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## EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION IN INDIA

Among the various manifestations of poverty, facilities for health, housing and education are very important. Besides providing the opportunities for enhancing income, improvement in the facilities of infrastructure in the above mentioned areas are very crucial. Deprivation in any of these facilities which can be material and nonmaterial will affect the quality of life. Nonmaterial deprivation can be in the form of lack of facilities for meeting basic needs, especially that of safe drinking water, housing and education. Therefore it is necessary that any development programme and policy formulation must include the need for improvement in the level of education, health and housing amenities for the poor. Absolute deprivation in any of these basic needs will affect the quality of life of the people. There is a need to review the existing facilities in these three sectors. In this paper an attempt has been made to review the development and infrastructure facilities in the field of education especially at the school level.

Illiteracy and ignorance have been identified as important factors causing poverty. Education as such, may not be directly responsible for poverty but indirectly it certainly plays a pivotal role. Education, besides enhancing general awareness, refines communication skill and also provides opportunities for better vocation which may improve the quality of life. Education, in fact, has been considered as the key to equality of economic opportunity. It can also make people aware of the causes of poor health and hygiene. Thus deprivation in education becomes an important dimension of poverty. Besides reviewing the infrastructure and other facilities at the school level, educational level of the general population as well as that of working population have also been discussed in this paper.

## Growth in Literacy rate

The educational policy framed in 1986 and revised in 1992, the main objectives were, beside improvement and expansion of education in all sectors, elimination of disparities and also improvement and relevance of education

[^0]at all levels. Special emphasis was on free and compulsory primary education to eradicate illiteracy and also to make it job oriented. To achieve the objectives various schemes were introduced in the tenth plan. To sustain the basic literacy skill acquired by millions of neo-literates was the major crisis before the Government. It was felt that "there is a greater possibility of neo-literates regressing into partial or total illiteracy unless special efforts are continued to consolidate, sustain and possibly enhance their literacy level" ( Ministry of HRD, Annual Report 2005-06). The literacy campaigns also suffered due to natural calamities and the lack of political will. It has been accepted in the report that there are still pockets where illiteracy is high especially among females.

At the time of independence in 1951, the percentage of literates in India was only 18.3. Less than ten percent of females were literates as compared to 27 percent males. This includes the people of all age-groups. But if we take into account only those persons whose age is seven years and more than the percentage of literates comes down to only 16.67 percent, (males 24.95 and females 9.45). This has been termed as "effective literacy rate" in 2011 census. The literacy rate which takes into account the entire population is termed as "crude literacy rate". After a gap of sixty years in 2001 the effective literacy rate increased to 64.83 from 16.67 percent in 1951. Among males it increased from 25 to more than 75 percent (75.26) and it registered significant increase among females from 10 percent in 1951 to more than fifty percent $(53.67 \%)$. The effective literacy rate in 2011 increased to 74 percent, whereas among males it was more than eighty percent (82.14) and in females it jumped to more than $65(65.46 \%)$.This indicates that more and more people in India taking advantage of increasing facilities in education and this is a positive sign for further development of India.

## Level of Education

The level of education of the population is another indicator to gauge the educational transformation. Sex wise distribution of population 15 years and above as well as their rural urban status level of education has been discussed on the basis of NSS data for the 1995-96 and 2007-08 given in table 1.

The data in table one reveals that in 1995-96, about two-third of rural females whose age was 15 years and above were not literate, but by 2007-08 the percentage of such females came down to 52 , which means that the number of females in rural areas going to school is showing upward trend. This trend has also been reflected in other categories i.e. literate upto primary, where the percentage has gone up from 17 in 1995-96 to 23 in 2007-08, at middle level it increased from 8.7 to 12.3 and in secondary and above it became the double of 1995-96 in 2007-08.

The same trend has been observed among males in rural areas. In 1995-96, almost forty percent were illiterate, but the percentage came down
to 28 in 2007-08. However, in other categories, increase in number of rural males was not significant except among those who studied upto secondary and above, where it increased from 16 percent to almost 24 percent.

About one third of urban females of 15 years and above were illiterate in 1995-96, but in 2007-08, their percentage came down to 25 percent. Another significant feature is that the number of urban females going to higher education has shown upward trend. It appears that the urban females do not want to stop only at primary and middle but would like to go for higher education.

Among urban males only 14 percent of the males in 15 years and above were illiterate but their percentage came down to 11 in 2007-08. It appears from the data that urban males like urban females prefer to go for higher education as their number has crossed more than 50 percent in 2007-08. On the other hand, the number of males studying only upto primary or middle level has shown downward trend.

The data in table 2 shows the distribution of those who have studied secondary and beyond. In the year 2004-05 in the age group 15 and above less than one percent did post graduation but in 2007-08 their percentage increased to more than one percent ( $1.4 \%$ ). However, the percentage of graduates went up from 2.9 in 2005-05 to 4.8 in 2007-08.

The number of people both males and females in rural as well in urban areas for higher education is also improving over the years

## Educational Level of Workers

Distribution of workers according to their educational level is another indicator which may give some idea how education helped the people to get better jobs. Only one fifth of the total workers were in the category of secondary and above in 2004-05. Among females the percent of such persons was only 10 as compared to about 25 percent males. This means that about 80 percent of working population in the country in the year 2004-05 could not be called as educated and as a consequence their earning will also be just adequate to meet their basic needs, which will affect their quality of life.

In urban areas 42 percent of the workers were in the category of educated (secondary and above) but in rural areas the percentage of such people was only 14. Among urban males 44 percent were classified as educated as compared to 31 percent urban females. In rural areas the percentage of educated male/female workers was only 18 and 6 respectively.

Distribution of workers according to their educational level gives a very gloomy picture for India as a whole. The picture is not very bright even among urban workers, as majority of them can not be classified in the category of educated. The situation is more dismal in rural India. The overall picture
on educational front of workers is not very encouraging and as a consequence their quality of life will also be affected. It is really surprising that such gloomy picture emerges even when government has opened more schools and given all other facilities to make people literate.

Another dimension to measure the standard of living of people is to analyze the educational level of those workers who are above 15 years of age. The distribution in table 4 reveals overall percentage of workers who are educated and above 15 years of age is only 20 . One fourth of the workers were just literate or studied up to primary in the year 2004-05. Only six percent of the total workers, whose age was more than 15 were graduate and above. Three percent of the working females were graduates as compared to slightly more than 7 percent, working males. The overall percentage of working females included in the category of secondary and above was 10 as compared about 26 percent working males.

Rural urban distributions of educated workers whose age was 15 and above is also not encouraging. In 2004 about 46 percent of the workers in rural areas were illiterate as compared to more than 51 percent in 1999-2000. The percentage of illiterate male female workers has gone down in 2004-05 as compared to 1999-2000 but the trend is not bright. 18 percent of the workers in urban areas in 2004-05 were not literate. Among urban males the percentage of such people was only 13 percent as compared to 37 percent urban females. Among rural people more than 45 percent were illiterate in the year 2004-05. About two third rural females were illiterate as compared to one third males in 2004-05.

Average number of years of education of the population who are above 15 years of age is another indicator. The distribution shows that on an average only four and half years are spent on education by the people of India. Among workers the average number of years of education is only four. Among male workers the average years of education is 5 as compared to 5.3 among general population. The average for females workers is 2.3 and 3.4 years for general population. The average year of education among urban population is about 7 for males as well as females as compared to 3.5 among to rural people.

## Growth of Educational institutions

After Amendment in the constitution in 1976, education was included in the concurrent list. Under this change, the responsibility of Union government was enhanced to play more significant role not only in maintaining the quality and standards but also to asses and monitor the educational requirements in the country. The role of state government though remained unchanged. One of the main aims of the new National Policy on Education formed in 1986, which was revised in 1992, was to make adult education a
mass movement and to provide universal access, retention and quality with special emphasis on elementary education.

A glance at the number of educational institutions from pre-primary to high and higher secondary level from 1981 to 2004 shows significant growth at all levels.. In 1981, there were only 10,281 pre-primary schools in the country but by 2004, the number of such schools went upto 63569 registering an increase of 618 percent. Increase in number of primary/junior basic schools was only 155 percent (from 4,94,503 in 1981 to 767,520 in 2004). The number of high/higher secondary schools also increased more than five times during the same period. In 1981 there were 51,006 high/higher secondary schools and the number increased to 274731 n 2004 . It appears that in 24 years from 1981 to 2004, the government had opened more pre primary schools in order to provide more facilities so that more and more children may go to school. But this will be of no use until and unless people realize the significance of education and send their wards to schools.

## Enrolment by Level of Education

Enrolment of students by level of education is given in table 7.
The data in the table shows that enrolment of students from PrePrimary level to high/higher secondary from 1981 to 2004, has increased considerably. The highest increased was at the pre-primary level, where the percentage of increase was more than four hundred percent from 1981 to 2004. At the primary level, the increase was only one hundred seven percent whereas the increase at the middle level was about two fifty percent. There was significant increase of more than three hundred enrolment at the high/higher level. This reveals that more and more parents are sending their children to schools and that is a positive development for the country as a whole.

## Dropouts of students at school level

Data in table-7 reveals high degree of dropouts at all levels from primary to secondary and students of both the sexes dropped out, though the girls have outnumbered boys. In 1980-81, 56 percent of the boys dropped out at the primary level and the number enhanced to 80 percent at the secondary level. At the middle level it was 68 percent. Among girls this percentage varied from 62 percent at the primary level to 87 percent at the secondary level. After two decades in 2000-01, the dropout rate came down but it was around 40 percent at the primary level. The middle and secondary level dropout continued to be more than fifty percent.

High dropout rate at the school stage can be one of the reasons for poor educational level of the people. It is also possible that the dropout rate might be higher in rural areas as parents do not send their children to schools especially girls (as girls are helpful in domestic work and boys work in field
along with adults). Lack of awareness regarding the utility of education in the life of rural people might be another factor for higher dropout rate in rural areas. Awareness programme about the utility of education among rural people may be the answer and without that mere increase in number of schools may not be of much help. In the following two sections infrastructure and the basic facilities available have been discussed.

## II

## Infrastructure Available at the School level

For quality education it is necessary to provide proper infrastructure, such as proper building, teaching staff, blackboard etc. Lack of any of these facilities will certainly affect the quality of education. Availability of infrastructure have been discussed in the following pages. Data for this section have been taken from the Elementary Education in India Analytical Report 2004-05 published by National University Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

## Schools without Building

Building is an essential requirement to run a school but not all the schools in the country fulfill the requirement. About six percent of schools in the country in 2005, numbering more than 41 thousand did not have any building. The number includes not only primary schools but also secondary and higher secondary schools. These schools without building are located in rural as well as in urban areas. About eight percent of the schools without building (numbering 3179) are located in urban areas and rest are in rural areas. More than one thousands schools without building are privately management schools ( $2.48 \%$ ) and rest are under government management. About three fourth of the schools without building are primary schools, 21 percent of the schools are independent upper primary. It is not only the primary school children who suffer but even the students of secondary and higher secondary classes also suffer. Naturally, during rainy seasons, the classes might not be held regularly and students loose important teaching hours, which may affect their performance. It is really surprising that even after six decades of independence we are unable to provide even roof to children in schools.

Even those schools which do have building may not have permanent structure. The distribution of schools according to the type of building shows that in 2005, only 70 percent of the schools had Pucca (concrete) building. In urban areas also, not all the schools had Pucca building. Surprisingly, more than one fourth of the schools in urban areas did not have permanent structure. About one percent of the schools in urban areas either had Kuccha building or the classes are held in tent. In rural areas, 70 percent had Pucca building and 30 percent are either had partially Pucca or multiple type building. In about
two percent schools in rural areas, the classes are held either in tent or in Kuccha building. The schools which do not have proper building, the students have to suffer because the classes may be disrupted due to rain or severe hot conditions.

## Schools by Classrooms

The Government of India initiated a scheme of operation blackboard in 1987. Under this scheme each school was supposed to have two classrooms and a Verandah. Additional rooms were to be provided by the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) launched in 1994. Despite all the schemes and programmes, there were no classrooms in about 11 percent of the schools in 2005. Ten percent of the schools with no classroom were located in rural areas and in urban areas the percentage of such schools was more than 12. Interestingly, more than 17 percent schools imparting education upto secondary and higher secondary level also had no classrooms. Students of such schools which had no classroom are deprived of quality education. When classes are held in open, there can be many distractions and the students are deprived of quality education.

Number of schools with one class room was slightly more than 10 percent ( $10.39 \%$ ) in 2005. More than 11 percent of such schools were in rural areas and about 5 percent in urban areas. There were about two percent secondary and higher secondary schools with only one classroom. About five percent of such schools had two classrooms and 13 percent three classrooms. More than one fourth of the schools in rural areas are managing with two classrooms. There were only 4.5 percent schools in 2005 , which had more than 10 classrooms. The students, who attend classes in these schools which do not have proper classrooms, are deprived of quality education and the basic foundation of such students will also be weak.

About 15 percent of the schools with one classroom are primary schools and two percent of the schools with one room are schools where teaching is done from primary and upper primary to secondary and higher secondary schools. One has to imagine how all these schools with only one classroom are managing their classes. Naturally majority of the classes in such schools must be held in open. The level and quality of teaching in such schools will be very poor and the students are worst affected.

Regarding the conditions of the classroom it was found that more than 31 percent of the schools in the country in 2005, needed repair as only 68 percent schools were classified as in good condition. Among primary schools which required repair, the percentage was more than 36 percent. Schools where teaching is done from upper primary to secondary and higher secondary, 29 percent were in need of some repair work. In fact 10 percent of such schools required major work and 19 percent needed minor repair.

## Student-classroom ratio

Ideally it may be difficult to limit number of students in class, but more number of students not only creates problem of seating but also affects the teaching as teacher may not be in position to give equal attention to all students. In such conditions introvert and shy students are the worst sufferers as their interaction with teachers is limited. Overall there were 20 percent schools in the country in 2005 where number of students in one classroom was more than sixty. In 2003, the percentage of such schools was one fourth. In primary level schools, the percentage of such schools is highest i.e 23 percent. Upper primary schools with secondary and higher secondary teaching the percentage school with high ratio is 14.1. A comparison of schools managed by government and privately managed schools shows that high ratio students schools are much higher in government schools as compared to private schools.

## Single-teacher schools

One of the basic requirements to impart quality education it is essential to have sufficient number of good quality teachers depending upon the level of teaching. If the basic foundation of the children is weak and the concepts are not clear it will be reflected in their future performance. In India there are many schools who are deprived of this basic requirement. There were 27,000 schools constituting almost three percent $(2.62 \%)$ of the total schools which do not have any teacher and another $1,44,093$ schools ( $14.66 \%$ ) were managed by only one teacher in 2005. One has to imagine the fate of students in these 27,000 schools where no teacher is available. How a school can be managed without any teacher? Students of the schools without teacher are deprived of basic education. This figure of 27,000 includes all types of schools from primary to secondary and such school exist in rural as well as in urban areas. The percentage of schools without any teacher in urban area was 3.66 in 2005 as compared to 1.69 in rural areas. In government records such schools as well as the students in these schools will add to the number but the students will be worst affected. It is not only the rural children, but children in urban areas also face this problem.

The percentage of primary schools without teacher is 1.62 for all areas. Again the percentage of primary schools without teacher is more ( $2.64 \%$ ) in urban areas as compared to schools in rural areas (1.49\%). About 13 percent of the schools in the country in 2005 were run by single teacher, and this included even secondary and higher secondary. Majority of such schools ( $14.66 \%$ ) are in rural areas and $4.41 \%$ numbering 5,487 are in urban areas. How one teacher can manage classes from primary to secondary as schools with single teacher include all types of schools. More than 15 percent of schools with single teacher are government schools and 3.45 percent are private schools. The percentage of single teacher was highest among primary schools (18.15\%).

## Teacher Pupil Ratio

Quality of education might also be affected due to high pupil teacher ratio. The overall pupil-teacher ratio was 39 for all areas in the year 2004. In rural areas it was 40 where as in urban areas the ratio was 36 . Though the overall pupil-teacher ratio is not high, but there are seven percent schools where the pupil-teacher ratio is more than 100 . In rural areas the percentage of such schools is 7.5 as compared to 4.6 percent among urban schools. High pupil-teacher ratio means that one teacher has to take care of more than 100 pupils and in such cases it is difficult to maintain the quality. At the primary level the percentage of such schools is more than 8. In rural areas there are 8.7 percent schools where the ratio of pupil-teacher at the primary level is more than 100 , and in urban areas the percentage of such school is more than five.

About 50 percent of the total budget year marked for educational development is allocated for elementary education and another 31 percent for secondary education. Thus, the share of university and higher education and technical education is only 17 percent. Despite the fact that Government of India allocates major share of funds for improving the quality of education at the elementary and secondary level the outcome is much less than satisfactory. There is a need to look into the factors which are responsible for poor quality of elementary education, despite that 50 percent of the budget was allocated for its development in the year 2004.

## Academic qualifications of teachers

Both, educational and professional qualifications of teachers are important for providing the quality of education to students. About 48 percent of the total teachers in all the schools were educated up to higher secondary. Of these about 3.26 percent were below secondary, 22 percent secondary and 23 percent higher secondary. Sexwise, there is not much difference in the educational qualification of teachers. In rural areas more than 50 percent were educated up to higher secondary, whereas in urban areas the percentage of such people is thirty eight. 54 percent of the females in rural areas were educated up to higher secondary as compare to upper primary integrated with higher secondary 4,642 and higher secondary schools 2222 . Overall, there were more than 82 thousand schools without blackboard. About sixty percent of the schools without blackboard were primary schools.

40 percent in rural areas, same is the case with males. Among rural male teachers, more than 48 were educated up to higher secondary and in urban areas the percentage of such teachers was 34 only. This shows that in the teachers in rural areas were not very well educated as compared to urban areas who are better qualified. Since the remunerations of school teachers are not attractive, not many people prefer to join schools and that affects the quality of education.

## Other Facilities in Schools

Facilities taken into account are schools without drinking water facility, toilet facility, blackboard facility and the qualifications of the teachers.

## Drinking water facility

About twenty percent schools in the country did not have drinking water facility. In urban areas the percentage of such schools is 13 as compared to 20 percent in rural areas. Number of government school with no drinking water facility is very high ( $21.55 \%$ ) as compared to privately managed schools $(7.35 \%)$. The distribution includes all categories of schools, including those schools where secondary and higher secondary classes are also held.

Tap water facility was available in 21.46 percent of the schools which means in almost eighty percent schools there is no tap water facility. Even in urban areas 50 percent of the schools did not have tap water facilities. In rural areas the percentage of such schools is more than eighty-two. In majority of the schools in rural areas the major source of drinking water is hand pump. In urban areas about one fourth of the schools supply hand pump facility. Five percent of the schools use tube well as a source of water.

## Toilet facility in schools

There are about 67 percent of the schools which did not have separate toilets for girls including 30 percent schools where teaching is done from upper primary to secondary and higher secondary. The schools where classes are held from primary to secondary and higher about 25 percent did not have separate toilets for girls. In primary schools more than 75 percent of the schools do not provide separate facility for girls. In upper primary level 73 percent and in primary with upper primary about 53 percent do not have separate toilets for girls.

Rural urban distribution shows that in urban areas 41 percent and in rural areas about 70 percent did not have toilet facility to their girl students. Lack of toilet facility for girls can be one factor that parents may not like to send their grown up daughters to schools. It is not only in rural areas but even in urban areas it can act as a deterrent factor especially for adolescent girls. In urban areas 20 percent schools where teaching is done from upper primary to secondary and higher secondary toilet facility for girls is not available.

## Schools without blackboard

Blackboard is an important part of classroom teaching, not at the elementary level but even at the higher level as use of blackboard facilitates the understanding and students can grasp the concepts better. It is really
surprising that about 8 percent of the schools in the country in 2005 were without blackboard. In fact, the percentage of schools without blackboard from primary with upper primary \& secondary and higher secondary was highest (9.37) followed by upper primary ( $8.06 \%$ ), and upper primary with secondary/higher secondary (7.87). The percentage of schools without blackboard was higher ( $8.55 \%$ ) in urban areas as compared to schools in rural areas ( $6.83 \%$ ). A comparison of privately managed and government schools shows that the percentage of privately managed schools without blackboard is higher ( $8.47 \%$ ) as compared to government schools (7.76\%). All the students studying in these schools are deprived of quality education, as without blackboard teaching will be affected.

In terms of number there were 48,989 primary schools without blackboards in 2005. Number of other schools without blackboard was elementary schools 10,727 , upper primary 5,796 ,

## Summing Up

The whole exercise reveals the Government of India is trying to improve the level of education of the masses by opening more and more schools in rural as well as in urban areas. But the facilities provided in most of the schools are not enough and need more efforts to improve the facilities. The basic requirement of good and sufficient number of teachers, enough rooms and blackboard facilities are not available in large number of schools. Even the schools in urban areas lack these facilities. It is clear from the above analysis that more opening new educational institution will not solve the problem. The level of education of the workers and that of general public is not encouraging at all. It is important that masses should be made aware of the benefits of education and how it can help in improving their quality of life. Mass movement to make people aware about the benefits of education is need of the hour. Awareness camps may be organized especially in rural areas to make people aware and to persuade to them to send their children to schools. They may also be given some incentives.

Table 1
Educational Level in 1995-96 and 2007-08 (percentages)
( 15 years and above)

| Category | Not literate |  | Literate upto <br> primary |  | Middle | Secondary and <br> above |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1995-96$ | $2007-08$ | $1995-96$ | $2007-08$ | $1995-96$ | $2007-08$ | $1995-96$ | $2007-08$ |  |  |
| Rural females | 68.3 | 52.5 | 17.0 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 12.3 | 6.0 | 12.2 |  |  |
| Rural males | 39.4 | 28.2 | 27.9 | 28.2 | 16.8 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 23.6 |  |  |
| Urban females | 32.7 | 25.4 | 21.0 | 20.0 | 17.1 | 15.9 | 29.3 | 38.7 |  |  |
| Urban males | 14.3 | 11.3 | 22.1 | 19.7 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 43.0 | 50.1 |  |  |

Source: NSS 64 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Round (July 2007-June 2008) p. 15.
Table 2
Level of Education Secondary and above in 2004-05 and 2007-08 (Percentages)
(15 years and above)

| Category | Secondary |  | Higher secondary |  | Diploma |  | Graduates |  | Postgraduates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2004- \\ 05 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 07- \\ 08 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2004- \\ 05 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 07- \\ 08 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2004- \\ 05 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 07- \\ 08 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2004- \\ 05 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 07- \\ 08 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2004- \\ 05 \end{array}$ | 07 08 |
| Rural females | 3.8 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 0,3 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Rural males | 6.9 | 12.6 | 3.5 | 6.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| Urban 1 females | 9.7 | 15.6 | 6.5 | 10.0 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Urban males | 12.1 | 18.4 | 8.3 | 12.1 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 8.9 | 13.3 | 2.7 | 3.9 |
| Total | 6.8 | 11.9 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 1.4 |

Table 3
Percentage Distribution of Workers by Educational Level, 2004-05

| Educational Level | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M | $F$ | $T$ | M | $F$ | $T$ | M | $F$ | $T$ |
| Not Literate | 34.4 | 67.5 | 44.0 | 13.4 | 37.7 | 17.9 | 28.9 | 62.8 | 38.3 |
| Literate upto Primary | 29.8 | 18.6 | 26.4 | 23.1 | 20.6 | 22.7 | 28.1 | 18.9 | 25.6 |
| Middle | 17.8 | 8.0 | 14.9 | 19.3 | 10.5 | 17.6 | 18.2 | 8.4 | 15.5 |
| Secondary | 8.9 | 3.2 | 7.2 | 14.8 | 6.8 | 13.3 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 8.6 |
| Higher Secondary | 4.4 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 9.0 | 4.9 | 8.3 | 5.6 | 1.8 | 4.5 |
| Diploma/Certificate Course | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| Graduate | 2.9 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 12.4 | 5.5 | 2.3 | 4.6 |
| Postgraduate and above | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| Secondary and above | 17.9 | 5.9 | 14.3 | 44.2 | 31.3 | 41.8 | 24.8 | 9.9 | 20.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: NSSO, Employment and Unemployment situation in India, 2004-05 NSS $61{ }^{\text {st }}$ Round, Report No. 515 Sept., 2006.
Table 4
Percentage Distribution of Workers (Age 15 + ) by Educational Level, 1999-2000 and 2004-05

| Educational Level | Year | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $M$ | $F$ | $T$ | $M$ | F | $T$ | $M$ | $F$ | $T$ |
| Not literate | 1999-00 | 39.6 | 73.9 | 51.5 | 16.0 | 43.9 | 21.5 | -28.4 | -62.2 | -39.5 |
|  | 2004-05 | 33.8 | 66.4 | 45.6 | 13.1 | 37.3 | 18.3 |  |  |  |
| Literate upto | 1999-00 | 27.3 | 15.5 | 23.2 | 21.9 | 17.6 | 21.1 | -27.6 | -18.7 | -24.7 |
| Primary | 2004-05 | 29.4 | 18.4 | 25.4 | 22.7 | 20.3 | 22.2 |  |  |  |
| Middle | 1999-00 | 16.3 | 6.2 | 12.8 | 18.8 | 10.3 | 17.2 | -18.4 | -9.1 | -15.4 |
|  | 2004-05 | 18.1 | 8.7 | 14.7 | 19.4 | 11.9 | 17.8 |  |  |  |
| Secondary | 1999-00 | 9.3 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 16.9 | 8.8 | 15.4 | -10.8 | -4.1 | -8.6 |
|  | 2004-05 | 9.3 | 3.6 | 7.2 | 15.0 | 7.3 | 13.3 |  |  |  |
| Higher Secondary | 1999-00 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 9.4 | 5.5 | 8.6 | -7.5 | -2.9 | -6.0 |
|  | 2004-05 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 12.9 | 8.5 | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Graduation and above | 1999-00 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 16.8 | 13.9 | 16.2 | -7.3 | -2.9 | -5.8 |
|  | 2004-05 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 16.9 | 14.7 | 16.4 |  |  |  |
| Secondary and above | 1999-00 | 16.8 | 4.3 | 12.4 | 43.1 | 28.2 | 40.2 | -25.5 | -9.9 | -20.4 |
|  | 2004-05 | 18.7 | 6.4 | 14.3 | 44.8 | 30.5 | 41.7 |  |  |  |
| Total | 1999-00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | -100.00 | -100.00 | -100.00 |
|  | 2004-05 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |  |  |  |

Source: NSSO: Employment and Unemployment situation in India, Reports Nos. 458 and 515 ( $55^{\text {th }}$ ed. $61^{\text {st }}$ Rounds).

Table 5
Average Number of Years of Education of Population (age 15 +) 2004-05

| Category | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M | F | $T$ | M | F | $T$ | M | F | $T$ |
| Education of workers | 4.3 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 4.1 |
| General Population | 4.5 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 7.6 | 5.9 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 4.4 |

Source: Compiled from the NSSO data
Table 6
Number of Educational Institutions

| Category | 1981 | 1991 | 2004 | Increase from <br> 1981 to 2004 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pre-Primary Schools | 10,281 | 15,877 | 63,569 | 618.3 |
| Primary/Junior Basic Schools | 494,503 | 560,935 | 767,520 | 155.2 |
| High/Higher Secondary | 51,006 | 79,796 | 274,731 | 538.6 |

Source: India Year Book, 2008 Manpower Profile, IAMR
Table 7
Enrolment by Level of Education 1981-2004

| Year |  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Category | 1981 | 1991 | 2001 | 2004 | Increase in <br> percentage from |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1981-2004) |

Source: Manpower Profile India Year Book 2008.
Table 8
Dropout Rate from 1980-81 to 2004-05

|  | Primary |  | Middle | Secondary |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls |
| $1980-81$ | 56.20 | 62.50 | 68.0 | 79.40 | 79.80 | 86.60 |
| $1990-91$ | 40.10 | 45.97 | 59.1 | 65.13 | 67.50 | 76.96 |
| $2000-01$ | 39.71 | 41.90 | 50.1 | 57.95 | 66.41 | 71.51 |
| $2004-05$ | 31.81 | 25.42 | 50.49 | 51.28 | 60.41 | 63.88 |

[^1]Table 9
Lack of Infrastructure in Schools (2005)

| School category | Schools without building (No) | \% of schools with Kuccha \& Building | \% of schools with no class room | \% of schools with one classroom | \% of classroom need major repair | \% of single teacher schools |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary only | 30048 | 2.14 | 10.18 | 14.60 | 12.18 | 18.15 |
| Primary with upper primary | 1533 | 0.99 | 8.27 | 1.79 | 8.54 | 1.90 |
| Primary/upper primary/secondary \& higher secondary | 186 | 0.74 | 10.46 | 0.85 | 3.81 | 1.64 |
| Upper primary | 8614 | 3.48 | 15.96 | 3.77 | 13.71 | 10.39 |
| Upper primary with secondary higher secondary | 577 | 1.37 | 7.12 | 0.84 | 9.99 | 1.29 |
| No response | 121 | - | - | - | - | - |
| All schools | 41079 | 1.95 | 10.90 | 10.39 | 10.39 | 13.36 |
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