | 75.2 | 76.3 | 75.1 | 67.2 | 67.7 | 39.2 | 28.4 |
|  | U. Primary | 74.9 | 79.0 | 78.6 | 78.8 | 78.8 | 78 | 78.8 | 78 | 77.6 | 76.7 | 15.1 | 48.3 |

In most of the states there was no noticeable variation in attendance across months.
However, the months in which attendance was relatively less in different states, are shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Months with lean attendance in different states

| Month with lean attendance | Primary stage | Upper Primary Stage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| March | Assam | Assam |
| April | Assam, Delhi and Uttrakhand | Assam, Orissa, Rajasthan \&Uttrakhand |
| May | Punjab | - |
| June | Maharashtra \& Madhya Pradesh | Maharashtra \& Madhya Pradesh |
| July | Delhi | Uttar Pradesh |
| December | - | Uttar Pradesh |

The following broad patterns with regard to students' low attendance across months can be summarized as follows:

- Attendance is relatively less in the starting month of the academic session and the month immediately following the vacations.
- Students tend to remain absent more often in the months in which they or their parents are called upon to participate in various agriculture related activities like sowing and harvesting.
- Overall, there is not much variation in the recorded attendance of students over different months of the year as per the attendance register.


### 4.10 Difference between the Mean Attendance of Dropout and Non-Dropout Students

It was expected that the attendance rate of children who dropout is less than that of others who do not. In order to find out the difference between the attendance rate of children who dropped out from school and those who continued to remain in school, the attendance rate of dropouts was compared with that of non-dropouts. Table 4.11 shows the attendance rate of the two groups of students, dropouts and non-dropouts. The difference between the two is obviously large and was found to be statistically significant.

Table 4.11 Difference between the mean attendance of dropouts and non-dropout students

| States | $\mathbf{N}$ | Mean attendance |  | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Non-Dropout | Dropout |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 214 | 80.6 | 43.6 | 37.1 |
| Assam | 96 | 61.4 | 38.8 | 22.6 |
| Bihar | 144 | 63.5 | 54.2 | 9.3 |
| Chhattisgarh | 93 | 73.8 | 43.1 | 30.7 |
| Delhi | 120 | 65.8 | 47.5 | 18.4 |
| Gujarat | 96 | 84.7 | 59.9 | 24.8 |
| Haryana | 96 | 61.4 | 38.8 | 22.6 |
| Himachal Pradesh | - | 91.2 | 68.3 | 22.9 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 120 | 65.7 | 54.1 | 11.6 |
| Karnataka | 56 | 93.7 | 31.4 | 62.3 |
| Kerala | 164 | 95.2 | 72.9 | 22.3 |
| Maharashtra | 46 | 87.9 | 42.2 | 45.6 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 121 | 77.9 | 41.7 | 36.2 |
| Orissa | 179 | 68.0 | 48.4 | 19.6 |
| Punjab | 96 | 71.5 | 42.0 | 29.5 |
| Rajasthan | 235 | 77.0 | 50.7 | 26.3 |
| Tamil Nadu | 25 | 91.5 | 47.6 | 43.9 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 339 | 72.1 | 54.1 | 18.1 |
| Uttarakhand | 44 | 81.4 | 68.6 | 12.8 |
| West Bengal | 388 | 70.4 | 31.0 | -39.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 5}$ |

$\mathrm{N}=$ Number of schools reporting incidence of drop out.

Table 4.11 shows in every state the children who were not regularly attending school tended to dropout.

### 4.11 Teachers' Presence in Schools

During school visits, the teachers who were present were also counted for comparison with the number of teachers who were posted in the school. The average attendance rate of teachers was calculated by dividing the total number of teachers who were present by the number of teachers who were posted in the sampled schools. The total number of teachers in primary and upper primary schools in the entire state was used as weight for calculating the national level average of teacher attendance in primary and upper primary schools.

Overall, based on the head count data of 20 major states, we find that the average teacher attendance is $81.7 \%$ in primary schools and $80.5 \%$ in upper primary schools. Thus, only about $18 \%$ teachers in primary schools and about $19 \%$ in upper primary schools were found absent during school visits. Table 4.12 and Charts 8 and 9 show state-wise teachers' attendance rates in primary and upper primary schools respectively.

Table 4.12 Percentage of teachers found present in primary and upper primary schools

| State | Primary schools |  |  | Upper primary schools |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I $^{\text {st }}$ Period | Last Period | Overall | I $^{\text {st }}$ Period | Last Period | Overall |
| Andhra Pradesh | 78.9 | 77.2 | 78.1 | 78.2 | 76.4 | 77.3 |
| Assam | 77.7 | 80.6 | 79.2 | 56.5 | 53.7 | 55.2 |
| Bihar | 74.8 | 76.8 | 75.8 | 74.3 | 75.6 | 74.9 |
| Chhattisgarh | 75.2 | 76.2 | 75.7 | 74.4 | 72.6 | 73.5 |
| Delhi | 95.2 | 94.8 | 95.0 | - | - | - |
| Gujarat | 70.4 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 87.7 | 87.4 | 87.6 |
| Haryana | 87.0 | 86.8 | 86.9 | 91.9 | 91.9 | 91.9 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 80.2 | 79.6 | 80.0 | 88.8 | 87.0 | 88.0 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 80.8 | 80.8 | 80.8 | 89.4 | 77.2 | 83.1 |
| Karnataka | 83.5 | 84.3 | 83.9 | 83.8 | 84.2 | 84.0 |
| Kerala | 84.6 | 84.3 | 84.5 | 85.8 | 84.8 | 85.3 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 69.7 | 71.1 | 70.4 | 66.8 | 67.3 | 67.0 |
| Maharashtra | 88.1 | 87.4 | 87.8 | 87.4 | 86.8 | 87.1 |
| Orissa | 86.8 | 87.9 | 87.4 | 86.9 | 86.2 | 86.6 |
| Punjab | 84.2 | 82.7 | 83.5 | 78.9 | 77.4 | 78.1 |
| Rajasthan | 81.2 | 81.0 | 81.1 | 80.2 | 79.4 | 79.8 |
| Tamil Nadu | 86.9 | 86.3 | 86.6 | 92.5 | 86.7 | 89.6 |
| Uttrakhand | 77.9 | 78.7 | 77.8 | 78.3 | 77.1 | 77.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 83.9 | 82.4 | 83.0 | 82.3 | 82.9 | 82.6 |
| West Bengal | 96.5 | 96.1 | 96.3 | 98.2 | 97.9 | 98.1 |
| Over all | $\mathbf{8 1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 . 5}$ |

There was not much difference between attendance rate in the first period and in the last period. Only in upper primary schools of Jammu \& Kashmir the attendance of teachers in the last period was considerably less than that in the first period but since data from only $47 \%$ (see table 2.2) of the selected sample could be collected in this state, the difference could be just due to sampling fluctuation and may not be the real difference.

Less than $10 \%$ teachers were found absent in primary schools in West Bengal and Delhi. The highest absence rate of teachers was in Gujarat (30.0\%) and Madhya Pradesh (29.6\%). In upper primary schools, the average absence rate of teachers was less than $10 \%$ in West Bengal and Haryana. It was quite high in MP (33\%) and highest (44.8\%) in Assam. The reasons for low attendance need to be explored in these states. It may, however, may be mentioned that some of the teachers who were found absent, could be on leave and others could be on duty elsewhere. The absence rate should not be equated with teacher absenteeism. Since in this study the focus was on students' attendance, the reasons of teacher absence were not explored.



## CHAPTER 5

## REASONS FOR STUDENTS’ LOW ATTENDANCE AND MEASURES FOR IMPROVING ATTENDANCE RATE

### 5.1 Reasons of Low Attendance in Primary and Upper Primary Schools

To pinpoint reasons of low attendance in the sampled schools, views of schools, head teachers, teachers, parents, and community members were sought through structured questionnaires. The respondents were required to identify the reasons out of the list of probable reasons given in the instrument. In the present section, reasons of students' low attendance or absence from school as identified by different respondents have been discussed.

## i) Reasons of Low Attendance according to Head Teachers

Head teachers were provided a list of nine probable reasons of low attendance. These were
R1. Student's lack of interest in studies
R2. Parents' poverty
R3. Students being engaged in household work
R4. Students' participation in income generation activities,
R5. Temporary migration of parents in search of work,
R6. Parents' indifference towards child's education.
R7. Students' participation in religious and social functions
R8. Students' inability to attend school due to illness, or some health problem
R9. Inability to attend school due to illness of some family member
They were asked to select three reasons that they considered most important for students remaining absent in their schools. Their responses are presented in Table 5.1 for primary and Upper primary stages separately.

It is evident from Table 5.1 that more than $50 \%$ respondents (Head teachers) in as many as 11 states (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand) have attributed students' low attendance at primary level to their parents' poverty. In five states (Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh) over $50 \%$ head teachers have given students' engagement in household chores as the reason for their low attendance. The students' compulsion to get involved in income generation activities to supplement the family income has been identified as the reason in five states, namely, Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. The students' illness has been identified as a prominent reason in four states, namely, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal where poverty related reasons were not highlighted. Parents' indifference towards children's education has been identified as one of the prominent reasons in four states, namely, Chhattisgarh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Punjab and Uttarakhand. Students' lack of interest in studies has been identified as a significant reason at primary level only in West Bengal. The students' low attendance has been attributed to their participation in religious and social functions by less than $30 \%$ head teachers in most states, the only exceptions being Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu where this percentage is between 40 and 50 percent.

Very few head teachers felt that children's staying away from the school to look after ailing members of the family, was a likely reason.

Table 5.1 Percentage of Head Teachers giving different reasons for low attendance of students in primary and upper primary schools (P- Primary; UP- Upper Primary)


Not many Head teachers in three states (Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa) considered any reason out of the nine probable reasons as relevant and applicable in their respective
states. On the other hand, Head teachers in three states (Bihar, J\&K, Uttar Pradesh) have attributed students' low attendance to the combination of three poverty related reasons (R2, R3 and R4), while in the states of Chhatisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, MP, Punjab, Uttarakhand and Rajasthan, it has been attributed to the combination of two poverty related reasons.

The reasons of low attendance at the upper primary level are in line with the ones identified for the primary level. The respondents in as many as ten states (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttarakhand) have identified parents 'poverty' as the major reason, while the poverty related reason 'need for getting involved in income generation activities' has been identified in eight states, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, J\&K, MP, Punjab, Rajasthan and UP. In addition parents' indifference towards childrens' education which arises due to their poverty and illiteracy has been identified as a reason in four states, namely, Chhatisgarh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Punjab and Uttarakhand. The necessity to get involved in household work, which is also related to parents' poor economic conditions, has been identified as a significant reason in five states, namely, Gujarat, Haryana, Rajasthan, UP and West Bengal. Lack of interest in studies on the part of students, parents' migration, participation in religious and social functions, and illness of some family member have not been found as significant reasons of low attendance at upper primary level in any state

### 5.2 Reasons of Students' Low Attendance according to School Teachers

School teachers are better placed to hold views about the probable reasons of students' low attendance in schools because of their closeness to them and greater awareness of their home background. The questionnaire meant for school teachers included a comprehensive list of eight probable reasons out of which the respondents were required to indicate their choices as per their own observations. The percentage of respondents giving different reasons of low attendance at the primary and upper primary levels are given in Table 5.2.

The reasons listed in the questionnaire were :
R1. Parents lack of interest in the child education
R2. Students engagement in wage earning activities
R3. Students involvement in household work/taking care of younger brother/sister
R4. Poor learning ability of children
R5. Child's own illness
R6. Illness in the family
R7. Participation in religious and social events
R8. Family migrating to other place in search of work
The reasons identified by more than $50 \%$ respondents in different states are given below:
i. Lack of Parents' Interest in Child Education : This reason was identified as a major reason by more than $50 \%$ of the teachers at both primary and upper primary level in 13 states - Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarkhand and West Bengal at both primary and upper primary levels. In Maharashtra, more than 50\% teachers gave this as reason only at upper primary level.
It is worth noting that unlike head teachers, more teachers consider lack of parents' interest in child's education as a prominent reason
ii. Involvement in Household Work or Sibling Care : This reason was one of the major reason stated by more than $50 \%$ of the teachers in 12 states: Bihar, Chhatisgarh , Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh,

Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. At primary stage only this reason was given in Delhi,
iii Involvement in Income Generation Activities: This reason was given by more than $50 \%$ of the teachers of both primary and upper primary schools in nine states: Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal.

Table 5.2 Percentage of school teachers giving different reasons for low attendance of students in primary and upper primary schools

| Sl.No. | State |  | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | P | 39.7 | 21.5 | 35.5 | 3.6 | 17.9 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 30.9 |
|  |  | UP | 31.5 | 18.3 | 26.2 | 3.3 | 10.0 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 18.0 |
| 2 | Assam | P | 42.2 | 48.1 | 39.7 | 15.3 | 65.5 | 22.5 | 26.9 | 32.1 |
|  |  | UP | 46.9 | 42.4 | 34.4 | 14.2 | 69.8 | 24.7 | 32.6 | 24.0 |
| 3 | Bihar | P | 85.3 | 84.4 | 79.0 | 8.2 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 7.6 | 20.2 |
|  |  | UP | 83.7 | 86.5 | 75.5 | 6.4 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 10.6 | 19.0 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | P | 83.6 | 51.9 | 63.3 | 20.2 | 22.6 | 8.5 | 10.0 | 33.4 |
|  |  | UP | 77.9 | 46.6 | 59.5 | 16.0 | 22.9 | 7.6 | 24.4 | 38.2 |
| 5 | Delhi | P | 75.4 | 27.1 | 51.1 | 10.0 | 26.6 | 9.3 | 27.3 | 59.4 |
| 6 | Gujarat | P | 38.2 | 29.4 | 61.8 | 7.8 | 32.4 | 9.8 | 38.2 | 28.4 |
|  |  | UP | 38.9 | 34.2 | 69.3 | 6.3 | 35.8 | 7.6 | 43.8 | 33.2 |
| 7 | Haryana | P | 76.3 | 64.7 | 64.6 | 13.3 | 24.2 | 8.7 | 11.0 | 21.8 |
|  |  | UP | 67.3 | 68.8 | 70.7 | 18.3 | 17.3 | 7.7 | 10.6 | 18.8 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | P | 50.6 | 15.1 | 33.5 | 18.8 | 55.9 | 19.6 | 42.1 | 11.8 |
|  |  | UP | 58.7 | 14.7 | 42.7 | 16.0 | 50.7 | 17.3 | 45.3 | 13.3 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | P | 65.7 | 51.3 | 55.9 | 63.3 | 15.2 | 28.0 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
|  |  | UP | 59.3 | 58.3 | 74.5 | 42.5 | 20.2 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| 10 | Karnataka | P | 56.7 | 18.4 | 43.3 | 28.6 | 47.7 | 26.3 | 45.6 | 30.5 |
|  |  | UP | 59.2 | 30.2 | 49.5 | 30.5 | 38.7 | 20.5 | 40.8 | 29.3 |
| 11 | Kerala | P | 23.6 | 3.8 | 7.20 | 7.70 | 65.9 | 17.8 | 18.3 | 8.2 |
|  |  | UP | 27.1 | 11.2 | 5.6 | 12.1 | 70.1 | 26.2 | 23.4 | 7.5 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | P | 42.0 | 19.0 | 54.0 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 12.0 | 19.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | UP | 62.0 | 28.0 | 68.0 | 14.0 | 38.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 50.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | P | 52.0 | 50.0 | 64.0 | 8.0 | 25.0 | 9.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | UP | 58.0 | 59.0 | 61.0 | 10.0 | 18.0 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 21.0 |
| 14 | Orissa | P | 31.3 | 21.0 | 27.7 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 7.3 | 1.0 |
|  |  | UP | 24.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 1.0 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 |
| 15 | Punjab | P | 76.0 | 28.5 | 49.6 | 9.7 | 27.2 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 58.7 |
|  |  | UP | 76.6 | 24.9 | 48.5 | 10.9 | 24.0 | 11.2 | 28.4 | 64.2 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | P | 45.3 | 28.1 | 80.5 | 18.5 | 22.3 | 13.2 | 36.9 | 30.8 |
|  |  | UP | 52.7 | 28.6 | 78.5 | 17.3 | 18.7 | 11.9 | 36.6 | 29.0 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | P | 27.5 | 8.4 | 27.8 | 7.4 | 60.7 | 38.6 | 56.2 | 18.5 |
|  |  | UP | 38.6 | 20.7 | 41.4 | 11.7 | 49.0 | 35.9 | 44.8 | 21.4 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | P | 88.3 | 58.4 | 78.0 | 10.4 | 21.2 | 6.0 | 15.3 | 18.9 |
|  |  | UP | 76.3 | 64.1 | 64.1 | 9.1 | 34.1 | 10.8 | 18.5 | 16.5 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | P | 74.0 | 20.0 | 68.0 | 25.0 | 31.0 | 13.0 | 33.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | UP | 76.0 | 13.0 | 76.0 | 34.0 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 33.0 | 11.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | P | 65.8 | 54.2 | 60.0 | 36.8 | 27.4 | 9.0 | 26.8 | 17.4 |
|  |  | UP | 64.1 | 64.1 | 60.2 | 37.2 | 26.9 | 12.8 | 21.8 | 10.2 |
|  | Over all | P | 59.3 | 39.5 | 56.3 | 14.0 | 30.2 | 11.8 | 22.1 | 24.4 |
|  |  | UP | 54.1 | 38.2 | 57.6 | 13.8 | 30.5 | 12.0 | 25.6 | 26.2 |

iv Child's Illness: This reason was a major reason stated by more than $50 \%$ of the teachers in five states: Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu at primary stage and in Assam, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala at upper primary stage.
v. Parents' Migration: This reason was stated by more than $50 \%$ of the teachers in Punjab at the primary stage and in Delhi, Maharashtra and Punjab at the upper primary stage.

The other 3 reasons (R4, R6 and R7) wee not considered important by the teachers as less than $50 \%$ endorsed these in every state. The exceptions were Jammu \& Kashmir where $63.3 \%$ teachers considered R4 (Child's poor learning ability) as an important reason at primary level and Tamil Nadu where $56.2 \%$ teachers considered R7 (participation in religious and social functions) as a significant reason at primary level. It shows that teachers by and large blame the parents and not the students for poor attendance in schools.

### 5.3 Reasons of Students' Absence as per VEC Members

The opinions of VEC members with regard to reasons of students absence were also solicited with the help of a structured questionnaire, which gave them the option to choose from a comprehensive list of 8 probable reasons, viz.

R1. Parents' migration to other places in search of work
R2. Participation in agricultural operations or family business
R3. Getting involved in household work or looking after younger sibling
R4. Participation in income generation activities
R5. Lack of essential facilities in schools
R6. Medium of instruction being different from home language
R7. School being not attractive, and
R8. Parents' indifference towards their wards' education
The VEC or SMC members' response with regard to probable reasons of students' absence from school are presented in Table 5.3. They had to choose 3 most important reasons from the list given above.

It is evident from the table that more than $50 \%$ VEC/SMC members in 11 states (Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal) said that students' involvement in agriculture related activity or family business was the main reason for their absence from school at both primary and upper primary levels. Only in Andhra Pradesh, while $62.1 \%$ VEC members gave R2 (involvement in agriculture or family business) as a reason for upper primary students, only $36.7 \%$ gave that as a reason in the case of primary students. In almost the same 11 states (Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgrh, Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, West Bengal), they felt that students' involvement in household work or taking care of younger siblings was also an equally important reasons for absence from school. More than $50 \%$ VEC/SMC members in as many as 16 states have endorsed at least one reason out of the five reasons relating to poor socio-economic background of children's parents, namely, migration in search of work, participation in agriculture or family business, participation in income generation activities and parents' indifference towards their wards' education. In their opinion one or more of these poverty related reasons accounted for child's frequent absence from school.

No reason out of the given probable reasons has been identified as a major reason of child's frequent absence from school in three states: Orissa, Maharashtra, and Uttarakhand as less than $50 \%$ respondents endorsed one or more of the given reasons.

It may be noted that very few VEC/SMC members felt that (1) the medium of instructions being different from home language (2) lack of facilities in school and (3) school being unattractive, were responsible for child's frequent absence from school. In general, they blamed poor economic condition of parents and not the school for children remaining absent even when enrolled in school. Overall, the views of VEC members are in tune with those of teachers and head teachers in attributing low attendance to poverty and home conditions.

Table 5.3: Reasons of child's absence from school at primary and upper primary stage according to VEC or SMC members

| Sl.No. | State |  | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | P | 76.5 | 36.7 | 49.0 | 40.8 | 13.3 | 2.0 | 14.3 | 35.7 |
|  |  | UP | 82.2 | 62.1 | 24.1 | 44.8 | 3.4 | - | 6.9 | 37.9 |
| 2 | Assam | P | 78.2 | 24.2 | 69.0 | 34.5 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 8.3 | 70.2 |
|  |  | UP | 87.2 | 19.2 | 69.2 | 29.5 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 80.8 |
| 3 | Bihar | P | 39.1 | 64.2 | 57.7 | 48.2 | 39.4 | 4.0 | 23.4 | 21.2 |
|  |  | UP | 40.4 | 57.4 | 56.4 | 50.0 | 37.2 | 3.2 | 24.5 | 24.5 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | P | 47.1 | 58.3 | 79.1 | 32.7 | 11.9 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 45.7 |
|  |  | UP | 43.8 | 54.8 | 69.9 | 39.7 | 13.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 47.9 |
| 5 | Delhi | P | 82.8 | 24.6 | 63.1 | 27.9 | 6.6 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 71.3 |
| 6 | Gujarat | P | 41.2 | 55.9 | 73.5 | 29.4 | 2.9 | - | - | 38.2 |
|  |  | UP | 54.8 | 60.5 | 78.0 | 29.4 | 6.2 | - | 0.6 | 21.5 |
| 7 | Haryana | P | 46.6 | 83.8 | 69.5 | 45.7 | 6.9 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 41.3 |
|  |  | UP | 52.9 | 77.4 | 66.0 | 56.6 | 7.3 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 12.1 |
| 8 | Himachal Pradesh | P | 2.1 | 17.5 | 48.6 | 49.8 | 11.8 | 22.5 | 17.1 | 54.7 |
|  |  | UP | 2.7 | 20.0 | 49.3 | 52.0 | 20.0 | 18.7 | 12.0 | 58.7 |
| 9 | Jammu \& Kashmir | P | 30.0 | 81.9 | 16.1 | 34.3 | 59.1 | - | 12.0 | 66.6 |
|  |  | UP | 35.6 | 61.4 | 19.4 | 35.3 | 71.6 | - | 9.7 | 66.9 |
| 10 | Karnataka | P | 45.9 | 59.7 | 61.7 | 27.2 | 20.7 | 4.1 | 10.3 | 70.0 |
|  |  | UP | 49.3 | 52.2 | 68.1 | 29.0 | 15.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 79.7 |
| 11 | Kerala | P | 39.0 | 15.2 | 9.5 | 1.9 | 32.4 | 1.0 | 22.9 | 39.0 |
|  |  | UP | 43.1 | 21.6 | 9.8 | 2.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 25.5 | 37.3 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | P | 43.0 | 29.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 16.0 | 49.0 |
|  |  | UP | 40.0 | 37.0 | 44.0 | 18.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 49.0 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | P | 48.0 | 69.0 | 60.0 | 37.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | UP | 49.0 | 75.0 | 61.0 | 32.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 17.0 |
| 14 | Orissa | P | 21.7 | 38.0 | 21.0 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 9.3 |
|  |  | UP | 24.0 | 37.0 | 18.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| 15 | Punjab | P | 15.9 | 83.7 | 18.9 | 64.8 | 24.2 | 7.9 | 3.5 | 6.6 |
|  |  | UP | 11.8 | 79.4 | 25.0 | 67.6 | 36.8 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 2.9 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | P | 47.2 | 65.1 | 84.4 | 31.9 | 20.1 | 2.3 | 10.8 | 34.6 |
|  |  | UP | 44.5 | 71.4 | 88.4 | 32.3 | 17.3 | 1.2 | 10.2 | 33.4 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | P | 62.8 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 13.8 | 25.3 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 55.2 |
|  |  | UP | 63.9 | 44.6 | 39.8 | 16.9 | 18.1 | 3.6 | 10.8 | 47.0 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | P | 23.6 | 78.0 | 68.3 | 35.9 | 11.0 | 1.6 | 5.5 | 68.9 |
|  |  | UP | 19.8 | 75.6 | 65.1 | 37.2 | 19.8 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 69.8 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | P | 15.3 | 17.8 | 24.9 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 24.6 |
|  |  | UP | 10.8 | 21.0 | 24.3 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 28.7 |
| 20 | West Bengal | P | 19.4 | 67.4 | 72.6 | 65.5 | 12.6 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 39.0 |
|  |  | UP | 9.0 | 73.1 | 50.0 | 61.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 57.3 |
|  | Over all | $\mathbf{P}$ | 41.6 | 56.7 | 58.5 | 34.9 | 15.0 | 3.2 | 8.8 | 42.4 |
|  |  | UP | 44.1 | 57.1 | 56.8 | 31.0 | 15.0 | 1.2 | 7.4 | 42.1 |

In table 5.4 and 5.5, the findings on reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teaches and VEC members in different states are presented in a summary form for primary and upper primary levels respectively.

In these tables, the states in which $50 \%$ or more respondents endorsed the 5 major reasons of low attendance are listed. The states in which $70 \%$ or more responds endorsed a particular reason are shown in bold letters. The number of state endorsing a given reason is shown in parenthesis in each cell. The three reasons that were endorsed by less than $50 \%$ respondents are not shown in these tables.

Table 5.4 Reasons for low attendance of students at primary stage as given by $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ or more head teachers, teachers and village education committee/school management committee members

| Reasons | Head Teachers | Teachers | VEC members |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Child helps <br> in household <br> work/ sibling <br> care | Bihar, Gujarat, <br> Haryana, Rajasthan <br> and Uttar Pradesh <br> (5) | Bihar, Chhattisgarh, <br> Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, J <br> \& K, Maharashtra, <br> Madhya Pradesh, <br> Rajasthan, U.P., <br> Uttarakhand, West <br> Bengal(12) | Assam, Bihar, Delhi, <br> Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, <br> Haryana, Karnataka, <br> M.P. Rajasthan, U.P., <br> West Bengal (11) |
| Poverty/Child <br> needed to <br> help parents <br> in their <br> occupational <br> work | Andhra Pradesh, <br> Assam, Bihar, <br> Chattisgarh, Gujarat, | Bihar, Chhattisgarh, <br> Guryana, J \& K, <br> M.P., Punjab, <br> Rajasthan, Uttar <br> Pradesh Uttarkhand, Haryana, M. P., <br> (12) | U.P., West Bengal (7) | | Assam, Bihar, |
| :--- |
| Chhattisgarh, Delhi, |
| Gujarat, Haryana, |
| Karnataka, MP, |
| Punjab, Rajasthan, |
| U.P, J \& K. (12) |,

Note: In the states shown in bold letters, the percentage of respondents giving a particular reason was more than $70 \%$.

Table 5.5 Reasons for low attendance of students at upper primary stage as given by over 50\% head teachers, teachers and VEC/SMC members

| Reasons | Head Teachers | Teachers | VEC members |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child helps household in work/ sibling care | UP, Gujarat, Haryana, Rajasthan and West Bengal (5) | Bihar, Chhattisgarh, <br>  <br> K, Maharashtra, M.P. <br> Rajasthan, U.P., <br> Uttrakhand and West <br> Bengal (11) | Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh, U.P. Haryana, Karnataka, Rajasthan, M.P. and West Bengal.(10) |
| Poverty/Child needed to help parents in their occupational work | Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, J \& K ,Punjab Uttar Pradesh ,Rajasthan ((9) | Bihar, Haryana, <br> Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, <br> M.P., Punjab, U.P.,(7) | A.P., U.P., Bihar, Chattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, J\&K, Karnataka, M.P., Punjab, Rajasthan West Bengal, (12) |
| Temporary <br> Migration |  | Maharashtra and Punjab (2) | A.P., Assam, Gujarat, Haryana, Tamilnadu and Uttarakhand. (6) |
| Parents' indifference/ lack of interest | J \&K, Punjab, <br> Uttarakhand and <br> Chhattisgarh (4) | Bihar, Chattisgarh, Haryana, J \& K, Punjab, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Punjab, U.P. Uttarkhand, West Bengal, H.P., M.P., Rajasthan (14) | Assam, Jammu \& Kashmir, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, West Bengal(6) |
| Illness of the child | Kerala, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal (3) | Assam, H.P. and Kerala, (3) |  |
| Note: Upper Primary schools of Delhi were not covered. In the case of states shown in bold letters, the percentage of respondents giving a particular reason is over $70 \%$. |  |  |  |

To sum up, in majority of the states, head teachers felt that poverty or child's involvement in agriculture or other income generating activity of parents was the major reason for child's absence from school. Teachers in most states gave importance to the reason that the child was needed at home to help in household work or sibling care' and also to 'parents' indifference or lack of interest in child's education'. VEC/SMC members in maximum number of states felt that children were needed at home to help parents in household work or in contributing to family income and that was the main reason for their absenting from school.

### 5.4 Opinion of Teachers on School Related Factors responsible for Low Attendance

Teachers were asked to give opinion specifically about 5 school related variables responsible for low attendance in their schools. They were asked to indicate which factors were more responsible for child remaining absent from school out of 5 given factors. Teachers' responses showed that in only five states (Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, J\&K and West Bengal) these factors needed special attention as teachers' response was more than $40 \%$ on these variables. In the remaining states, less that $40 \%$ teachers mentioned any of the school variables to be responsible for low attendance of students. Many felt that the problem of students' absence was not serious and hence did not respond.

Table 5.6 Teachers' Opinion about school related factors responsible for children's absence from school

| Factors | Assam |  | Bihar |  | Chhattisga rh |  | Jammu \& Kashmir |  | West Bengal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr | Pr. | U.Pr | Pr | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr | Pr | U.Pr |
| Lack of Basic Facilities | ** | ** | *** | *** | - | - | *** | *** | - | - |
| Overcrowded class rooms | ** | * | ** | ** | - | - | * | * | - | - |
| Poor Accessibility of schools, | - | - | - | - | - | - | ** | * | - | - |
| Unattractive Environment, | - | - | * | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Teacher Shortage | * | * | ** | - | * | ** | *** | ** | ** | *** |

*40\%-<50\%; ** $50 \%-<75 \%$; ***75 and above
Lack of basic facilities in schools was considered serious by most teachers in Assam, Bihar and J\&K. Overcrowded classrooms lowered students' attendance in Assam, Bihar and J\&K in the opinion of large number of teachers. Difficult access to school appeared to be a problem that discourages students to attend school regularly in J\&K. Teacher shortage was highlighted by most teachers as a problem in Bihar (at primary stage only), Chhattisgarh, J\&K, West Bengal and to some extent in Assam. They felt that students tend to become irregular when there are not enough teachers in school. Unattractive school environment was not considered as a disincentive to students to attend school, except by a few teachers in primary schools of Bihar.

### 5.5 Reasons of Low Attendance given by Head Teachers, Teachers \& VEC/SMC

Overall weighted averages were derived from state wise responses of head teachers, teachers and VEC/SMC members for students' low attendance, these are summarized in the following table.

Table 5.7 Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers and VEC/SMC members

| Reasons | Head teachers <br> \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |
| Poverty/Involvement in income <br> generation activities | 49.7 | 51.1 | 39.5 | 38.2 | 54.1 | 56.7 |
| House hold work/sibling care | 39.6 | 40.3 | 56.3 | 57.6 | 57.2 | 56.6 |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 36.2 | 34.3 | 59.3 | 54.1 | 44.2 | 42.5 |
| Temporary migration | 17.9 | 16.2 | 24.4 | 26.2 | 41.3 | 44.0 |
| Child's illness | 27.5 | 19.2 | 30.2 | 30.5 |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social <br> function | 20.1 | 20.4 | 22.1 | 25.6 |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school |  |  | 26.3 | 23.7 | 14.7 | 15.0 |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 32.1 | 27.2 |  | 7.6 |
| Unattractive school /Lack of interest <br> in going to school |  |  | 14.9 | 12.1 | 9.5 | 7.6 |
| Difficult access to school especially <br> in rainy season |  |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Lack of proper monitoring to bring <br> children to school |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Parents' lack of interest in child's education and engagement of the child in income generation activities/ household work emerged as most potent reasons for children's low attendance according to the teachers. The other factors were: child's illness, family's
temporary migration and participation in religious and social functions. Nearly one fourth of the teachers felt that lack of facilities in schools is also a factors for students' low attendance.

### 5.6 Reasons of Child's Absence from School given by Parents

Parents of students were asked to give reasons for their wards being irregular or remaining frequently absent form school. Many parents felt that their children were attending school regularly and hence did not give any reason. However, quite a few parents responded and the data on reasons that they endorsed (in case more than $10 \%$ endorsed a particular reason) are shown state-wise in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8 Reasons given by parents for low attendance of children

| State | Temporary <br> Migration | Lack of facilities | Learning difficulty | Child does not like going to school | Unhappy with teacher behaviour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.Andhra Pradesh | $\bullet$ |  | - |  |  |
| 2. Assam | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |
| 3. Bihar | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| 4. Chhattisgarh |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| 5. Delhi | $\bullet \bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| 6.Gujarat | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |
| 7. Haryana |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - |
| 8. Himachal Pradesh |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 9. Jammu \& Kashmir | $\bullet \bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |
| 10.Maharashtra | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |
| 11.Madhya Pradesh | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet \bullet$ | - |
| 12.Orissa |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |
| 13. Punjab | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| 14. Rajasthan |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| 15. Tamil Nadu |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 16. Uttarakhand |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| 17.West Bengal |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| No. of States | 9 | 11 | 9 | 13 | 3 |

$\bullet 10 \%-<20 \%$; •• $20 \%-<40 \%$; ••• $40 \%$ and above
In three states (Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala) less than $10 \%$ parents endorsed any of the listed reasons for low attendance and these are not shown in the table.

In most states ( 13 out of 20 ), 10 to 40 percent parents said that the main reason was that the child does not like going to school. The next important reason given by parents was that 'school lacked facilities'. This reason was supported by over $40 \%$ parents in Assam and Bihar. The third reasons that emerged as important was 'temporary migration of the family'. It was given greater weightage in Delhi, Jammu \& Kashmir, Maharashtra and Punjab, where more of migrant families come to work.

In 9 states between $10 \%$ and $20 \%$ parents felt that children absented form school due to experiencing difficulty in learning. Very few felt that teachers' behavior was responsible for discouraging children to attend school. Only in Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand, 10 to 20 percent parents felt that this was the reason for child not going to school.

The reasons given by parents are mostly school related reasons. They felt that improvement in facilities and teaching learning at school will make students more regular. In a few states, where families from other states such as Bihar and Uttar Pradesh migrated for a few months
for work, parents felt that temporary migration of the family also affected school attendance rate of children.

## Family Related Reasons of Students' Low Attendance in view of Parents

In view of the wide spread perceptions regarding students' involvement in household work and engagement in earning activities as the major reasons of their low attendance in schools, the parents were asked to indicate the frequency of their involvement in the two activities on a three point scale, viz 'frequently' 'some times' and 'rarely'. The parents 'responses with regard to the engagement of their wards in the two activities mentioned above are presented in Table 5.9.
Table 5.9 Parents (\%) perceptions about family responsibilities \& involvement in earning activities as cause of low attendance

| Sl.No | State |  | HouseholdResponsibilities |  |  | Involvement in earning activities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Freque ntly | Somet imes | Rarely | Freque ntly | Someti mes | Rarely |
| 1 | Andhra | P | 9.5 | 37.1 | 53.4 | 19.4 | 55.1 | 25.6 |
|  | Pradesh | UP | 13.1 | 38.9 | 48.0 | 22.9 | 51.4 | 25.7 |
| 2 | Assam | P | 9.2 | 58.5 | 2.3 | 19.7 | 50.2 | 30.0 |
|  |  | UP | 8.2 | 59.5 | 32.3 | 16.8 | 50.5 | 32.7 |
| 3 | Bihar | P | 3.9 | 14.3 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 11.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | UP | 4.1 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 3.2 | 11.6 | 1.5 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | P | 3.9 | 9.2 | 7.7 | 1.5 | 11.1 | 2.5 |
|  |  | UP | 1.9 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 1.7 | 15.9 | 2.1 |
| 5 | Delhi | P | 8.9 | 55.3 | 35.8 | 11.3 | 66.9 | 21.9 |
| 6 | Gujarat | P | 23.3 | 37.2 | 39.5 | 50.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | UP | 33.5 | 40.5 | 25.9 | 37.1 | 46.4 | 16.5 |
| 7 | Haryana | P | 14.9 | 54.9 | 30.2 | 7.8 | 56.9 | 35.3 |
|  |  | UP | 19.8 | 54.7 | 25.5 | 9.0 | 72.6 | 18.4 |
| 8 | Himachal | P | 4.4 | 25.7 | 69.9 | 7.5 | 50.7 | 41.8 |
|  | Pradesh | UP | 7.3 | 30.8 | 61.9 | 10.6 | 54.7 | 34.8 |
| 9 | Jammu \& | P | 4.2 | 68.1 | 27.7 | 6.6 | 85.2 | 8.1 |
|  | Kashmir | UP | 3.7 | 66.9 | 29.4 | 6.9 | 84.8 | 8.3 |
| 10 | Karnataka | P | 4.5 | 15.9 | 11.2 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 2.4 |
|  |  | UP | 5.9 | 20.4 | 10.5 | 1.9 | 7.7 | 4.6 |
| 11 | Kerala | P | 0.2 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
|  |  | UP | 0.3 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 |
| 12 | Maharashtra | P | 2.4 | 14.1 | 83.5 | 13.3 | 37.9 | 48.8 |
|  |  | UP | 3.6 | 17.6 | 78.8 | 10.1 | 48.2 | 41.7 |
| 13 | Madhya Pradesh | P | 4.0 | 34.0 | 62.0 | 19.0 | 51.0 | 30.0 |
|  |  | UP | 5.0 | 32.0 | 63.0 | 16.0 | 56.0 | 28.0 |
| 14 | Orissa | P | 5.8 | 28.7 | 65.5 | 12.5 | 72.0 | 15.6 |
|  |  | UP | 7.5 | 28.8 | 63.7 | 24.3 | 58.0 | 17.7 |
| 15 | Punjab | P | 10.1 | 54.7 | 35.2 | 17.2 | 62.1 | 20.7 |
|  |  | UP | 4.4 | 65.0 | 30.5 | 7.2 | 42.3 | 50.5 |
| 16 | Rajasthan | P | 5.6 | 40.9 | 51.5 | 2.1 | 9.5 | 3.7 |
|  |  | UP | 8.9 | 44.3 | 45.6 | 4.6 | 18.6 | 6.3 |
| 17 | Tamil Nadu | P | 1.0 | 4.7 | 16.0 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 1.6 |
|  |  | UP | 1.2 | 8.7 | 15.5 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| 18 | Uttar Pradesh | P | 5.4 | 45.6 | 49.1 | 20.1 | 54.3 | 25.6 |
|  |  | UP | 5.3 | 44.9 | 49.8 | 10.5 | 64.7 | 24.8 |
| 19 | Uttarakhand | P | 8.0 | 22.0 | 71.0 | 14.0 | 40.0 | 46.0 |
|  |  | UP | 6.0 | 29.0 | 66.0 | 10.0 | 55.0 | 34.0 |
| 20 | West Bengal | P | 10.3 | 24.2 | 34.2 | 7.7 | 17.2 | 55.8 |
|  |  | UP | 10.9 | 24.6 | 37.7 | 9.6 | 21.3 | 16.5 |

### 5.7 Focus Group Discussion with Community Members

Informal focus group discussions (12 per state) were held by supervisors and investigators in each state to find out what the community felt about reasons of children being absent from school. The main reasons emerging from these discussions were :

R1. Poor quality of teaching;
R2. Shortage of teachers;
R3. Poor accessibility/ lack of transport;
R4. Poverty;
R5. Poor facility in schools;
R6. Parents indifference;
R7. Illness of child/ family members;
R8. Household work/ sibling care
Table 5.10 shows the reasons that were important (indicated by $\bullet$ in the cells) in most of the FGDs in each state.

Table 5.10 Reasons of children's absence from school emerging from FGD with Community members

| State | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra Pradesh | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| Assam |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bihar | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Chhattisgarh |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| Delhi |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Gujarat |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |
| Haryana |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Himachal Pradesh |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| Jammu \& Kashmir |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Karnataka |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| Kerala |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Maharashtra |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Madhya Pradesh | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Orissa | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| Punjab |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
| Rajasthan |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tamil Nadu | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| Uttar Pradesh | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| Uttarakhand | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| West Bengal |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
| No. of States | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |

In FGD, opinions were expressed freely on all home related and school related reasons. It appears that in majority of the states ( 15 out of 20 ), the main reason for child remaining frequently absent from school that emerged from group discussions, was that 'facilities in school' were poor. It is interesting to note that the community members do not seem to be satisfied with the existing facilities in schools in as many as 15 states. The other reasons emerging form group discussions in 11 to 12 states 'were poor accessibility or lack of transport for going to schools', 'poverty' and 'parents indifference'. 'Child's illness' or 'being pre-occupied with household work or sibling care' emerged as reason for children's
absence from school during FGD in only 6 or 7 states. School factors such as 'shortage of teachers' and 'poor quality of teaching' emerged as reasons of low attendance of children in 8 or 9 states.

### 5.8 Home Background Variables Associated with Students’ Absence Rate

In this section an attempt has been made to identify home related factors which are largely responsible for students' absence. The step-down regression analysis was undertaken. In which students' absence rate was defined as percentage of days on which a student was absent in the previous school year was used as the dependent variable. It was computed by subtracting student's attendance rate from 100.
The home background factors considered in this analysis were:
i. Class= Class in which the child studied (classes 1-8)
ii. Gender: (Girl=1, boy=0)
iii. Social group: ( $\mathrm{OBC} \&$ General category $=1 ; \mathrm{SC} / \mathrm{ST}=0$ )
iv. Age: Age of child
v. Helpstu: (Student gets help in studies (Yes=1, No=0))
vi. Mettchs: Parents meet teacher to discuss child's progress in studies (Yes=1, No=0)
vii. Dadocc: Father's occupation (transformed into continuous variable using Mosteller \& Tukey transformation)
viii. Dadedu: Father's education (converted into continuous variable using Mosteller \& Tukey method transformation)
ix. Mumed: Mother's education (transformed into continuous variable using Mosteller \& Tukey method transformation)
x. SCQLTY: Student's opinion about school and teaching quality (Scores:0-4); higher score for quality being perceived as poor
The results based on the regression analysis are presented in Table 5.11.
Table 5.11: Multiple $\mathbf{R}$ for student's absence rate as dependent variable and with other characteristics as independent variables

| States | R | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R}^{2} \times \\ & \mathbf{1 0 0} \end{aligned}$ | Class | Gender | Soc. Gr. | Age | Help in studies | Mettchs | Dadocc | Daded | Mumed | SCQLTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra Pradesh | 0.210 | 4.4 | -0.053* | - | - | - | -0.166** | -0.119** | - | -0.144** | - | 0.9** |
| Assam | 0.211 | 4.4 | 0.037** | 0.120** | -0.073 | -0.031** | - | 0.502** | -0.093** | -0.139** | - | - |
| Bihar | 0.243 | 5.9 | - | -0.04* | - | 0.05** | -0.06** | -0.09** |  | -0.44** | - | 0.17** |
| Chhattisgarh | 0.34 | 11.6 | -0.1* | - | - | - | - | -0.05* | 0.04** | -0.11** | - | 0.28** |
| Delhi | 0.335 | 11.2 | -0.035* | - | -0.129** | - | -0.172** | -0.198** | -0.075** | - | - | 1.138** |
| Gujarat | 0.453 | 20.5 | - |  | 0.121** | - | -0.138** | -0.091** | - | - | - | 0.323* |
| Haryana | 0.133 | 1.8 | -0.02 | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | -0.062** | 0.458** |
| Himachal Pradesh | 0.179 | 3.2 | -0.077** | - | - | - | - | 0.084* | -0.045* | 0.066** |  | 0.258* |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 0.259 | 6.7 | 0.039** | -0.29** | -0.253** | - | - | - | -0.120** | - | 0-.057* | - |
| Karnataka | 0.396 | 15.6 | - | - | -0.14** | - | -0.06** | -0.08** | - | - | -0.05** | 0.32** |
| Kerala | 0.119 | 1.4 | -0.15** |  | -- | 0.12* |  | -0.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | 0.253 | 6.4 | - | - | - | - | 0.08** | 0.08** | 0.05* | 0.1** | - | 0.16** |
| Maharashtra | 0.391 | 15.3 | - | - | -0.057** | - | -0.103** | -0.156** | - | -0.60** | - | 0.242** |
| Orissa | 0.391 | 15.3 | - | -0.037* | -0.08** | 0.112** | - | -0.146** | - | -0.06* | -0.074** | 0.248** |
| Punjab | 0.329 | 10.8 | -0.038* | - | -0.123* | 0.029* | - | -0.221* | - | - | - | 1.274* |
| Rajasthan | 0.370 | 13.6 | -0.102** | 0.080* | - | 0.032** | -0.113** | -0.272** | -0.038** | - | - | 1.562** |
| Tamilnadu | 0.204 | 4.2 | - | - | -0.04* | 0.09* | -0.07** | - | - | - | - | 0.15** |
| Uttar Pradesh | 0.205 | 4.2 | -0.055* | -0.102* | - | 0.017* | -0.27* | 0.091* | - | -0.089* | - | 0.834** |
| Uttarakhand | 0.274 | 7.5 | - | - | -0.158** | - | -0.090** | - | - | -0.093** | - | 0.098** |
| (\$)West Bengal | 0.528 | 27.9 | - | 0.117** | 0.168* | 0.166** | - | -0.219** | - | -0.217** | - | - |

Note: *Significant at 0.05; ** Significant at 0.01 level; (\$) West Bengal also considered Household work as one independent variable which emerged as significant in the final model $0.076 *$.

The table shows state-wise values of regression coefficient of those independent variables in the final model which contributed significantly to the students' absence rate along with the value of Multiple R and percentage of variance explained by the independent variables $\left(100 \times R^{2}\right)$. The table also shows regression coefficients of the above mentioned 10 variables that were found to be significant at 0.05 or 0.01 level. In the cells that are blank, the value of regression coefficient was not significant and hence it is not shown.

The values of $100 \times R^{2}$ in the above table show the percentage of variance of students' absence rate that is explained by the 10 variables included in the model. This percentage differs widely across the states ranging from $1.4 \%$ in Kerala to $20.5 \%$ in Gujarat. In 9 states (Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab and West Bengal) the contribution of the ten variables to absence rate is in the range of $10 \%$ to $28 \%$.

The set of variables emerging as significant contributors to students' attendance rate in the final model varies considerably across states. At best, it can stated that some independent variables were found to be significant contributors more often in the final model than others. The following variables can be considered as the variables that affect attendance rate of children in most states if not all the states:

- Student's own perception of quality of school.
- Parent's meeting with teacher to enquire about child's studies.
- Student getting help in studies at home
- Belonging to general/ OBC category
- Father's education

Students' Own Perception of Quality of School was observed to be associated significantly with students' absence in 15 states (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh \& Uttarakhand). If the students felt that the school was good, they attended school more regularly.

Parents Meeting with Teacher to enquire about Child's Studies in School also emerged as significant contributor to child's presence or absence in school. The regression coefficient was observed to be negative in 11 states (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Jammu \& Kashmir, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab and West Bengal). implying that in these states parents meeting with teachers led to reduction in child's absence rate.

Students getting Help in Studies at Home contributed negatively to children's absence (that is, reduced absence rate) in 9 states (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal) implying that the more educated the family members were, the less was the absence rate of their children. However, there was no definite trend in respect of the association of gender with absence rate. In Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Jammu Kashmir and Bihar, boys' absence rate is higher, whereas in Assam, Rajasthan and West Bengal girls' absence rate was found to be more, after partialling out the effect of other factors.

Social Classes of the Child made a difference. The children belonging to SC/ ST category were absent from school more often than those who belonged to non-SC/ ST category as the regression coefficient was negative and significant in 9 states and positive and significant in only two states (Gujarat and West Bengal) where the finding is just the opposite.

Father's Education contributed negatively in 9 states - Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal where as

Mothers education contributed negatively in 3 states- Haryana, Karnataka and Orissa. Father's occupation was observed to be contributing negatively in Assam, Delhi and Jammu \& Kashmir.

### 5.9 Measures Undertaken by Schools (as per Head Teacher) for Increasing Students' Attendance Rate

An attempt was made in the study to find out the measures taken at school stage by head teachers to increase students' attendance rate. Following is the overall weighted average as derived from their state wise responses.

Table 5.12 Steps undertaken by head teacher for increasing students' attendance rate

| Measures taken | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Admonishing the students who were irregular | 86.9 | 88.6 |
| Taking help of VEC/SMC members to make students <br> more regular in attending school | 81.7 | 83.7 |
| Meeting parents of frequently absent children to impress <br> on them the need to send the children to school regularly | 67.4 | 71.0 |
| Motivating students to be regular during school assembly <br> during school assembly | 63.1 | 64.1 |
| Entrusting responsibility to some students for <br> bringing children of their neighbourhood to school | 53.6 | 67.6 |

More than $80 \%$ of head teachers admonish the irregular students and also take the help of VEC/SMC members to make students more regular in attending school. Meeting parents, use of peer pressure to attend school regularly and motivating irregular students to be regular in attending school are also the strategies adopted by head teachers but these are relatively less common.
5.10 Measures taken by VEC/SMC Members for increasing Students’ Attendance according to Head Teachers.

Community participation in school management is one of the major thrust area of SSA. An attempt was made to find out the extent of community participation in increasing students' attendance rate as per head teachers' perception. Following is the overall weighted average derived from their responses in different states.

Table 5.13 Measures taken by VEC/SMC members for Reducing Students' absence rate according to head teachers.

| Measures taken | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contacting parents of irregular students | 79.1 | 80.8 |
| Making some community member responsible for <br> bringing all children of neighbourhood to school | 61.4 | 62.9 |
| Visiting homes of girls whose attendance is poor | 53.2 | 56.6 |
| Improving school environment to make it more <br> attractive to children | 51.0 | 55.2 |
| Creating awareness about importance of girls' education <br> by organizing fairs, shows, etc. | 33.4 | 52.1 |
| Making arrangement at community level to look after <br> younger children to enable girls to come to school | 33.7 | 35.3 |

Head teachers reported that nearly $80 \%$ of VEC/SMC members contact parents of irregular students to make them more regular in attending school. It appears that VEC/SMC members
also make some community member responsible for bringing children of their neighborhood to school. Other strategies are less common but according to head teachers, quite a few VECs/SMCs (33 to 56 percent) adopted those strategies too.

### 5.11 Measures proposed by VEC Members for increasing Students’ Attendance Rate

VEC members were asked to choose the two most important measures out of 5 given measures for increasing students' attendance rate. The measures preferred by them are shown in Table 5.14 in terms of the median values of the percentages of respondents who preferred a given reason in different states.

Table 5.14 Measures proposed by VEC members for Reducing Students' absence rate

| Measure | \% of VEC members <br> (median) |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. Motivate parents to send children to school | 79.5 |
| 2. Establish more Anganwadis to free children from sibling care | 24.3 |
| 3. Improve teaching in school | 23.8 |
| 4. Provide scholarships/ incentives for regularity in attendance | 38.3 |
| 5. Make schools more attractive | 16.2 |

It appears that most of them (79.5\%) felt that parents should be motivated to send children to school regularly in order to reduce absence rate. The next most important measure suggested by them ( $38.3 \%$ ) was to provide scholarships or other incentives for regularity in attendance. Improving teaching-learning in schools and making schools attractive were given relatively lower rating ( $23.8 \%$ and $16.2 \%$ respectively). About $24 \%$ members also gave importance to establishment of Anganwadis as a measure for freeing older children from sibling care so that they could attend school more regularly.

## CHAPTER 6

## RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE WITH SOME QUALITY INDICATORS OF EDUCATION

### 6.1 Introduction

Students' achievement, repetition rate and drop out rate are some of the easily measurable indicators of Quality of Education especially at the elementary level of education. The relationship of students' attendance rate with these indicators is being explored in this chapter to find out how the attendance rate affects the quality of education as assessed by these indictors.

The specific questions to be answered are:

1. What is the correlation of students' attendance rate at primary and upper primary stages with (a) Repetition rate and (b) Drop out rate of students?
2. How students' attendance is related to achievement in annual examination when the effect of other student and school related variables is partialled out?

To answer the first question, only simple correlations were calculated between attendance and repetition or dropout rate. However, for the second question, regression analysis was carried out. The correlations could not be reported for 3 states (HP, Maharashtra and West Bengal) as the state reports did not include these correlations.

### 6.2 Relationship between Students' Attendance Rate and Repetition Rate

We explored the association between students attendance rate with repetition rate by calculating the correlation coefficient between (a) attendance rate of students as derived from school register for the year 2005-06 and (b) their repetition rate, that is, percentage of students who repeated grades in 2006-07 out of the total students enrolled in primary/ upper primary classes in 2005-06.

From the correlations reported in Table 6.1, it is clear that in most cases attendance rate of children in school is negatively correlated with their repetition rate which implies that the higher the attendance rate in a school, the less is the repetition rate in that school. It is logical that if the students attend school more regularly, it is less likely that they will repeat grades.

Although most of the correlations are negative, some are not statistically significant at 0.05 or 0.01 level possibly due to the sample size not being large enough, particularly in the case of upper primary schools. Further, there are several other factors responsible for child's grade repetition which could also be the reason for its correlation with attendance rate being low and statistically insignificant in some states. But in Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Rajasthan and Uttarakhand the negative correlations are fairly high at the primary stage which shows that irrespective of other factors, the attendance rate is an important factor that affects repetition rate.

Correlations were also calculated between attendance rate of students in a particular class with repetition rate in that class. These are reported in Annexure 1. The findings are
similar though not uniform in all the states. In most states, the negative correlations are significant only in some of the classes and not in all the classes.

Table 6.1: Correlation of students' attendance rate with repetition rate \& dropout rate

| State | Primary schools |  |  | Upper Primary schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Correlation of attendance with |  | N | Correlation attendance with |  |
|  |  | Repetition Rate | Dropout Rate |  | Repetition Rate | Dropout Rate |
| Andhra Pradesh | 396 | -0.21** | -0.11* | 91 | -0.20 | -0.10 |
| Assam | 252 | -0.037 | 0.041 | 78 | -0.118 | -0.034 |
| Bihar | 346 | -0.05 | -0.21** | 79 | -0.05 | -0.31** |
| Chhattisgarh | 294 | -0.35** | 0.05 | 72 | -0.03 | 0.07 |
| Delhi | 124 | -0.083 | -0.006 | - | - | - |
| Gujarat | 263 | -0.364** | -.275** | 192 | -0.201** | -.155* |
| Haryana | 247 | 0.011 | -0.093 | 53 | 0.154 | 0.019 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 122 | 0.095 | -0.02 | 28 | 0.032 | -0.096 |
| Karnataka | 335 | -0.37** | -0.37** | 63 | -0.37** | -0.26* |
| Kerala | 288 | -0.15** | 0.03 | 81 | -0.08 | 0.04 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 301 | -0.189** | 0.189** | 79 | -206 | -206 |
| Orissa | 369 | -0.12* | -0.31** | 100 | -0.17 | -0.24* |
| Punjab | 227 | 0.092 | -0.001 | 68 | -0.166 | 0.123 |
| Rajasthan | 277 | -0.316** | -.200** | 121 | -0.275** | -.234* |
| Tamil Nadu | 299 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 63 | 0.11 | -0.29* |
| Uttar Pradesh | 321 | -0.05 | -0.14* | 87 | 0.03 | -0.13 |
| Uttarakhand | 195 | -0.352** | -0.109 | 51 | -0.129 | -0.239 |

* Significant at 0.05 level; ** significant at 0.01 level; No information was available from from H.P., Maharashtra \& West Bengal


### 6.3 Relationship between Students' Attendance Rate and Dropout Rate

From the data on dropouts in each school, the dropout rate was calculated for the year 2005-06 and its correlation with attendance rate was derived for both primary and upper primary schools in each state. Table 6.1 shows the correlations so obtained.

Most of the correlations are negative and the negative correlations are statistically significant at 0.05 or 0.01 level in the case of primary schools in 7 states (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Karnataka, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh) in the case of primary schools. In the case of upper primary schools, the negative correlations are significant in 6 states (Bihar, Gujarat, Karnataka, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamilnadu); in most other states the correlations are negative although not statistically insignificant..

The broad conclusion is that in the schools in which attendance rate is low, the dropout rate tends to be high. However, since several other factors also affect dropout rate, the negative correlations with attendance rate are not high. Apart from attendance, students' home background variables and social factors play important role in dropping out of a child from school.

The correlations of class-wise students' attendance rate with class-wise dropout rate were also derived. These are reported in Annexure II. The conclusions are similar to what has been discussed above in the case of class-wise attendance rate and repeater rate.

### 6.4 Contribution of Students' Attendance and Other Student Variables to Achievement

The students' marks in the annual examination of the terminal grade of primary and upper primary levels have been used in this analysis as measure of 'students' achievement'. Relationship of students attendance with the students' achievement has been separately explored for Total marks (aggregated score in all subjects), Language and Mathematics. Students' standardised achievement scores in above mentioned subjects were used as dependent variables. The independent variables used in the step down multiple regression analysis are
(i) $\%$ of days student attended school
(ii) School location (Rural= 1, Urban=0)
(iii) Students' social group (SC/ST/OBC/Muslim $=0$, others= 1 )
(iv) Gender (girl=1, boy=0)
(v) Repeater in 2005 (student was repeater in 2005= 1, was not repeater $=0$ )
(vi) Repeater in 2006 (student currently repeater= 1, not repeater= 0 )
(vii) Disability (student having disability $=1$, having no disability $=0$ )

It is to be noted that the independent variable 'Students' attendance rate' (\% days student attended school) was always retained in the model whereas among the other independent variables, only those variables which significantly contributed to dependent variables were retained in the model.

The following discussions use multiple correlation (R) to present efficacy of the regression model in terms of $R^{2} \times 100$ which represents the percentage of variance of achievement score explained by the attendance rate and other independent variables and Standardised regression coefficient which indicates the degree of relationship of the independent variables with the achievement score after the effect of the remaining independent variables has been partialled out.

## (a) Contribution of Students' Attendance to Achievement in the Terminal Grade of Primary Stage

The values of $\mathrm{R} 2 \times 100$ in table 6.2 show to what extent the regression model is able to predict or explain the achievement of students. The percentage of variation that is accounted for by the independent variables finally retained in the regression equation is represented by $R^{2} \times 100$. The maximum variation of total achievement accounted for by independent variable was $41.7 \%$ in Madhya Pradesh. In some other states, this percentage which represents efficacy of the model was less but substantial: West Bengal (40.4\%), Andhra Pradesh (38.3\%), Maharashtra (36.6\%), Rajasthan (35.8\%), Chhattisgarh (33.3\%), Orissa ( $31.6 \%$ ), Delhi ( $31.1 \%$ ) and Uttar Pradesh ( $26.8 \%$ ). In other states, the percentage of variation explained by the set of independent variables was quite low (less than 5\%). Such states are Karnataka (0.9\%), Bihar (1.6), Haryana (2.3\%), and Tamil Nadu (4.0\%).

Regression coefficients of the different independent variables including 'Students' Attendance rate', when the dependent variable is 'total score' in the last grade of primary stage are also presented in Table 6.2 along with the values of $R^{2} \times 100$. Since students' attendance is the main variable for this study, the variable was retained in the model even if it was not statistically significant. In the case of other independent variables, the variable was retained in the model only if its value of regression coefficient was statistically significant at least at $5 \%$ level of significance.

It is to be noted that the contribution of students' attendance rate was statistically significant in all the states except Haryana where the contribution of this variable is insignificant. The relationship of this variable with the total achievement has been very firmly established in the case of Andhra Pradesh (0.596), Assam (0.262), Chhattisgarh (0.22), Delhi (0.254), Gujarat (0.352), Jammu \& Kashmir (0.309), Orissa (0.360), Uttar Pradesh (0.408), and West Bengal ( 0.443 ) in which values of regression coefficient were above 0.25 . Besides, there are some states where the contribution of students attendance is statistically significant and greater than zero but the values are quite low. Such states are Bihar (0.090), Himachal Pradesh (0.046), Karnataka (0.05), Kerala (0.05), Maharashtra (0.028), Punjab (0.099), and Uttarakhand ( 0.075 ). Such situation may be because of the achievement scores in these states being based on the school level examination which varies from school to school and does not provide a very reliable measure of achievement.

Table 6.2 Results of regression analysis of students achievement (Total) for terminal grade of Primary stage

| State | $\mathbf{R}^{2} \times \mathbf{1 0 0}$ | Standardised Partial Regression Coefficient ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ) of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Attendance | School <br> Location | Social <br> group | Gender | Repeater <br> in 2005 | Repeater <br> in 2006 | Disability |
| Andhra <br> Pradesh | 38.3 | $0.60^{* *}$ | - | - | - | - | $-0.45^{* *}$ | - |
| Assam | 11.5 | $0.262^{* *}$ | $0.125^{* *}$ | $0.241^{* *}$ | - | $0.396^{* *}$ | $-1.161^{* *}$ | - |
| Bihar | 1.6 | $0.09^{* *}$ | $-0.07^{* *}$ | $-0.02^{*}$ | - | - | $-0.02^{*}$ | $-0.04^{* *}$ |
| Chhattisgarh | 33.3 | $0.22^{* *}$ | $-0.08^{* *}$ | $0.04^{* *}$ | $-0.03^{* *}$ | $-0.04^{* *}$ | $-0.44^{* *}$ | $-0.03^{* *}$ |
| Delhi | 31.1 | $0.254^{* *}$ | $0.138^{* *}$ | $-0.04^{* *}$ | - | $-0.338^{* *}$ | $-1.504^{* *}$ | - |
| Gujarat | 16.3 | $0.352^{* *}$ | $0.043^{* *}$ | $-0.07^{* *}$ | - | $-0.073^{* *}$ | $0.024^{* *}$ | $-0.046^{* *}$ |
| Haryana | 2.3 | -0.019 | $-0.098^{* *}$ | $-0.19^{* *}$ | $0.072^{* *}$ | $0.154^{* *}$ | $-1.340^{* *}$ | - |
| Himachal <br> Pradesh | 9.8 | $0.046^{*}$ | - | $0.066^{* *}$ | $0.085^{* *}$ | $-0.071^{* *}$ | $-0.266^{* *}$ | $0.065^{* *}$ |
|  <br> Kashmir | 10.0 | $0.309^{* *}$ | - | $0.055^{* *}$ | - | - | $-0.028^{*}$ | - |
| Karnataka | 0.9 | $0.05^{* *}$ | $-0.06^{* *}$ | - | - | - | $-0.04^{* *}$ | - |
| Kerala | 8.8 | $0.05^{* *}$ | $-0.10^{* *}$ | $0.10^{* *}$ | $0.02^{*}$ | $-0.08^{* *}$ | $-0.22^{* *}$ | $-0.03^{* *}$ |
| Madhya <br> Pradesh | 41.7 | $0.21^{* *}$ | $0.04^{* *}$ | - | - | - | $0.54^{* *}$ | - |
| Maharashtra | 36.6 | $0.028^{* *}$ | $-0.035^{* *}$ | $0.134^{* *}$ | - | $-0.058^{* *}$ | $-0.379^{* *}$ | - |
| Orissa | 31.6 | $0.360^{* *}$ | $-0.129^{* *}$ | $0.055^{* *}$ | - | - | $-0.330^{* *}$ | - |
| Punjab | 19.0 | $0.099^{* *}$ | $-0.145^{* *}$ | $-0.35^{* *}$ | $0.112^{* *}$ | $-0.362^{* *}$ | $-2.353^{* *}$ | - |
| Rajasthan | 35.8 | $0.185^{* *}$ | $0.106^{* *}$ | $0.120^{* *}$ | -0.04 | $-0.487^{* *}$ | $-2.490^{* *}$ | $-0.312^{*}$ |
| Tamil Nadu | 4.0 | $0.15^{* *}$ | - | $0.05^{* *}$ | $0.07^{* *}$ | $0.03^{*}$ | $-0.09^{* *}$ | $-0.04^{* *}$ |
| Uttar <br> Pradesh | 26.8 | $0.41^{* *}$ | - | $0.15^{*}$ | - | $-0.40^{* *}$ | $-1.96^{* *}$ | - |
| Uttarakhand | 7.2 | $0.075^{* *}$ | - | $0.053^{*}$ | - | - | $-0.244^{* *}$ | - |
| West Bengal | 40.4 | $0.443^{* *}$ | $-.117^{*}$ | $.125^{*}$ | - | - | $.341^{* *}$ | $-.124^{*}$ |

*0.05 level of significance; ** 0.01 level of significance
The results of the regression analysis for achievement in language and mathematics as the dependent variables are presented in Annexure III. As in the case of total achievement sore, the highest percentage of variation explained both in Language and Mathematics achievement scores by the set of independent variables was about $40 \%$ in Madhya Pradesh. The states in which substantial percentage of variation was accounted for by independent variables ( over $25 \%$ ) in either subject were Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Orissa, Rajasthan and West Bengal. Except in West Bengal, Orissa and Maharashtra, there was almost no difference between language and mathematics as far as this aspect is concerned. The maximum difference of 18 parentage
points between the two subjects was found in Maharashtra whereas the difference in the case of Orissa and West Bengal was $3 \%$ points and $7 \%$ points respectively. In general, the variation explained by the independent variables is more in the case of Mathematics compared to Language, but there are few exceptions.

In this Table too as in table 6.2 the values of regression coefficient are given for the main variable (students' attendance) for every state and for other independent variables only if the values of regression coefficients were statistically significant at least at $5 \%$ level. The findings are similar, which shows that attendance rate affects students' achievement significantly in both subjects almost equally.
(b) Contribution of Students' Attendance to Achievement in the Terminal Grade of Upper Primary Stage
The approach to regression analysis and the set of independent and dependent variables were the same for the achievement of students of the terminal grade of upper primary stage as that for the terminal grade students of primary stage. Table 6.3 presents similar set of results as were presented in the Table 6.2 for the total marks. It is to be noted that state report for the states of Haryana and Uttarakhand did not provide value of regression coefficient for students; attendance variable.

The state in which the independent variables accounted for maximum variation in total marks ( $49.7 \%$ ) was Himachal Pradesh. The other states in which substantial proportion of variation in total marks (more than $25 \%$ ) was explained by the independent variables are Madhya Pradesh (29.1\%), Rajasthan (29.4\%), Chhattisgarh (32.5 \%), Orissa $\mathbf{( 3 4 . 7 \%}$ ), West Bengal ( $\mathbf{3 7 . 2 \%}$ ) and Maharashtra ( $42 \%$ ). There are some states for which this percentage is very low (below 5\%). Such states are Gujarat (0.3\%), Assam (1.7\%), Punjab (2.4\%) and Uttarakhand (3.9\%).

Table 6.3 Regression coefficients of independent variables with achievement (Total marks) at upper primary stage

| State | $\mathrm{R}^{2} \times 100$ | Standardised Partial Regression Coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Attendance | School Location | Social group | Gender | Repeater in 2005 | Repeater in 2006 | Disability |
| Andhra Pradesh | 22 | 0.259** | - | group | 0.104* | - | -1.571** | - |
| Assam | 1.7 | 0.005** | -0.008* | 0.239** | - | - | -0.876** | - |
| Bihar | 5.9 | 0.18** | 0.15** | - | 0.05* | - | - | - |
| Chhattisgarh | 32.5 | 0.14** | 0.06* | - | -0.06** | $-0.08^{* *}$ | -0.49** | - |
| Gujarat | 0.3 | 0.059** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Haryana | 9.8 | NS | -0.179** | $-0.13^{* *}$ | - | -0.218** | -0.769** | - |
| Himachal Pradesh | 49.7 | 0.145** | - | 0.053** | - | - | - | - |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 8.7 | 0.280** | $-0.243^{\star *}$ | - | - | 0.715* | - | - |
| Karnataka | 6.1 | 0.24** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kerala | 14.9 | NS | 0.09** | 0.10** | 0.12** | -0.09** | -0.30** | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | 29.1 | 0.1 | 0.08** | 0.07** | - | 0.05** | 0.49** |  |
| Maharashtra | 42 | 0.111** | - | - | 0.034* | -0.092** | $-0.569^{* *}$ | - |
| Orissa | 34.7 | 0.35** | - | 0.07** | - | -0.05** | -0.36** | - |
| Punjab | 2.4 | 0.056** | - | -0.22** | 0.189** | - | - | - |
| Rajasthan | 29.4 | 0.288** | -0.255** | 0.0872 | - | -0.538** | $-1.233^{* *}$ | - |
| Tamil Nadu | 6.5 | 0.21** | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.12* | - | - | -0.06* |
| Uttar Pradesh | 16.1 | 0.286** | 0.113* | - | 0.113* | 0.991** | -2.585** | - |
| Uttarakhand | 3.9 | NS | - | - | -0.112* | -0.101* | -0.104* | - |
| West Bengal | 37.2 | $0.314^{* *}$ | 0.189** | 0.167** | - | - | 0.427** | - |

*0.05 level of significance; ** 0.01 level of significance;

From table 6.3, it is evident that the contribution of students' attendance to total marks is not significant in the case of Haryana,, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand. The states indicating fairly strong relationship ( regression coefficient $>0.20$ ) are Tamil Nadu (0.21), Karnataka (0.24), Andhra Pradesh (0.259), Jammu \& Kashmir (0.28), Uttar Pradesh ( 0.286 ), Rajasthan ( 0.288 ), West Bengal ( 0.314 ) and Orissa ( 0.35 ). There are also some states in which the values for contribution of students' attendance are statistically significant but these being very low ( less than 0.1 ), the result does not have any practical significance. Such states are Assam, Punjab and Gujarat.

Annexure IV provides results of the regression analysis separately for language and mathematics achievement scores. Students attendance contributed substantially (regression coefficient $\mathbf{>} \mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ ) to achievement in both the subjects in the case of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. The states providing significant but very low contribution to achievement in both the subjects are Haryana in language and Punjab in both the subjects. Further, contribution of this variable to language was substantially higher ( more than 0.04 points) than that to mathematics in Chatisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

## CHAPTER 7

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

7.1. The study was conducted in 19 major states of India and National Capital Territory of Delhi mainly to estimate the average attendance rate of children in primary and upper primary schools and to find out the reasons of children not attending school regularly.
Objectives of the study included assessment of the students' attendance rate on the basis of actual head count of students in the schools, finding out the difference between attendance rate of boys and girls and of students belonging to different social groups in both primary and upper primary schools and the reasons of students' remaining absent from school. Attempt was also made to find out how students' attendance is related to quality as indicated by repetition and dropout rates and achievement in annual examination and to what extent school and home related factors affected child's attendance in school .
7.2 In all 12 agencies which included universities, NGOs and organizations involved in educational or social research were commissioned to undertake the study at State level. It was a sample study in which 300 to 400 schools per state were selected depending on the size of the state. The total sample was of 6715 schools drawn from 286 districts of 20 states. Out of these, 4989 schools were primary schools and 1726 were upper primary schools; 5549 schools were from rural area and 1166 schools from urban area.
7.3 The students in primary classes in the 20 states covered in the study accounted for $92 \%$ of total students in these classes in the country and the students of upper primary classes accounted for about $94 \%$ of total upper primary students in the country. Among the major states with population exceeding 50 lakhs, Jharkhand was left out and in Delhi, upper primary schools were not covered. The estimates were derived from the data on the number of students who were enrolled and the number of students who were found to be actually present in school by the investigators during three unannounced visits to schools. Attendance was observed twice on the days of visit to school, first after about $1 / 2$ hour of opening of school and next, about $1 / 2$ hour before closing of school.
7.4 Data was also collected from schools and community members including parents of the children studying in elementary classes as well as those who had dropped out from school at some stage. Questionnaires and interview schedules were developed specifically for the study to collect information about schools and teachers; students' attendance from attendance register as well as head count and achievement in school examination. Focused group discussions with the community members were also held. In all, 20,225 teachers, 6959 VEC members and 65,557 parents were interviewed to find the reasons.
7.5 On pooling up the data of all the 20 states, it is found that the average attendance rate of students at primary level was $68.5 \%$ and at upper primary level, $75.7 \%$ according to head count data. The attendance rate of girls was a little higher than that of boys at both primary and upper primary levels. At primary level, the gender difference was of only 1.6 percentage points while at the upper primary level, the difference was of 3.5 percentage points.
7.6 The attendance rate of the different social groups (SC, ST, others) was in the range of $66 \%$ to $71 \%$ at primary level and in the range of $76 \%$ to $79 \%$ at the upper
primary level. There was not much difference between attendance rate of different social groups. The attendance rate of Muslim children was a little less than that of total children ( $66.4 \%$ ) at primary level but not at upper primary level.
7.7 There was significant class to class variation in attendance rate. It was lowest in class I ( $65.6 \%$ ); it gradually increased to $72.0 \%$ in class V and further to $78.8 \%$ in class VII. Obviously the students of upper classes do not abstain from going to school as frequently as those of lower classes.
7.8 Among the states, the attendance rate of students at primary level was below the overall average of $68.5 \%$ in Bihar ( $42.0 \%$ ), Chhattisgarh ( $67.7 \%$ ), Orissa ( $66.8 \%$ ), Rajasthan ( $62.7 \%$ ), and Uttar Pradesh ( $57.4 \%$ ) . The states in which the attendance rate was quite high ( $80 \%$ or more) were Assam (81.3\%), Haryana (81.5\%), Karnataka (86.2\%), Maharashtra (89.0\%), Punjab (81.7\%), Tamil Nadu (88.3\%) and Uttarakhand (80.0\%).
7.9 At the upper primary level, the states in which the attendance rate was below the overall average of $75.7 \%$ were Bihar (36.8\%), Chhattisgarh (75.0\%), Madhya Pradesh ( $69.8 \%$ ), Orissa ( $69.0 \%$ ), Punjab ( $74.7 \%$ ), Uttar Pradesh ( $60.5 \%$ ) and West Bengal ( $70.2 \%$ ). The states in which the attendance rate was relatively very high (above 85\%) are Haryana (85.1\%), Himachal Pradesh (93.2\%), Kerala (92.0\%), Maharashtra ( $89.0 \%$ ) and Tamil Nadu ( $87.8 \%$ ).
7.10 In this study, data was collected on teacher absence also during school visits by finding out how many teachers out of those posted in the school, were present. The overall average attendance rate of teachers in primary schools was $81.7 \%$ implying that their average absence rate was $18.3 \%$. The states in which the attendance rate of teachers at primary level was found below the overall average were Andhra Pradesh (78.1\%), Assam (79.2\%), Bihar (75.8\%), Chhattisgarh (75.7\%), Gujarat (70.0\%), Himachal Pradesh (80.0\%), Madhya Pradesh (70.4\%), Jammu and Kashmir (80.8\%) and Uttar Pradesh ( $77.8 \%$ ). Teacher attendance rate was quite high (over $90 \%$ ) in Delhi (95\%) and West Bengal (96.3\%).
7.11 The average attendance rate of teachers in upper primary schools was (80.5\%) implying that their average absence rate was (19.5\%). The attendance rate of teachers was found to be less than the overall average attendance in Andhra Pradesh (77.3\%), Assam (55.2\%), Bihar (74.9\%), Chhattisgarh (73.5\%), Madhya Pradesh (67.0\%), Punjab (78\%), Rajasthan (79.8\%) and Uttrakhand (77.7\%). Teachers attendance rate was quite high (over 90\%) in Haryana (91.9\%) and West Bengal (98.1\%).
7.12 Some of the reasons of students' frequent absence from school given by teachers and VEC members were school related and some were home related. The prominent school related reasons were lack of adequate facilities in school, teacher shortage and over-crowded class rooms. The common home related reasons were mainly economic such as child being required to do household work at home or child being required to help parents in their work related to agriculture or business. Some felt that parents' indifference or lack of interest was also responsible for child's frequent absence. Parents, on the other hand, felt that schools were ill-equipped and there
was shortage of teachers. They also felt that the child's lack of interest in studies or reluctance to go to school was responsible for child's low attendance.
7.13 The set of home background factors that emerged as significant contributors to students' attendance rate in the final model varies considerably across states. At best, it can be stated that some independent variables were found to be significant contributors more often in the final model than others. The variables can be considered as the variables that affect attendance rate of children in most states if not all the states are i)Student's own perception of quality of school, ii) parent's meeting with teacher to enquire about child's studies, iii) student getting help in studies at home, iv) belonging to general/ OBC category and v) father's education
7.14 Students' attendance in the concerned set of independent variables was found to be contributing significantly to students achievement in most of the states for Total, Language as well as Mathematics at primary and upper primary stage.
7.15 The remedial measures suggested by the community members for improving attendance rate were (i) there should be improvement in school facilities, school environment and teaching-learning in classrooms (ii) parents should be educated about the importance of sending children to school regularly and not involving them too much in household work or income generating activity. Poverty alleviation measures will help in relieving children from such work and making them more regular in attending school.
7.16 On analyzing the views expressed by teachers, parents and community members in the course of focused group discussions, the following suggestions also emerged for improving attendance rate of children.
(i) Facilities in school and school environment should be improved to make schools more attractive for the children. It should be ensured that there is no teacher shortage in schools and classrooms are not over-crowded.
(ii) The quality of education in schools should improve so that parents feel that the child is learning something worthwhile in school
(iii) Parents should no longer remain indifferent about the child's education and unconcerned about whether he/she attends school regularly or not. They should motivate the child to be regular in going to school.
(iv) Teachers in school should be more childfriendly and classrooms should be attractive so that children feel enthusiastic about going to school instead of being reluctant or unwilling.
(v) The VECs and community members should assume greater responsibility for ensuring regularity of children in going to school. If children are found to be missing classes, the matter should be brought to the notice of parents and teachers should take necessary corrective action.
(vi) To reduce the absence rate because of illness or poor health, regular health check up of students should be carried out and arrangements should be made to enhance medical facilities for school going children.

## Annexure

Annexure I. Class wise Co-efficient of Correlation of students' attendance with repetition rate

| State | Primary |  |  |  |  |  | Upper primary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | I | II | III | IV | V | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { VI } \\ \hline \mathbf{r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VII } \\ \hline \mathbf{r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VIII } \\ \hline \mathbf{r} \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | R | r | $\mathbf{r}$ | R | $\mathbf{r}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 302 | -0.19** | -0.19** | -0.22** | -0.24** | -0.17** | 98 | -0.17 | -0.20 | - |
| Assam | 252 | -0.029 | 0.020 | -0.087 | $\begin{array}{r} 0 . \\ 011 \end{array}$ | -0.208 | 78 | -0.017 | 0.022 | -0.118 |
| Bihar | 296 | -0.10 | -0.10 | 0.15** | -0.07 | -0.16** | 78 | -0.03 | -0.12 | -0.25 |
| Chhattisgarh | 292 | -0.31** | -0.35** | -0.25** | -0.35** | -0.25** | 81 | -0.17 | -0.08 | -0.22 |
| Delhi | 124 | -0.06 | -.224* | 0.057 | -0.062 | 0.064 | - | - | - |  |
| Gujarat | 296 | -0.255** | -0.253** | -0.345** | -0.192** | -0.316** | 292 | -0.213** | -0.162** | -0.201** |
| Haryana | 247 | -0.026 | -0.015 | 0.1 | -0.088 | 0.104 | 53 | 0.189 | 0.203 | 0.172 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 245 | -0.129 | -0.118 | -0.027 | -0.121 | -0.021 | 75 | -0.043 | -0.002 | 0.038 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 122 | 0.043 | 0.019 | 0.108 | -0.098 | 0.095 | 28 | 0.052 | 0.202 | 0.131 |
| Karnataka | 296 | -0.55** | -0.30** | -0.42** | -0.37** | -0.37** | 70 | -0.33** | -0.47** | -0.07 |
| Kerala | 230 | -0.06 | 0.00 | -0.08 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 88 | -0.18 | -0.23 |  |
| Madhya Pradesh | 316 | -0.155** | -0.160** | -0.063 | -0.055 | -0.262** | 80 | -0.079 | -0.107 | -0.166 |
| Maharashtra | NA | -0.64** | -0.126** | -0.162** | -0.117** | 0.068** | 94 | 0.022 | 0.028 | - |
| Orissa | 369 | -0.11* | -0.19** | -0.11* | -0.14** | 0.01 | 31 | -0.16 | 0.016 | - |
| Punjab | 227 | 0.037 | 0.025 | 0.112 | -0.08 | 0.092 | 68 | -.246* | -0.21 | 0.209 |
| Rajasthan | 227 | -0.232** | -0.236** | -0.428** | -0.369** | 0.198** | 121 | -0.180 | -0.232* | -0.262** |
| Tamil Nadu | 281 | -0.04 | -0.09 | -0.21** | -0.01 | -0.01 | 72 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 323 | -0.14* | -0.10 | -0.02 | 0.04 | -0.14* | 77 | 0.07 | -0.28** | 0.16 |
| Uttarakhand | 257 | -0.486** | -0.671** | -0.587** | -0.039 | -0.014 | 63 | -0.164 | -0.058 | -0.014 |
| West Bengal | 310 | -0.173* | -0.077 | -0.104 | -0.208 | -0.756** | 70 | -0.020 | -0.056 | -0.275** |

*0.05 level of significance; ** 0.01 level of significance;
$\mathbf{N}=$ No. of school covered; $r=$ coefficient of correlation
In Gujarat out of 292 upper primary schools covered in the sample, 243 had primary section.; In Maharashtra , out of 94 upper primary schools covered in the sample, 92 had primary section.

## Annexure II. Class wise Co-efficient of Correlation of students' attendance rate with dropout rate

| State | N | I | II | III | IV | V | N | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | R | r | r | r | r |  | r | r | r |
| Andhra Pradesh | 302 | -0.15** | -0.14** | -0.11* | -0.10* | -0.10 | 98 | -0.07 | -0.14 | - |
| Assam | 252 | -0.015 | -0.067 | -0.010 | 0.104 | 0.015 | 78 | -0.036 | 0.091 | -0.034 |
| Bihar | 296 | -0.26** | -0.10 | -0.19** | -0.24** | -0.17** | 78 | -0.19 | -0.30** | -0.10 |
| Chhattisga rh | 292 | -0.06 | 0.06 | -0.00 | -0.05 | -0.06 | 81 | -0.00 | -0.01 | 0.03 |
| Delhi | 124 | 0.035 | 0.079 | 0.078 | -0.67 | 0.009 | - |  |  |  |
| Gujarat | 296 | -0.308** | -0.201** | -0.201** | -0.173** | -0.202** | 292 | -0.162* | -0.118 | -0.155* |
| Haryana | 247 | -0.043 | 0.029 | -0.318** | -0.095 | -0.029 | 53 | 0.114 | -0.122 | -0.028 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 245 | -0.144* | 0.003 | 0.067 | -0.084 | 0.058 | 75 | 0.018 | -0.034 | -0.145 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 122 | 0.05 | -0.004 | 0.061 | -0.007 | -0.246** | 28 | $-0.556^{* *}$ | 0.039 | 0.031 |
| Karnataka | 296 | -0.31* | -0.43* | -0.38* | -0.44* | -0.44* | 70 | -0.26 | -0.43* | - |
| Kerala | 230 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.30** | 88 | -0.04 | -0.03 | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | 316 | -0.053 | -0.065 | -0.097 | 0.004 | -176** | 301 | -0.063 | -256* | -0.191 |
| Maharasht ra | NA | 0.039** | -0.020 | -0.098** | 0.028** | -0.110** | 94 | -0.178** | $-0.176 * *$ | - |
| Orissa | 369 | -0.30** | -0.23** | -0.29** | -0.28** | -0.28** | 31 | -0.12 | $-0.30^{* *}$ | - |
| Punjab | 227 | 0.387** | 0.027 | -0.11 | -0.041 | 0.042 | 68 | 0.101 | 0.019 | 0.129 |
| Rajasthan | 227 | -0.153** | -214** | -0.279** | -0.179** | -0.250** | 121 | -083 | -0.230 | -0.218 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tamil } \\ & \text { Nadu } \end{aligned}$ | 281 | 0.03 | -0.13 | -0.01 | -0.07 | -0.05 | 72 | -0.26 | -0.32 | -0.41* |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Uttar } \\ & \text { Pradesh } \end{aligned}$ | 323 | -0.16** | -0.12* | -0.09 | -0.11 | -016** | 77 | -0.19 | -0.09 | -0.01 |
| Uttarakha nd | 257 | -0.140* | -0.004 | -0.006 | -0.004 | -0.341* | 63 | -0.156 | -0.329* | -0.131 |
| West Bengal | 310 | $-0.808^{* *}$ | -0.159** | -0.113* | -0.179** | -0.127* | 70 | -0.127 | -0.168 | -0.799** |

*0.05 level of significance ; ** 0.01 level of significance; $\mathbf{N}=$ No. of school covered; $r=$ coefficient of correlation

Annexure III. Variables contributing significantly to Students' achievement (Language \& Mathematics) at primary stage.

| State |  | $\mathbf{R}^{2} \times 100$ | Standardised Partial Regression Coefficient $(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ of |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

*0.05 level of significance ; ** 0.01 level of significance

Annexure IV. Variables contributing significantly to students' achievement (Language \& Mathematics) at upper primary stage.

| State |  | $\mathrm{R}^{2} \times 100$ | Standardised Partial Regression Coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Attendance | School Location | Social group | Gender | Repeater in 2005 | Repeater in 2006 | Disability |
| Andhra Pradesh | Lang | 24 | 0.285** | - | 0.165* | 0.152* | - | -1.518** | - |
| Andhra Pradesh | Math | 20.2 | $0.231^{* *}$ | - | - | 0.192* | - | -1.549** | - |
| Assam | Lang | 6.9 | 0.256** | - | - | - | - | -1.228** | - |
| Assam | Math | 5.6 | 0.225** | - | 0.007* | 0.007* | - | -1.292** | - |
| Bihar | Lang | 3.4 | 0.15** | 0.06* | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bihar | Math | 2.8 | 0.15** | 0.08** | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chhattisgarh | Lang | 32.5 | 0.17** | 0.06** | 0.06** | -0.05* | -0.10*** | -0.42** | - |
| Chhattisgarh | Math | 28 | 0.13** | 0.06** | - | - | - | -0.51** | - |
| Gujarat | Lang | 28.6 | 0.463** | 0.019 | - | - | -0.151** | -0.067** | 0.095** |
| Gujarat | Math | 29.2 | 0.461** | 0.051** | - | - | -0.164** | -0.029** | 0.093** |
| Haryana | Lang | 13.3 | 0.036* | 0.164** | -0.20** | - | -0.209* | -0.859** | -0.241* |
| Haryana | Math | 8.7 | NS | - | -0.16** | - | - | -0.662** | - |
| Himachal Pradesh | Lang | 32.7 | 0.171** | - | - | 0.098** | - | -0.496** | - |
| Himachal Pradesh | Math | 34.8 | $0.116^{* *}$ | - | 0.066** | - | - | $-0.557^{* *}$ |  |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | Lang | 5.3 | $0.163^{* *}$ | - | -0.24** | 0.254** | -0.768* | - | - |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | Math | 4.4 | 0.173** | -0.192** | -0.28** | - | - | - | - |
| Karnataka | Lang | 3.5 | 0.19** | - | 0.06* | 0.06** | - | - | - |
| Karnataka | Math | 5 | 0.18** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kerala | Lang | 12 | NS | - | 0.10** | 0.12** | -0.08** | -0.32** | - |
| Kerala | Math | 14.4 | NS | 0.04* | 0.09** | 0.08** | -0.07** | -0.29** | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | Lang | 23 | 0.13** | - | - | 0.00* | - | 0.44** | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | Math | 31 | 0.11** | - | 0.08** | - | ${ }^{-}$ | 0.50** | 0.07** |
| Maharashtra | Lang | 35.8 | 0.133* | - | 0.043** | 0.052** | -0.077** | -0.509** | - |
| Maharashtra | Math | 35 | 0.129** | - | - | - | -0.053* | -0.520** | - |
| Orissa | Lang | 30.3 | 0.32** | -0.05* | 0.07** | 0.05* | -0.06** | -0.34** | - |
| Orissa | Math | 27 | 0.31** | - | 0.1** | - | -0.07** | -0.3** | - |
| Punjab | Lang | 16.6 | 0.078** | - | -0.24** | 0.175** | - | -2.221** | - |
| Punjab | Math | 6.7 | 0.065** | 0.118* | -0.10** | 0.129** | - | -1.381** | - |
| Rajasthan | Lang | 17.3 | 0.235** | -0.232 |  | - | -0.392 | -0.902 | - |
| Rajasthan | Math | 17.9 | 0.185** | -0.109* |  | - | -0.559** | -0.109* | - |
| Tamil Nadu | Lang | 5.4 | 0.20** | -0.09** |  | 0.13** | - | -0.04 | -0.08** |
| Tamil Nadu | Math | 14.9 | 0.19** | -0.04* | 0.04* | 0.08** | -0.04* | - | -0.06* |
| Uttar Pradesh | Lang | 11 | 0.292** | - | - | - | - | -1.296** | - |
| Uttar Pradesh | Math | 10 | $0.228^{* *}$ | 0.248** | - | 0.096 | - | -1.709** | - |
| Uttarakhand | Lang | 9.5 | 0.181** | - | - | 0.06* | -0.162** | -0.140** | - |
| Uttarakhand | Math | 8.5 | 0.196** | - |  | $1.120^{* *}$ | -0.111** | $-0.131^{* *}$ | - |
| West Bengal | Lang | 36.1 | 0.415** | - | - | - | - | 0.329** | 0.218** |
| West Bengal | Math | 32.8 | 0.275** | 0.202** | 0.180** | - | - | 0.419** | - |

*0.05 level of significance ; ** 0.01 level of significance

- Andhra Pradesh
- Assam
- Bihar
- Chhattisgarh
- Delhi (only Primary)
- Gujarat
- Haryana
- Himachal Pradesh
- Jammu \& Kashmir
- Karnataka
- Kerala
- Madhya Pradesh
- Maharashtra
- Orissa
- Punjab
- Rajasthan
- Tamil Nadu
- Uttar Pradesh
- Uttarakhand
- West Bengal

Attendance rates given in the state data sheets are based on actual head count of students who were present out of the enrolled students during 3 unannounced visits to the sampled schools, except in Gujarat where the schools were visited only twice and in Kashmir region of J\&K where schools were visited only once. These data sheets also include attendance rate of teachers determined in the same way

Along with the attendance rate of students at primary and upper primary stages attendance rates for the different groups of students (boys/girls; SC/ST/Muslims) and for schools in rural and urban areas are also given for every state in these data sheets.

The Reasons for low attendance as given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC and parents are also being presented in the data sheets. The issues emerging out of Focus group discussions ( 12 in each state) have also being compiled along with.

Parents' response in affirmative, for participation of their wards in wage earning activities and /or engagement in household work /sibling care. is marked only when $10 \%$ or more parents reported frequent involvement of their wards in such activities.

## Andmpa Prades

Sample : 400 schools from 20 districts; Primary-302, Upper Primary-98, Urban-110, Rural-290 Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 73.3 | 72.0 | 72.7 | 78.9 | 77.2 | 78.1 |
| Upper primary | 77.5 | 75.7 | 76.6 | 78.2 | 76.4 | 77.3 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 73.3 | 77.4 |
| Girls | 73.4 | 79.4 |
| SC | 73.1 | 76.2 |
| ST | 72.1 | 72.5 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 69.9 | 76.1 |
| OBC | 75.4 | 81.4 |
| Others | 81.4 | 84.4 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 75.9 | 78.2 |
| Urban | 69.6 | 77.4 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and Focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Teachers } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | VECs \% |  | Focus Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 63.9 | 64.4 | 21.5 | 18.3 | 40.8 | 62.1 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 25.6 | 25.6 | 35.5 | 26.2 | 49.0 | 24.1 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 46.9 | 47.8 | 39.7 | 31.5 | 35.7 | 37.9 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 43.3 | 43.3 | 30.9 | 18.0 | 76.5 | 82.8 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 26.4 | 23.3 | 17.9 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 8.3 | 12.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 3.2 | 3.3 | 15.5 | 10.8 | 13.3 | 3.4 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 8.0 | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 8.9 | 5.6 | 14.3 | 6.9 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 3.0 | 3.5 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |

## - 5 B

Sample : $\mathbf{3 3 0}$ schools from 12 districts;
Primary-252, Upper Primary-78, Urban-33, Rural-297
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 82.2 | 80.4 | 81.3 | 77.7 | 80.6 | 79.2 |
| Upper .primary | 84.6 | 84.4 | 84.5 | 56.5 | 53.7 | 55.2 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 82.5 | 83.0 |
| Girls | 82.0 | 86.0 |
| SC | 82.9 | 85.6 |
| ST | 77.6 | 85.5 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 86.3 | 80.4 |
| OBC | 78.3 | 83.9 |
| Others | 81.5 | 89.0 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 80.5 | 84.3 |
| Urban | 81.3 | 85.4 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and Focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 73.8 | 74.4 | 48.1 | 42.4 | 34.5 | 29.5 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 31.0 | 37.2 | 39.7 | 34.4 | 69.0 | 69.2 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 33.7 | 32.1 | 42.2 | 46.9 | 70.2 | 80.8 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 24.2 | 24.4 | 32.1 | 24.0 | 78.2 | 87.2 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 43.7 | 46.2 | 65.5 | 69.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 11.1 | 12.8 | 26.9 | 32.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 8.7 | 5.1 | 57.1 | 54.7 | 8.3 | 7.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 42.3 | 44.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 29.8 | 31.1 | 8.3 | 2.6 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school due to river etc. |  |  | 28.4 | 28.0 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |

Sample : 368 schools from 26 districts
Primary-279, Upper Primary-89, Urban-63, Rural-305

Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 44.0 | 40.4 | 42.2 | 74.8 | 76.8 | 75.8 |
| Upper primary | 38.4 | 35.3 | 36.8 | 74.3 | 75.6 | 74.9 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 43.8 | 36.1 |
| Girls | 44.3 | 41.8 |
| SC | 46.4 | 42.2 |
| ST* | 61.6 | 84.0 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 45.3 | 40.0 |
| OBC | 46.6 | 38.1 |
| Others | 72.8 | 40.0 |

*High attendance rate of ST is due to small number of ST students in the sample.
Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 41.9 | 36.6 |
| Urban | 43.9 | 37.3 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head <br> teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U. <br> Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income <br> generation activities | 66.7 | 61.8 | 84.4 | 86.5 | 64.2 | 57.4 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 52.0 | 44.9 | 79.0 | 75.5 | 57.7 | 56.4 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 44.1 | 49.4 | 85.3 | 83.7 | 21.2 | 24.5 |  |  |
| Temporary migration | 6.6 | 5.6 | 20.2 | 19.0 | 39.1 | 40.4 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 5.7 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and <br> social function | 12.5 | 13.5 | 7.6 | 10.6 |  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Lack of facilities in school | 14.7 | 25.8 | 82.5 | 72.2 | 39.4 | 37.2 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 67.7 | 60.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school /Lack of <br> interest in going to school |  |  | 42.5 | 33.5 | 23.4 | 24.5 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Difficult access to school <br> especially in rainy season |  |  | 16.1 | 12.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Poor quality of mid day meal |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |

## Sample :365 schools from 9 districts

Primary-283, Upper Primary-82, Urban-37, Rural-328
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 68.4 | 67.1 | 67.7 | 75.2 | 76.2 | 75.7 |
| Upper primary | 75.3 | 74.7 | 75.0 | 74.4 | 72.6 | 73.5 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 68.0 | 70.5 |
| Girls | 68.5 | 80.7 |
| SC | 69.2 | 74.9 |
| ST | 67.9 | 74.6 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 80.3 | 79.6 |
| OBC | 69.3 | 77.5 |
| Others | 84.8 | 90.7 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 68.3 | 74.2 |
| Urban | 65.3 | 77.4 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 76.0 | 79.3 | 51.9 | 46.6 | 58.3 | 54.8 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 36.0 | 36.6 | 63.3 | 59.5 | 79.1 | 69.9 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 52.7 | 59.8 | 83.6 | 77.9 | 45.7 | 47.9 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 17.0 | 4.9 | 33.4 | 38.2 | 47.1 | 43.8 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 12.5 | 11.0 | 22.6 | 22.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 27.9 | 25.6 | 10.0 | 24.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 4.6 | 4.9 | 29.6 | 24.4 | 11.9 | 13.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 51.0 | 34.4 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 17.9 | 24.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 14.1 | 10.7 |  |  |  |  |


Sample : 124 schools from 9 districts
Primary-124, Urban-94, Rural-30
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 74.1 | 72.1 | 73.1 | 95.2 | 94.8 | 95.0 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary |
| :--- | :---: |
| Boys | 74.6 |
| Girls | 73.7 |
| SC | 74.7 |
| ST | 78.4 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 70.3 |
| OBC | 73.0 |
| Others | 70.6 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary |
| :--- | :---: |
| Rural | 73.0 |
| Urban | 73.1 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head <br> teachers <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Teachers <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | VECs <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Focus Group <br> Discussion | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poverty/Involvement in income <br> generation activities | 39.2 | 75.4 | 27.9 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 44.2 | 51.1 | 63.1 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 25.0 | 75.4 | 71.3 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 60.8 | 59.4 | 82.8 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 13.3 | 26.6 |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and <br> social function | 28.3 | 27.3 |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 4.2 | 10.5 | 6.6 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  | 10.0 |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school /Lack of <br> interest in going to school |  | 7.5 | 5.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Defficult access to school <br> especially in rainy season |  | 5.3 |  |  |  |

## Cujaras

Sample : 345 schools from 13 districts
Primary-53, Upper Primary-292 (243 with primary section ), Urban-51, Rural-294
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 76.5 | 73.6 | 75 | 70.4 | 70.0 | 70.0 |
| Upper primary | 80.2 | 77.1 | 78.6 | 87.7 | 87.4 | 87.6 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 76.5 | 80.3 |
| Girls | 76.5 | 80.7 |
| SC | 79.7 | 82.5 |
| ST | 73.1 | 77.5 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 76.0 | 77.5 |
| OBC | 79.4 | 80.9 |
| Others | 79.7 | 84.1 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 70.7 | 75.5 |
| Urban | 70.6 | 79.5 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers <br> \% |  | Teachers <br> \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | }{} |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in <br> income generation activities | 54.9 | 58.8 | 29.4 | 34.2 | 55.9 | 60.5 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 52.9 | 50.0 | 61.8 | 69.3 | 73.5 | 78.0 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 21.6 | 17.3 | 38.2 | 38.9 | 38.2 | 21.5 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 21.6 | 29.4 | 28.4 | 33.2 | 41.2 | 54.8 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 23.5 | 18.0 | 32.4 | 35.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and <br> social function | 27.5 | 27.2 | 38.2 | 43.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | - | - | 1.8 | 12.9 | 2.9 | 6.2 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 2.2 | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school /Lack of <br> interest in going to school |  |  | 0.7 | 6.4 | - | 0.6 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Difficult access to school <br> especially in rainy season |  |  | 1.5 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |

Sample :300 schools from 13 districts
Primary-247, Upper Primary-53, Urban-77, Rural-223
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 83.1 | 81.3 | 82.2 | 87.0 | 86.8 | 86.9 |
| Upper primary | 88.0 | 82.2 | 85.1 | 91.9 | 91.9 | 91.9 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 82.7 | 88.1 |
| Girls | 83.5 | 88.0 |
| SC | 83.6 | 86.8 |
| ST | 91.3 | 87.5 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 82.9 | 84.1 |
| OBC | 81.8 | 88.6 |
| Others | 83.7 | 89.6 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 79.1 | 80.6 |
| Urban | 77.2 | 77.1 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 65.9 | 66.7 | 64.7 | 68.8 | 83.8 | 77.4 | $\checkmark$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 56.1 | 56.9 | 64.6 | 70.7 | 69.6 | 66.0 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 26.0 | 25.5 | 76.3 | 67.3 | 41.3 | 12.1 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 15.2 | 11.8 | 21.8 | 18.8 | 46.6 | 52.9 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 11.4 | 17.6 | 24.2 | 17.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 15.0 | 21.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 4.9 | 3.9 | 17.6 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 7.3 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 30.8 | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 8.2 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 3.8 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 5.5 | 5.0 |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |

Mimachal Pradosh

Sample :320 schools from 9 districts
Primary-245, Upper Primary-75, Urban -14, Rural-306
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 95.1 | 94.1 | 94.6 | 80.2 | 79.6 | 80.0 |
| Upper primary | 93.6 | 92.8 | 93.2 | 88.8 | 87.0 | 88.0 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 95.0 | 93.1 |
| Girls | 95.3 | 94.1 |
| SC | 94.1 | 92.4 |
| ST | 95.1 | 94.6 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 90.8 | 94.0 |
| OBC | 97.4 | 94.0 |
| Others | 95.4 | 94.1 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 94.9 | 93.1 |
| Urban | 92.0 | 94.7 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and Focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | $\underset{\text { \% }}{ }$ Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 37.6 | 33.3 | 15.1 | 14.7 | 49.4 | 52.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 27.8 | 48.0 | 33.5 | 36.3 | 48.6 | 49.3 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 70.0 | 33.3 | 50.6 | 52.5 | 54.7 | 58.7 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 6.1 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 43.3 | 34.7 | 55.9 | 50.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 41.2 | 40.0 | 42.0 | 45.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 2.9 | 6.7 | 9.4 | 10.7 | 11.8 | 20.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 22.9 | 22.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 10.2 | 10.7 | 17.1 | 12.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficulty in understanding Teaching language |  |  |  |  | 22.5 | 18.7 |  |  |

## 

Sample : 150 schools from 9 districts
Primary-122, Upper Primary-28, Urban-7, Rural-143
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 80.9 | 78.1 | 78.5 | 80.8 | 80.8 | 80.8 |
| Upper primary | 79.2 | 75.8 | 77.5 | 89.4 | 77.2 | 83.1 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 80.4 | 80.0 |
| Girls | 81.6 | 78.0 |
| SC | 77.3 | 74.8 |
| ST | 94.7 | 38.5 |
| Muslim | 81.2 | 80.9 |
| OBC | 79.8 | 85.8 |
| Others | 81.2 | 78.2 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 75.8 | 76.4 |
| Urban | 82.4 | 77.8 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and Focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers <br> $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |  | Teachers <br> $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in <br> income generation <br> activities | 79.1 | 67.8 | 51.3 | 58.3 | 81.9 | 61.4 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| House hold work/sibling <br> care | 23.4 | 32.5 | 55.9 | 74.5 | 16.1 | 19.4 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 57.8 | 74.3 | 65.7 | 59.3 | 66.9 | 66.9 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 25.0 | 22.8 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 30.0 | 35.6 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 19.6 | 19.0 | 15.2 | 20.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious <br> and social function | 9.1 | 15.2 | 1.6 | 0 |  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Lack of facilities in school | 3.1 | 2.6 | 78 | 78 | 59.1 | 71.6 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 71 | 63 |  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Unattractive school /Lack <br> of interest in going to <br> school |  |  | 17 | 21 | 12.0 | 9.7 |  |  |
| Difficult access to school <br> especially in rainy season |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2amatara

Sample : 366 schools from 15 districts
Primary-295, Upper Primary-71, Urban-64, Rural-302
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 86.3 | 86.1 | 86.2 | 83.5 | 84.3 | 83.9 |
| Upper primary | 87.2 | 86.7 | 86.9 | 83.8 | 84.2 | 84.0 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 86.4 | 84.4 |
| Girls | 86.3 | 89.9 |
| SC | 85.1 | 89.1 |
| ST | 78.7 | 79.3 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 87.8 | 90.4 |
| OBC | 86.9 | 88.6 |
| Others | 92.9 | 92.8 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 85.9 | 84.9 |
| Urban | 87.0 | 91.7 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Head } \\ \text { teachers \% }\end{array}$ |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Focus } \\ \text { Group }\end{array}$ | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Discussion |  |$]$



Sample : 318 schools from 12 districts
Primary-228, Upper Primary-90, Urban -68, Rural-250

Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 91.7 | 91.1 | 91.4 | 84.6 | 84.3 | 84.5 |
| Upper primary | 92.4 | 91.6 | 92.0 | 85.8 | 84.8 | 85.3 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 91.5 | 92.2 |
| Girls | 92.0 | 92.7 |
| SC | 90.1 | 94.8 |
| ST | 85.9 | 89.8 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 91.8 | 93.7 |
| OBC | 91.9 | 94.5 |
| Others | 96.6 | 97.3 |

Attendance rate (overall ) of students by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 91.1 | 91.4 |
| Urban | 93.3 | 92.6 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head <br> teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in <br> income generation activities | 24.1 | 41.1 | 3.8 | 11.2 | 15.2 | 21.6 |  |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 2.6 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 5.6 | 9.5 | 9.8 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 23.2 | 24.4 | 23.6 | 27.1 | 39.0 | 37.3 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 10.5 | 8.9 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 39.0 | 43.1 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 69.7 | 67.8 | 65.9 | 70.1 |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Participation in religious and <br> social function | 23.7 | 26.7 | 18.3 | $23 . .4$ |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 1.8 | 2.2 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 32.4 | 23.5 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 6.7 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school /Lack of <br> interest in going to school |  |  | 4.3 | 2.8 | 22.9 | 25.5 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Difficult access to school - <br> lack of transport facility |  |  | 15.9 | 11.7 |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |

## Madnya Pradesh

## Sample :375 schools from 20 districts;

## Primary-290, Upper Primary-85, Urban-78, Rural-297

Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 73.3 | 70.9 | 72.1 | 69.7 | 71.1 | 70.4 |
| Upper primary | 70.8 | 68.9 | 69.8 | 66.8 | 67.3 | 67.0 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 72.8 | 69.6 |
| Girls | 73.9 | 72.0 |
| SC | 73.3 | 71.4 |
| ST | 69.5 | 67.4 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 75.6 | 74.6 |
| OBC | 75.5 | 73.0 |
| Others | 78.5 | 78.6 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 73.8 | 70.1 |
| Urban | 73.3 | 73.2 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Head } \\ \text { teachers \% }\end{array}$ |  |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Focus } \\ \text { Group }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Discussion |  |$]$

## Manarashora

Sample: 400 schools from 20 districts
Primary-306, Upper Primary-94, Urban-80, Rural-320
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 90.0 | 89.0 | 89.0 | 88.1 | 87.4 | 87.8 |
| Upper primary | 90.0 | 89.0 | 89.0 | 87.4 | 86.8 | 87.1 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 90.0 | 90.0 |
| Girls | 90.0 | 91.1 |
| SC | 87.9 | 88.5 |
| ST | 85.1 | 89.8 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 88.7 | 90.1 |
| OBC | 92.8 | 92.2 |
| Others | 92.4 | 91.0 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 87.0 | 88.0 |
| Urban | 92.0 | 89.0 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 43.0 | 41.0 | 19.0 | 28.0 | 29.0 | 37.0 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 17.0 | 11.0 | 54.0 | 68.0 | 41.0 | 44.0 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 21.0 | 16.0 | 42.0 | 62.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 |  |  |
| Temporary migration | 25.0 | 18.0 | 43.0 | 50.0 | 43.0 | 40.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 31.0 | 13.0 | 54.0 | 38.0 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 13.0 | 5.0 | 19.0 | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 4.0 | 0.0 | 33.0 | 23.0 | 7.0 | 11.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 16.0 | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/ Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 16.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |

## Drissa

## Sample : $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ schools from $\mathbf{1 5}$ districts

Primary-300, Upper Primary-100, Urban-60, Rural-340

Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 67.8 | 65.8 | 66.8 | 86.8 | 87.9 | 87.4 |
| Upper primary | 69.5 | 68.6 | 69.0 | 86.9 | 86.2 | 86.6 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 67.3 | 66.7 |
| Girls | 68.2 | 72.5 |
| SC | 63.2 | 65.3 |
| ST | 62.8 | 64.2 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 65.2 | 62.1 |
| OBC \& Others | 72.6 | 72.9 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 67.6 | 68.7 |
| Urban | 64.0 | 69.9 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Head teachers } \\ \text { \% }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Teachers } \\ \text { \% }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { VECs }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Focus } \\ \text { Group }\end{array}$ | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr | Discussion |  |$]$

Sample : 295 schools from 12 districts
Primary-227, Upper Primary-68, Urban-48, Rural-247
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 80.9 | 82.5 | 81.7 | 84.2 | 82.7 | 83.5 |
| Upper primary | 74.2 | 75.1 | 74.7 | 78.9 | 77.4 | 78.1 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 82.4 | 74.4 |
| Girls | 79.2 | 74.0 |
| SC | 79.9 | 76.1 |
| ST | 90.6 | 99.4 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 83.0 | 77.2 |
| OBC | 84.0 | 74.6 |
| Others | 80.6 | 72.2 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 82.3 | 76.1 |
| Urban | 80.1 | 70.8 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Head } \\ \text { teachers \% }\end{array}$ |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Focus } \\ \text { Group }\end{array}$ | Parents |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Discussion |  |$]$

Rajosthan

Sample : 398 schools from 13 districts
Primary-277, Upper Primary-121, Urban-48, Rural-350
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 66.3 | 59.1 | 62.7 | 81.2 | 81.0 | 81.1 |
| Upper primary | 81.1 | 76.6 | 78.9 | 80.2 | 79.4 | 79.8 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 68.5 | 81.2 |
| Girls | 64.2 | 81.1 |
| SC | 65.3 | 80.2 |
| ST | 57.8 | 70.8 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 67.8 | 83.3 |
| OBC | 69.4 | 83.6 |
| Others | 69.6 | 86.3 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 62.5 | 78.4 |
| Urban | 63.2 | 80.4 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 62.8 | 61.6 | 28.1 | 28.6 | 65.1 | 71.4 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 61.4 | 71.9 | 80.5 | 78.5 | 84.4 | 88.4 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 21.3 | 22.3 | 45.3 | 52.7 | 34.6 | 33.4 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 16.3 | 21.5 | 30.8 | 28.9 | 47.2 | 44.5 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 33.9 | 28.1 | 22.3 | 18.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 25.6 | 31.4 | 36.9 | 36.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 4.3 | 0.8 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 20.1 | 17.3 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 15.9 | 16.6 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 7.3 | 6.4 | 10.8 | 10.2 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 5.1 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |

Sample : 353 schools from 13 districts
Primary-281, Upper Primary-72, Urban-54, Rural-299
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 89.1 | 87.6 | 88.3 | 86.9 | 86.3 | 86.6 |
| Upper primary | 88.2 | 87.5 | 87.8 | 92.5 | 86.7 | 89.6 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 88.6 | 88.0 |
| Girls | 89.5 | 88.2 |
| SC | 88.3 | 88.2 |
| ST | 82.9 | 86.2 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 88.1 | 99.5 |
| OBC | 90.6 | 81.5 |
| Others | 100 | 90.3 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 89.0 | 87.7 |
| Urban | 86.0 | 88.3 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC , parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head <br> teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in <br> income generation activities | 22.1 | 33.3 | 8.4 | 20.7 | 38.7 | 44.6 |  |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 14.9 | 36.1 | 27.8 | 41.4 | 38.7 | 39.0 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's <br> education | 26.0 | 33.3 | 27.5 | 38.6 | 55.2 | 47.0 |  |  |
| Temporary migration | 21.7 | 22.2 | 18.5 | 21.4 | 62.8 | 63.9 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 68.0 | 61.1 | 60.7 | 49.0 |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| Participation in religious and <br> social function | 47.0 | 36.1 | 56.2 | 44.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 0.4 | 0 | 10.8 | 10.5 | 25.3 | 18.1 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 15.8 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school /Lack of <br> interest in going to school |  |  | 5.6 | 6.9 | 10.0 | 10.8 | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Difficult access to school <br> especially in rainy season |  |  | 7.2 | 7.6 |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |

ythap Pradesh
Sample: $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ schools from 24 districts
Primary-310, Upper Primary-90, Urban -80, Rural-320
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 59.6 | 55.2 | 57.4 | 76.9 | 78.7 | 77.8 |
| Upper primary | 61.8 | 59.2 | 60.5 | 82.3 | 82.9 | 82.6 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 58.2 | 61.4 |
| Girls | 61.0 | 62.3 |
| SC | 59.6 | 62.8 |
| ST | 48.6 | 75.0 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 56.1 | 65.9 |
| OBC | 63.3 | 65.2 |
| Others | 71.6 | 70.0 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 58.2 | 59.8 |
| Urban | 53.1 | 62.8 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group <br> Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 69.8 | 71.3 | 88.3 | 76.3 | 78 | 75.6 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| House hold work/sibling care | 62.4 | 59.8 | 78.0 | 64.1 | 68.3 | 65.1 |  |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 49.8 | 49.4 | 58.4 | 64.1 | 68.9 | 69.8 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 9.6 | 8.0 | 18.9 | 16.7 | 23.6 | 19.8 |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Child's illness | 3.2 | 3.4 | 21.2 | 34.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 14.5 | 10.3 | 15.3 | 18.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 3.9 | 8.0 | 15.7 | 12.5 | 11.0 | 19.8 | $\checkmark$ | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 37.1 | 29.9 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Unattractive school/Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 8.8 | 8.3 | 5.5 | 3.5 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 3.7 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |

リttarkhand
Sample : 320 schools from 9 districts
Primary-257, Upper Primary-63, Urban-20, Rural-300
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 81.1 | 79.0 | 80.0 | 83.9 | 82.4 | 83.0 |
| Upper primary | 83.1 | 83.2 | 83.2 | 78.3 | 77.1 | 77.7 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 80.5 | 82.8 |
| Girls | 81.5 | 83.3 |
| SC | 81.5 | 83.0 |
| ST | 88.5 | 79.2 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 76.1 | 77.1 |
| OBC | 77.7 | 80.2 |
| Others | 89.4 | 89.9 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 79.0 | 82.0 |
| Urban | 76.0 | 67.0 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | Head teachers \% |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% |  | Focus <br> Group Discussion | Parents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. |  |  |
| Poverty/Involvement in income generation activities | 51.0 | 54.0 | 20.0 | 13.0 | 17.7 | 20.9 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| House hold work/sibling care | 34.6 | 44.4 | 68.0 | 76.0 | 24.9 | 24.3 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lack of Interest in child's education | 73.3 | 73.0 | 74.0 | 75.0 | 24.7 | 28.4 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Temporary migration | 8.2 | 3.2 | 13.0 | 11.0 | 15.3 | 10.8 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Child's illness | 33.5 | 30.2 | 31.0 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Participation in religious and social function | 19.8 | 15.9 | 33.0 | 33.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of facilities in school | 5.1 | 0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 6.8 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Shortage of teachers |  |  | 31.0 | 29.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Unattractive school/ Lack of interest in going to school |  |  | 7.0 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 2.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Difficult access to school especially in rainy season |  |  | 10.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |

Wast Benyal
Sample : 388 schools from 13 districts
Primary-310, Upper Primary-78, Urban-80, Rural-308
Attendance Rate

|  | Students |  |  | Teachers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | First hour | Last hour | Overall | First hour | Last hour | Overall |
| Primary | 74.0 | 74.5 | 74.2 | 96.5 | 96.1 | 96.3 |
| Upper primary | 69.9 | 70.6 | 70.2 | 98.2 | 97.9 | 98.1 |

Attendance rate in first hour by gender and social group

|  | Primary(I-IV) | Upper primary (V-VIII) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boys | 73.2 | 71.1 |
| Girls | 75.2 | 68.9 |
| SC | 72.1 | 66.2 |
| ST | 69.2 | 71.0 |
| Minority (Muslim) | 68.8 | 66.4 |
| OBC | 81.1 | 77.6 |
| Others | 82.3 | 73.9 |

Attendance rate (overall) by area

|  | Primary | Upper primary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 75.9 | 72.1 |
| Urban | 65.8 | 64.0 |

Reasons of low attendance given by head teachers, teachers, VEC/SMC, parents and focus group discussion

| Reasons | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Head } \\ \text { teachers \% }\end{array}$ |  | Teachers \% |  | VECs \% | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Focus } \\ \text { Group }\end{array}$ | Parents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Pr. | U.Pr. | Discussion |$]$

