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## Preface

This study on lateral entry and late admissions in primary schools of Haryana was undertaken mainly to find out why the enrolment in class II exceeded that of class I of the previous year. It was surmised that many children get admitted in classes other than class I directly after studying at home or in an unrecognised private school. Such cases of lateral entry are partly responsible for making the enrolment in class II or a higher class exceed that of the previous class of the previous year. Another reason was that many children get admitted in school, particularly in class I, even after $30^{\text {th }}$ September which is the date of reference for collecting enrolment and other educational data for EMIS. Such children are included among the promotees and repeaters in the following year but are excluded from the enrolment of $30^{\text {th }}$ September.

In this study on attempt was made to estimate the percentage children who enter laterally in classes II, III, IV or V and of those who are admitted late, that is, after $30^{\text {th }}$ September. The study was conduced on a sample basis in the schools of Hisar, Kaithal and Jind in August - September, 1998.

As a part of the study, the reasons for lateral entry were also explored by interviewing some of the parents. Estimates of repetition rates and dropout rates were obtained from the data collected from schools and necessary corrections were made in the repetition and dropout rates for the lateral entry cases and late admissions. It is noticed that the dropout rates increase after necessary corrections are made while the repetition rates decrease slightly when correction is made for late admissions. In particular, the uncorrected dropout rate in class I which was negative initially when the cases of late admission were ignored, is realistically estimated now and found to be in the range of 5 to 8 percent.

The study is presented in four chapters. Chapter I gives some background information for the study and describes the methodology, sampling design and tools used for the study. The findings of the study for the districts Hisar, Kaithal and Jind are reported in Chapters II, III and IV respectively. A set of summary tables giving the results of for all the three districts together and a few charts are given in Annex I. In Annex II, a note on unrecognised private schools based on a write up prepared by Dr. B. R. Goel is included. It is essentially based on his own observations and discussion with some teachers and parents in the three districts.

The study was conducted with the full cooperation and active participation of the administrative and field staff of DPEP in Haryana in particular, the Cluster Resource Centre Coordinators of the selected clusters who acted as Investigators and the DIET lecturers of the three districts who acted as supervisors and facilitators. Lastly, we are grateful to Shri Rattan Lal of SCERT, Gurgaon and Dr. B. R. Goel, retired Professor of NCERT, who actively collaborated with us in conducting this study. They provided great support in training the field staff and getting the data collected from schools in time.
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## Summary of Main Findings and Conclusions

## MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

## Changes in Enrolment Between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98

1. There is a steady decline in the total enrolment between 30 September and the end of the school year, as more children leave school than those who enter school. Between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98, the total enrolment declined by $3.7 \%$ in Hisar, by $3.2 \%$ in Kaithal and by $2.8 \%$ in Jind. Most of the decrease took place after 31.12.97.
2. Although the total enrolment in classes I-V declined, the enrolment in classes I and V either increased slightly or remained unchanged between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98, but the enrolment in classes II, III and IV decreased by 4 to 9 percent over the same period.
3. The decline in the enrolment of boys was greater than that in the enrolment of girls in Hisar, but the opposite was the case in Jind. In Kaithal, the rate of decline in enrolment was more or less the same for boys and girls.

## New Entrants Between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98

4. Although the enrolment declined between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98 because of some children leaving their schools, there were some new entrants also between these two dates. Such late entrants constituted $4.2 \%, 2.5 \%$ and $4.5 \%$ of the total enrolment on 30.9.97 in Hisar, Kaithal and Jind respectively.
5. The maximum number of late entrants were in classes I and $V$. Their percentage out of total enrolment in class I was $9.5 \%$ in Hisar, $4.5 \%$ in Kaithal and $6.8 \%$ in Jind. And their percentage in total enrolment in class V was $8.2 \%$ in Hisar, $2.5 \%$ in Kaithal and $4.5 \%$ in Jind. In other classes, such late entrants constituted less than $2 \%$ of the enrolment in those classes in each district.

## SCHOOL LEAVERS AFTER 30.9.97

6. The children who left to join other schools constituted $10.3 \%$ of the total enrolment of 30.9.97 in Hisar. This percentage was $7.2 \%$ in Kaithal and $10.0 \%$ in Jind. Nearly $70 \%$ of the leavers were those who left before 31.3 .98 in each district; the
remaining $30 \%$ left after 31.3 .98 as they did not return to their schools after the summer vacation.
7. There is not much of gender difference in the percentage of those who left theiir schools to join other schools or to become dropouts.
8. The minimum school leavers were in class I ( $5.6 \%$ in Hisar, $4.2 \%$ in Kaithal antd $4.0 \%$ in Jind out of class I enrolment of 30.9.97). In other classes, the percentage of school leavers was between 8 and 14 percent; only in class V in Jind, it was as high as $18.3 \%$.
9. Of the school leavers, 25 to 35 percent shifted to other government or recognisedd private schools. The rest either dropped out or joined unrecognised schools. However, the percentage of those who shifted to unrecognised schools is quite small ( 1.0 to 1.5 percent).

## Lateral Entry in Classes il to V

10. The children who were admitted directly in classes II to V in 1998 constituted $3.1 \%$ of the total enrolment on 31.8 .98 in Hisar, $2.8 \%$ in Kaithal and $3.7 \%$ in Jind. Among them, there were relatively more boys than girls in each of the threre districts.
11. The rate of lateral entry was highest in class $V(4.1 \%$ of class $V$ enrolment in Hisarr, and $5.2 \%$ of total enrolment in both Kaithal and Jind). It was lowest in class III. ( $2.2 \%$ of class II enrolment in Hisar, $1.5 \%$ in Kaithal and $2.7 \%$ in Jind).
12. The children who were admitted laterally in classes II to V after studying in unrecognised schools or at home, constituted only $1.3 \%$ of the total enrolment of classes II to V in Hisar, $1.5 \%$ in Kaithal and $2.2 \%$ in Jind.
13. Of the lateral entrants in classes II to V, $59 \%$ came from other government/privatie recognised schools in Hisar, $45 \%$ in Kaithal and $40 \%$ in Jind. Those who came from unrecognised schools constituted $25 \%$ of lateral entrants in Hisar, $35 \%$ of lateral entrants in Kaithal and $14 \%$ of lateral entrants in Jind. The rest ( $16 \%$ im Hisar, $20 \%$ in Kaithal and $46 \%$ in Jind) were those who had not attended any school earlier.
14. Very few children re-joined school after remaining dropouts for 1 or more years. There were less than $1 \%$ such children in the total enrolment of 1998.

## Repeaters and Repetition Rate

15. The overall repetition rate (percentage of children who studied in the same class again in 1998 out of all those enrolled in classes I to V in 1997) was $13.0 \%$ in Hisar, $15.3 \%$ in Kaithal and $12.8 \%$ in Jind.
16. The grade-wise repetition rate, which shows the percentage of children who repeated a particular grade in 1998 out of those enrolled in that grade in 1997, was highest for class III in Hisar (17.5\%) and Kaithal (17.9\%) and for class I (17.1\%) in Jind. The repetition rate was lowest in class V in all the three districts (ranging between $4.2 \%$ in Jind and $8.4 \%$ in Kaithal).
17. The repetition rates were slightly higher for boys in some classes and lower in others, compared to those of girls. However, there was no definite trend of gender difference in repetition rates.
18. In all the three districts, the repetition rates are slightly higher than those of 1996-97 derived from the EMIS data for the whole district. In particular, the repetition rates of class I are much higher than those of EMIS.
19. In Hisar, about $51 \%$ repeated grades because of failure in examination, $30 \%$ because of shortfall in attendance and another $20 \%$ for other reasons. In Kaithal, these percentages were $43 \%, 29 \%$ and $24 \%$ respectively and in Jind, $40 \%, 46 \%$ and $14 \%$ respectively. In classes I and II, the major reason was shortfall in attendance while in classes III to V , it was the failure in examinations. In most cases, the main reason for detention in the same class was unsatisfactory progress, whether it was due to low attendance or poor performance in the examination.

## Reasons for Lateral Entry

20. The main reason given by the parents who shifted their wards from unrecognised schools to the government schools, was the high fees they were charging which the parents could not afford. Another significant reason was the need for the child to be in a government or a recognised school to be able to appear for the grade V examination organised at the district level.
21. For those who were studying only at home previously, the main reason given by the parents was the need to keep the child at home to help in household chores or to look after the younger siblings.

## Repetition and Dropout Rates Corrected for Late admissions and Lateral Entry

22. The dropout rates increased slightly in classes II to IV, but considerably in classses I and V , when necessary corrections were made for late admissions and lateral entry. The uncorrected and corrected dropout rates of the different grades in the three districts are as follows :

| Class | Hisar |  | Kaithal |  | Jind |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Uncorrected | Corrected | Uncorrected | Corrected | Uncorrected | Corrected |
| I | -3.1 | 6.8 | -0.3 | 5.2 | -3.9 | 4.5 |
| II | 9.1 | 11.0 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 7.4 | 10.1 |
| III | 5.7 | 7.5 | 5.4 | 7.2 | 5.0 | 8.3 |
| IV | 9.1 | 11.2 | 3.9 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 8.1 |
| I-IV | 4.9 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 6.4 | 3.0 | 7.5 |

23. The maximum effect was on the dropout rate of class I since only in this classi, the number of children who were admitted late was quite large. In general, the effect of late admissions was more on dropout rates than of lateral entry.
24. The repetition rates declined slightly in each class, when the children who took admission late, were taken into account. The decrease is, however, insignificant (by less than 0.4 points) in all the classes except class I. The uncorrected and corrected repetition rates are as follows :

| Class | Hisar |  | Kaithal |  | Jind |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Uncorrected | Corrected | Uncorrected | Corrected | Uncorrected | Corrected |
| I | 13.0 | 11.9 | 17.4 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 16.1 |
| II | 11.7 | 11.7 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 11.4 | 11.3 |
| III | 17.5 | 17.4 | 14.9 | 17.8 | 15.0 | 14.9 |
| IV | 14.7 | 14.5 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 12.2 | 12.1 |
| V | 6.8 | 6.4 | 8.4 | $\mathbf{8 . 0}$ | 4.2 | 3.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3}$ |

25. There is no definite trend in respect of gender difference in repetition and dropout rates. In Hisar, the dropout rates for boys is higher, while in Kaithal it is higher for girls. In Jind, the two are almost equal. The repetition rates for boys and girls are almost the same in each class in every district.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. The private unrecognised schools are playing an increasingly significant role in providing primary education in the rural areas of Haryana. Although the cases of lateral entry into government schools from such unrecognised schools are not large in number and account for only less than $2 \%$ of total enrolment in classes I to V , they do make some difference in classes IV and V in which more children transfer to government schools to be able to appear for the district level class V examination.
2. The decline in class I enrolment between 1997 and 1998 to the tune of 18 to 22 percent shows that more and more children are probably entering private unrecognised schools now, which are not covered under EMIS. It is, therefore, important to study the enrolment pattern in these schools and the extent to which they are making contribution to universalisation of primary education. Perhaps the lateral entry into government schools from these schools is not large because many children continue their education upto class V and even beyond that, in these schools. Many of these schools are reported to have classes upto V and some even upto VIII.
3. A significant finding of the study is that schools continue to admit children in class I throughout the year and the number of children admitted after $30^{\text {th }}$ September were 5 to 10 percent of those enrolled on $30^{\text {th }}$ September. Again, the cases of late entry are more in class V due to some children taking admission in this class to be able to take the class $V$ examination. Since for calculation of such indicators as repetition and dropout rates, the enrolment figures of $30^{\text {th }}$ September are used, these children are left out. As a result, the dropout rate becomes very low or even negative. It is suggested that the data on the late entrants in class I may be collected on a regular basis as a part of EMIS in order get true picture of the repetition and dropout rates for class I.
4. Apart from the need to collect data on late entrants, it may be pointed out that the practice of entry in class I at any time of the year should be discouraged. In a way, it leads to greater heterogeneity in the class and hence wastage too, since it becomes difficult for the teacher to teach such children properly and bring them at par with others. This is reflected in high rates of repetition in class I ( $13 \%$ in Hisar to $17 \%$ in Kaithal and Jind), in which the promotion is supposed to be automatic. Effort
should be made to enroll all thes eligible children in class I right at the beginning of the school year and certainly nott after 30 September.
5. The repetition rates are high ( 112 to 18 percent) in all the classes except class V . Efforts should be made to redluce wastage due to children repeating grades by adopting better pedagogical metthods and more of remedial teaching.
6. The dropout rates are also quite significant when correction is made for late admissions and lateral entry. In particular, since the cases of late admission in class I and V are more the drop-rate: is affected more for these classes. When the late admission and lateral entry casess are ignored, the dropout rates are under-estimated; these rates require some adjustment by accounting for these cases in order to get a true picture of the extent of dropping out.
7. In order to get a better insightt into the phenomenon of dropping out, a special survey may be conducted to find out the number and percentage of children who are real dropouts and to know what they were doing after giving up studies and to ascertain whether they had becorme literate or not.
8. In the states in which a similar siituation exists in respect of lateral entry in classes II to IV/V and late admissions in celass I, a similar study may be conducted to find out how the drop-out and repetition rates are affected due to these factors.
9. When a similar study is conducted anywhere, it is suggested that in the states where the school year starts in summerr, the data on repeaters and dropouts for those who take admission after $30^{\text {th }}$ September may be collected separately (in addition to other data) in order to find out how the repetition and dropout rates of such students differ from those of the students who are admitted before $30^{\text {th }}$ September.
10. At present private unrecognised schools are totally ignored in the data collection programme. Since they are playiing an increasingly significant role in catering to the demand of certain sections of population in the country in both urban and rural areas, it is suggested that a separate comprehensive study may be undertaken to find out the percentage of school-age population enrolled in such schools and to get an idea of the infra-structural faccilities, equipment, quality of teachers, flow of students, rates of fee, etc. in them.

# Study of Lateral Entry in DPEP Districts of Haryana 

## Chapter I <br> Introduction

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

One of the objectives of the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) is to reduce the overall primary dropout rate to less than ten percent. Several interventions of DPEP have focussed on achieving this objective. For monitoring the progress made towards reduction of the dropout rate, the Educational Management Information System (EMIS) setup for DPEP districts provides annually the needed data on enrolment and repeaters in each primary class of the schools of these districts. The system became operational in 1995-96, and now the required data has become available for the years 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98 for most of the DPEP districts. From these data, one can derive the repetition and dropout rates, but in the case of dropout rates, an assumption that no child enters school in classes other than class I is implicit in the model. The dropout rates could naturally be distorted if this assumption does not hold good.

On comparing the class-wise enrolment figures of two consecutive years from the EMIS reports, it was found that in certain districts, the class II enrolment of 1997-98 exceeded the class I enrolment of 1996-97. Such a trend was particularly conspicuous in Haryana. Certainly, the excess in class II enrolment over that of class I enrolment of previous year required explanation. Obviously, several children were entering class II directly after studying at home or in a private unrecognised school. There are such cases of direct entry in classes III, IV and V also, though they may not be so large in number as to make the transition rates for these classes exceed one. Because of this phenomenon of lateral entry, it was not possible to get a true picture of the dropout rate. While some students dropout from the different classes of the primary stage, others take admission in these classes directly, as a result of which the dropout rate derived from the enrolment data without accounting for these 'drop ins' actually gets underestimated.

The enrolment and other data collected under EMIS of DPEP as well as the official educational statistics of the Department of Education, MHRD, are obtained only from the government and recognised private schools. The unrecognised private schools are left out. There are several such schools in urban areas and now in many rural areas also, which are generally run on commercial lines. Their main features are that they charge rather high fees in order to pay the teachers' salaries and to make some profit too; their curriculum includes teaching of English which in most states is not taught in the government schools at the primary level and they usually provide facilities and instructional materials normally not available in government schools. Some parents who feel that the instruction is better in such schools, send their children there but withdraw them later to enroll them in government schools because of financial or other reasons. The direct entry of such children in a government school in classes other than class I results in deflation of the dropout rate, since its computation is based on a model of follow-up of the class I cohort without any provision of direct entry in other classes.

Other factors also distort the dropout rate. For example, the children admitted in class I after $30^{\text {th }}$ September in a particular year are not counted in the enrolment figures of that year but if promoted, they are included in the enrolment of class II in the following year. As a result, the transition rate from class I to class II gets inflated. This study was undertaken mainly to assess the magnitude of lateral entry and late admissions in primary schools, as these are ignored in the analysis of enrolment data in the studies of retention. The study should help in finding out to what extent the assumptions normally made in the analysis of enrolment data for determining retention or dropout rates are not fulfilled.

It was decided to undertake this study in three DPEP districts of Haryana - Hisar, Kaithal and Jind on a sample basis. For this study, the necessary data on the number of children entering laterally in different classes, on new admissions in the school after $30^{\text {th }}$ September and on repeaters and school leavers had to be collected from a sample of schools in order to provide estimates of such indicators as the percentage of
children who enter directly in classes other than class I. Also, the study has attempted to find out the reasons of lateral entry from a sample of parents of the children.

### 1.2 ObJECTIVES

The objectives of the study are :
(i) to estimate the percentage of children who are admitted directly in a government or recognised private school in classes other than class I in the DPEP districts of Haryana.
(ii) to estimate the percentage of pupils who are admitted late, who repeat grades and who dropout from school in these districts.
(iii) to find out the reasons for lateral entry and grade repetition.

The study is conducted in three out of the four phase-I DPEP districts of Haryana. The districts covered in the study are Hisar, Kaithal and Jind.

### 1.3 TOOLS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

For collecting the data for this study, the following tools were prepared :
(i) Form 1 : Data on Enrolment - This form was meant for collecting information on enrolment on different dates of 1997 and 1998, and the number of school leavers, late admissions, repeaters and those entering directly in different grades. The form has 8 items divided into 24 subitems. On each item, the information required is that of the number of boys and girls in each class, ranging from I to V .
(ii) Form 2 : Information about Direct Entrants in Classes II, III, IV and V - In this form, the names of students admitted directly in classes II to V this year, that is, between 1.4.98 and 31.8.98, are to be recorded along with the information about what they were doing last year. This form was essentially meant for facilitating the filling up of Form 1.
(iii) Form 3 : Reasons for Repetition - In this form, the names of students who repeat are entered and for each student, the reason for repeating is recorded.
(iv) Form 4 : Interview Schedule for Parents / Guardians of the Children Admitted Directly in Classes II to $V$ - This schedule was to be filled by the interviewer after ascertaining from parents the reasons for lateral entry of the child in classes II to V.

The items on which information on class-wise number of boys, girls and their total was collected in Form 1 were as follows :
(i) Enrolment on 30.9.97, 31.12.97, 31.3.98 and 31.8.98.
(ii) Number of children who left school (a) between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98 and (b) after 31.3.98.
(iii) Number of new entrants after 30.9.97; among them the number of those who came from government or recognised private schools
(iv) Number of children who were in the same school last year out of the enrolment on 31.8.98; the number of those who were promotees from previous class; and the number of repeaters.
(v) Number of children who got admitted for the first time in the school this year out of the enrolment on 31.8.98; among them, the number of those who came from other government or recognised private school (a) as promotees (b) as repeaters; the number of those who came from unrecognised private schools; and number of those who were studying at home only previously.
(vi) Number of children who were dropouts and who re-entered to school to resume studies after a gap of 1 or more years.
(vii) Among repeaters, the number of those who were repeater because of (a) failing in the examination (b) attendance being less than $50 \%$ and (c) other reasons.
(viii) Among those enrolled on 30.9.97, the number of those who left school between 30.9.97 and 31.8.98 and (a) transferred to other government / private recognised school (b) transferred to an unrecognised private school (c) gave up studies and (d) about whom no information was available as to what they were doing.

All the forms were finalised after trying out in about 20 schools of Gurgaon and Jind districts. The forms were originally prepared in English but when the initial tryout showed that Hindi translation of the English forms was not satisfactory and certain technical terms were misunderstood, the forms were re-drafted in simple Hindi. The forms are reproduce in Annex $\mp$. Also, detailed instructions for filling the form were provided to the investigators in writing.

### 1.4 SAMPLING OF SCHOOLS AND PARENTS

It was decided to select a sample of 60 to 100 schools in each district for collecting the required data and estimating various parameters such as percentage of students taking admission directly in the different classes. For selecting the sample, the method of cluster sampling was used in order to facilitate data collection by the investigators. A list of clusters arranged block-wise for 1997 was obtained from the EMIS Unit, and a systematic sample of clusters was selected from the list. Various blocks of the district thus got adequately represented in the sample. The sample initially included 35 clusters, but in 3 clusters the data could not be collected due to certain administrative reasons.

All the schools of the selected clusters were included in the sample, provided their number did not exceed 10. Only in six clusters ( 4 of Jind and 2 of Kaithal) where the number of schools ranged between 13 and 20, some schools were excluded from the list at random in order to reduce their number to 10 or less to facilitate data collection in time for the study.

The following table shows the number of clusters and schools in the population and the sample in the three districts.

Population and the Sample

| District | Population |  |  | Sample |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Blocks | Clusters | Schools | Blocks | Clusters | Schools |
| Hisar | 11 | 110 | 878 | 10 | 15 | 90 |
| Kaithal | 5 | 46 | 413 | 5 | 9 | 53 |
| Jind | 6 | 54 | 557 | 6 | 11 | 85 |
| Total | 22 | 210 | 1848 | 21 | 35 | 228 |

The total sample consisted of 207 schools of 32 clusters from nearly all the blocks of Hisar, Kaithal and Jind. Only one block of Hisar (Tohana) and one of Jind (Nagura) remained unrepresented in the sample. It was $11.2 \%$ sample of schools of these three distircts, the sampling traction varying between $10.2 \%$ in Hisar and $13.6 \%$ in Kaithal.

For the sample of parents to be interviewed, it was decided to select at most 10 parents of the pupils who had taken lateral entry in classes II to V in the sampled schools. In several cases, the number was less than 10 due to either non-availability of parents for interview or the number of lateral entry cases not being large. In all, 467 parents were interviewd (163 in Hisar, 120 in Kaithal and 184 Jind).

### 1.5 Data Collection and analysis

For collection of data from schools on the prescribed forms, it was decided to entrust the task of CRC Coordinators of the selected clusters. They functioned as investigators for this study and were provided necessary orientation about the objectives of the study and the procedures to be followed for collecting information in meetings organised at SCERT, Gurgaon, on August 22/23 and 27, 1998. All the items in the Forms 1 to 4 were discussed in detail in these meetings.

For checking the data, lecturers of DIETs of these three districts, who were responsible for DPEP work, were deployed. They were entrusted with the work of supervision and independent checking of data collected by the CRC Coordinators. Prof. B.R. Goel, Professor (Retd.), NCERT, was given overall responsibility for guiding the field staff and checking of the data.

All the completed forms of Hisar and Kaithal were received from the CRC Coordinators by September 28, 1998, but in the case of Jind, most clusters could submit the forms only by October 9,1998 . The work of data cleaning coding, data entry and analysis was carried out by the staff of RESU.

## Chapter II

## Findings of the study for Hisar district

### 2.1 SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS

In Hisar, the sample included 90 schools belonging to 15 clusters selected by the method of systematic sampling from the total 110 clusters of the district. The total enrolment in classes I to V in these schools was 20532 on 30.9 .97 and 20253 on 31.8.98. The sample of schools was a $10.3 \%$ sample of all the schools of Hisar and the enrolment on 30.9 .97 in those schools was $10.1 \%$ of total enrolment in classes I to V in the district.

### 2.2 Changes in enrolment during the school year 1997-98

Table H 1 gives class-wise enrolment of boys, girls and total, for the beginning, the middle and the end of the school year 1997-98. The indices of change are also given in the table assuming the baseline figure of 30.9 .97 to be 100 .

We find that the total enrolment declined by $3.7 \%$ between 30.9 .97 and 31.3.98. In the case of boys the decline was by $5.2 \%$ while in the case of girls only by $2.1 \%$. There was relatively greater decrease in enrolment in the last quarter (1.1.9831.3.98) compared to the third quarter ( $1.10 .98-31.12 .98$ ). In fact in the third quarter, the girls enrolment increased slightly, while boys enrolment decreased.

Interestingly the enrolment in class I and V increased after 30.9 .97 while in three classes II, III and IV, decreased steadily between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98. The increase in class I is more because of new admissions after 30.9 .97 while in class V it is more because of transfers from unrecognised schools. It was noticed that admissions in class I are open throughout the year. Transfers from unrecognised schools in class V largely take place to enable the children to sit for the primary school leaving examination.

Table h1
ENROLMENT IN CLASSES I TO V aT THE BEGINNING, THE MIDDLE AND THE END OF SCHOOL YEAR AND INDICES OF CHANGE 1997-98(HISAR DISTRICT)

| Date | Class I |  |  | Class II |  |  | Class III |  |  | Class IV |  |  | Class V |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |  |  |  |
| 30.9.97 | 2492 | 2357 | 4849 | 2723 | 2439 | 5162 | 2142 | 2100 | 4242 | 1816 | 1514 | 3330 | 1587 | 1362 | 2946 | 10760 | 9772 | 20532 |
| 31.12 .97 | 2540 | 2487 | 5027 | 2570 | 2371 | 4941 | 2047 | 2101 | 4048 | 1727 | 1473 | 3200 | 1646 | 1438 | 3084 | 10530 | 9870 | 20400 |
| 31.3.98 | 2537 | 2432 | 4969 | 2441 | 2258 | 4699 | 1962 | 2038 | 4000 | 1673 | 1435 | 3108 | 1586 | 1402 | 2988 | 10199 | 9565 | 19764 |

Indices of Change with 30.9.97 figures as 100

| 30.9.97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31.12 .97 | 101.9 | 105.5 | 103.7 | 94.4 | 97.2 | 95.7 | 95.6 | 100.0 | 95.4 | 95.1 | 97.3 | 96.1 | 103.7 | 105.6 | 104.7 | 97.9 | 101.0 | 99.4 |
| 31.3.98 | 101.8 | 103.2 | 102.5 | 89.6 | 92.6 | 91.0 | 91.6 | 97.0 | 94.3 | 92.1 | 94.8 | 93.3 | 99.9 | 102.9 | 101.4 | 94.8 | 87.9 | 96.3 |

The maximum decrease in enrolment was noticed in class II, as the number of pupils declined by $9.0 \%$ between 30.9 .97 and 31.3 .98 , while in classes III and IV, the decline was by $5.7 \%$ and $6.7 \%$ respectively during the same period.

### 2.3 Children admitted after 30 September, 1997

Since the date of reference for EMIS and all other educational statistics is 30 September, the children who take admission after this date do not get included in the enrolment of that year. Since the new school year commences on $1^{\text {st }}$ April, in Haryana, most new admissions take place in April itself or latest by August. But the schools continue to admit children even after 30 September, particularly in class I. One.objective of the study was to assess the incidence of such late entry. Table H2 gives the number of the late entrants, that is, the children who took admission in different classes after 30.9.97. The table also shows the number of such late entrants per 100 pupils of the class as enrolled on 30.9.97, and also the percentage of those among the late entrants, who came on transfer from other government or recognised private schools.

Table H2
NUMBER OF LATE ENTRANTS (CHILDREN ADMITTED AFTER 30.9.97) AND TRANSFEREES FROM GOVERNMENT/RECOGNISED PRIVATE SCHOOLS AMONG THEM (HISAR DISTRICT)

|  |  | Sex | Number of pupils admitted after 30.9.97 in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| (a) | Late entrants (pupils admitted after 30.9.97) | $B$ | 268 | 26 | 34 | 27 | 125 | 480 |
|  |  | G | 191 | 29 | 28 | 20 | 117 | 385 |
|  |  | T | 459 | 55 | 62 | 47 | 242 | 865 |
| (b) | Pupils transferred from other govt. or recognised private schools out of (a) | B | - | 12 | 21 | 12 | 23 | 68 |
|  |  | G | - | 13 | 15 | 7 | 23 | 58 |
|  |  | $T$ | - | 25 | 36 | 19 | 46 | 126 |
| (c) | Late entrants per 100 pupils enrolled on 30.9 .97 | B | 10.8 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $G$ | 8.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 8.6 | 3.9 |
|  |  | $T$ | 9.5 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 8.2 | 4.2 |
| (d) | (b) as \% of (a) | B | - | 46.2 | 61.8 | 44.4 | 18.4 | 14.2 |
|  |  | G | - | 44.8 | 53.6 | 35.0 | 19.7 | 15.1 |
|  |  | $T$ | - | 45.5 | 58.1 | 40.4 | 19.0 | 14.6 |

There were 865 late entrants (those admitted after 30.9.97) in 1997-98 which is $4.2 \%$ of the total enrolment on 30.9.97. It means the enrolment would increase by $4.2 \%$ between 30.9 .97 and 31.3 .98 , if no one dropped out during this period.

The percentage of late entrants is slightly higher for boys than for girls. The maximum number of late entrants are in class I and class V , the percentage being $9.5 \%$ and $8.2 \%$ respectively in these classes. The percentage in other classes is rather small, between 1.0 and 1.5 percent. Among the late entrants in classes II, III and IV, quite a few ( 40 to 60 percent) are transferees from other government or recognised private schools. But in class V, only $14.6 \%$ are in this category, the rest $85.4 \%$ are apparently from unrecognised private schools.

### 2.4 SCHOOL LEAVERS FROM DIFFERENT CLASSES

Table H3 gives class-wise number of pupils who left school during the school year (i.e. between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98) and also the number of those who left after 3.1.3.98 (i.e. who did not return to the same school after the summer vacation).

Table H3
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WHO LEFT SCHOOL AFTER 30.9.97 (HISAR DISTRICT)

|  | Sex | No. of pupils who left school |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| Total leavers between 30.9. 97 \& 31.8.98 | Boys | 154 | 395 | 249 | 215 | 167 | 1180 |
|  | Girls | 119 | 307 | 186 | 180 | 142 | 934 |
|  | Total | 273 | 702 | 435 | 395 | 309 | 2114 |
| Leavers between 30.9.97 and 31.3.98 | Boys | 132 | 286 | 170 | 131 | 107 | 826 |
|  | Girls | 96 | 226 | 125 | 108 | 84 | 639 |
|  | Total | 228 | 512 | 295 | 239 | 191 | 1465 |
| $\%$ of children who left between 30.9 .97$\& 31.8 .98$ \& 31.8.98 | Bcys | 6.2 | 14.5 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 10.5 | 11 |
|  | Girls | 5 | 12.6 | 8.9 | 11.9 | 10.4 | 9.6 |
|  | Total | 5.6 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 10.5 | 10.3 |
| \% of children who left between 30.9.97\& 31.3.98 | Boys | 5.3 | 10.5 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 7.7 |
|  | Girls | 4.1 | 9.3 | 6 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 |
|  | Total | 4.7 | 9.9 | 7 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 7.1 |
| \% of children leaving between 30.9.97 and 31.3 .98 out of total leavers | Boys | 85.7 | 72.4 | 68.3 | 60.9 | 64.1 | 70.0 |
|  | Girls | 80.7 | 73.6 | 67.2 | 60.0 | 59.2 | 68.4 |
|  | Total | 83.5 | 72.9 | 67.8 | 60.5 | 61.8 | 69.3 |

It is noticed that $10.3 \%$ of the pupils enrolled on 30.9 .97 left school either during or at the end of the school year. Among these school leavers, the percentage of those who left during the school year (i.e. before 31.3.98), constituted $69.3 \%$. The percentage of school leaving girls was slightly lower ( $9.6 \%$ ) than that of school leaving boys (11.0\%).

The percentage of school leavers was highest in class II and lowest in class I. In class I, very few (only $16.5 \%$ ) among the leavers were those who did not continue education after remaining in school till the end of the year (31.3.98), while the percentage of such children in class II was as high as $27.1 \%$. In classes III, IV and V the percentage of pupils who left school ranged between 10 and 12 percent.

It may be pointed out that all the leavers were not necessarily dropouts. Some joined other schools. We shall see how many joined other schools and how many really dropped out in the next section.

### 2.5 DROPOUTS AMONG SCHOOL LEAVERS

An analysis of those who left school after 30.9.97 and did not continue in the same school in the following year was carried out to find out whether they were continuing their education in other schools or had become dropouts. Table 4 shows the distribution of such school leavers according to what they were doing after leaving their parent schools (that is, the schools included in this study) as reported by the school head teachers.

We find that among the school leavers who constituted $10.3 \%$ of the total 30 September enrolment in 1997, nearly one third ( $35.4 \%$ to be exact) joined other government or recognised private school, $12.7 \%$ joined other unrecognised schools, $10.4 \%$ had discontinued studies and for $51.9 \%$ of them, no information was available as to what they were doing. As it can be safely assumed that they were also dropouts, the percentage of dropouts among those who left the school became $51.9 \%$; the remaining $48.1 \%$ were those who continued their education. In brief, out of the total students, nearly $10 \%$ left the school in which they were studying in 1997-98, but half of them continued their education in other schools while the rest became dropouts.

The class to class variations are significant, as the percentage of the children who became dropouts among those who left school, was highest in class I ( $68.1 \%$ ) and lowest in class IV (42.5\%). The gender differences are also significant, there being
$57.7 \%$ dropouts among the female school leavers and $47.4 \%$ dropouts among the male school leavers.

Considering all those who did not shift to another government or recognised private school as dropouts, we find that $6.7 \%$ of the total pupils were dropouts (see row 19 Table H4). The highest dropout rate, $9.0 \%$, was in class II and the lowest, $4.3 \%$, in class I. It may be noted that these dropout rates are uncorrected for late entrants in different classes in 1997-98, and are, in a way, tentative since the schools do not have any proper record of what the children do after their names are struck off.

Table H4
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL LEAVERS ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY TRANSFERRED TO OTHER SCHOOLS OR DROPPED OUT (HISAR DISTRICT)

|  |  | Class I |  |  | Class II |  |  | Class III |  |  | Class IV |  |  | Class V |  |  | Classes Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 1 | Total Enrolment | 2492 | 2357 | 4849 | 2723 | 2499 | 5162 | 2142 | 2100 | 4242 | 1816 | 1514 | 3330 | 1587 | 1362 | 2946 | 10760 | 9772 | 20532 |
| 2 | Total School leavers | 154 | 119 | 273 | 395 | 307 | 702 | 249 | 186 | 435 | 215 | 180 | 395 | 167 | 142 | 309 | 1180 | 934 | 2114 |
| 3 | (2) as \% of (1) | 6.2 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 14.5 | 12.3 | 13.6 | 11.6 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 10.3 |
|  | Number of those who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Joined other govt/recognised Private school | 45 | 18 | 63 | 146 | 91 | 237 | 94 | 65 | 159 | 96 | 68 | 164 | 66 | 59 | 125 | 447 | 301 | 748 |
| 5 | joined unrecognised schools | 14 | 10 | 24 | 64 | 31 | 45 | 41 | 18 | 59 | 42 | 21 | 63 | 13 | 14 | 27 | 174 | 94 | 268 |
| 6 | dropped out | 9 | 10 | 19 | 41 | 35 | 76 | 18 | 22 | 40 | 13 | 31 | 44 | 16 | 25 | 41 | 97 | 123 | 220 |
| 7 | could not be located | 86 | 81 | 167 | 144 | 150 | 294 | 96 | 81 | 177 | 64 | 60 | 124 | 72 | 44 | 116 | 462 | 416 | 878 |
| 8 | (6)+(7) | 95 | 91 | 186 | 185 | 185 | 370 | 114 | 103 | 217 | 77 | 91 | 168 | 88 | 69 | 157 | 559 | 539 | 1098 |
|  | Percentage of those out of (2) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | joined other govt/recognised Private school | 29.2 | 15.1 | 23.1 | 37.0 | 29.6 | 33.8 | 37.8 | 34.9 | 36.6 | 44.7 | 37.8 | 41.5 | 39.5 | 41.5 | 40.5 | 37.9 | 32.2 | 35.4 |
| 10 | joined unrecognised schools | 9.1 | 8.4 | 8.8 | 16.2 | 10.1 | 6.4 | 16.5 | 9.7 | 13.6 | 19.5 | 11.7 | 15.9 | 7.8 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 14.7 | 10.1 | 12.7 |
| 11 | dropped out | 5.8 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 7.2 | 11.8 | 9.2 | 6.0 | 17.2 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 17.6 | 13.3 | 8.2 | 13.2 | 10.4 |
| 12 | could not be located | 55.8 | 68.1 | 61.2 | 36.5 | 48.9 | 41.9 | 38.6 | 43.5 | 40.7 | 29.8 | 33.3 | 31.4 | 43.1 | 31.0 | 37.5 | 39.2 | 44.5 | 41.5 |
| 13 | (11)+(12) | 61.7 | 76.5 | 68.1 | 46.8 | 60.3 | 52.7 | 45.8 | 55.4 | 49.9 | 35.8 | 50.6 | 42.5 | 52.7 | 48.6 | 50.8 | 47.4 | 57.7 | 51.9 |
|  | Percentage of those out of (1) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | joined other govt/recognised Private school | 1.8 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.1 | 3.6 |
| 15 | joined unrecognised schools | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| 16 | dropped out | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| 17 | could not be located | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| 18 | (16)+(17) | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.3 |
| 19 | (15)+(16)+(17) | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 7.2 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.7 |

### 2.6 CHILDREN ADMITTED DIRECTLY IN GRADES OTHER THAN GRADE I IN 1998

As our main objective was to study the incidence of lateral entry in grades II, III, IV and V , we analysed the data on those who took direct admission in these grades in 1998 to find out the percentage of such pupils and to know where they were studying before taking admission. Table H 5 gives the number of such pupils in each grade and their distribution according to what they were doing prior to joining the school in 1998. The class-wise enrolment figures are given in Table H6.

Table H5
Number of Children admitted Directly in Classes II, III, IV and V in 1998 upto 31 august (HISAR DISTRICT)

| Item | Sex | - | ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Classes |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| Number of children taking direct admission | $B$ | 73 | 91 | 65 | 61 | 290 |
|  | $G$ | 36 | 53 | 80 | 50 | 219 |
|  | T | 109 | 144 | 145 | 111 | 509 |
| Percentage of such children among the total students of classes II to V | $B$ | 2.8 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 3.5 |
|  | G | 1.5 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 2.8 |
|  | $T$ | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
| \% of children coming from unrecog. schools/homes in total students of classes II to V | $B$ | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
|  | $G$ | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
|  | $T$ | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Out of the children admitted directly |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of those transferred from other government or recognised private schools | $B$ | 53.4 | 49.5 | 66.2 | 68.9 | 58.3 |
|  | $G$ | 58.3 | 52.8 | 62.5 | 64.0 | 59.8 |
|  | $T$ | 55.0 | 50.7 | 64.1 | 66.7 | 59.0 |
| \% of those who came from unrecognised schools | $B$ | 27.4 | 29.7 | 20.0 | 24.6 | 25.8 |
|  | $G$ | 19.5 | 26.4 | 22.5 | 28.0 | 24.2 |
|  | $T$ | 24.8 | 28.5 | 21.4 | 26.1 | 25.1 |
| \% of those who were studying at home | $B$ | 19.2 | 20.9 | 13.8 | 6.6 | 15.9 |
|  | $G$ | 22.2 | 20.8 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 |
|  | T | 20.2 | 20.8 | 14.5 | 7.2 | 15.9 |

We find that of those enrolled in classes II to V in the schools of our sample in 1998 (upto 31.8 .98 ), only $3.1 \%$ came from other schools or after studying at home; the rest $96.9 \%$ were the children of the same school who were either promoted from the previous class or were repeating the same class. The maximum percentage of such lateral entrants was in class IV and V ( $3.9 \%$ and $4.1 \%$ respectively). In class II, only $2.2 \%$ and in class III, $3.0 \%$ children enrolled were those who came from other schools or directly from home.

Among those who took lateral entry in classes II to V, $59 \%$ were those who were transferred from other government or recognised private schools. Incidentally, $86 \%$ of these students were promotees from previous class and the rest $14 \%$ came as repeaters of the same class.

Those who were not in any government / recognised private school prior to taking admission in their present school constituted $41 \%$ of the lateral entrants or just $1.3 \%$ of the total students enrolled in classes II to V ( $0.8 \%$ coming from other unrecognised private schools and $0.5 \%$ after studying at home). In other words, $98.7 \%$ of the children enrolled in these classes were either studying in the same school or another government / recognised private school previously.

There are relatively more boys than girls who take lateral entry after studying in other unrecognised schools or at home. There were $58 \%$ boys and $42 \%$ girls among them. Among the boys enrolled in classes II to V, about $1.4 \%$ were studying in unrecognised schools or at home previously while among the girls this percentage was 1.1\%.

Class-wise, we find the percentage of children who were studying in unrecognised schools or at home prior to entering their present school was $1.0 \%, 1.5 \%, 1.4 \%$ and $1.35 \%$ respectively of the total students enrolled in classes II, III, IV and V.

### 2.7 Dropouts re-admitted in schools after a Gap of One or More Years

With increasing awareness of the benefits of education, it is felt that some children who had dropped out earlier would now be seeking admission again in the school to continue their education. We found very few children in this category among those enrolled in our sample of schools. In classes II to V, there were 99 such children out of 16285 enrolled in these classes which is only $0.6 \%$ of the total enrolled. Among them, two-third were boys and one-third girls. The maximum number of such children were in classes II and III ( 43 and 29 respectively out of 99 ) while in classes IV and V, there were only 15 and 12 such children. It was reported that the older the children become, the more shy they feel in seeking re-admission to the same class after a gap of 1 or more years.

### 2.8 Repeaters Among the Pupils in 1998-99

Table H6 gives the enrolment and number of repeaters in each class is 1998 and classwise repetition rates for 1997-98. The table also gives the percentage of repeaters in each class among the pupils enrolled in 1998. Repetition rates have been compared with those of 1996-97 based on EMIS data for the whole district.

Table H6
Total Enrollment and Number of Repeaters in Classes I to V in 1998 and Repetition
Rates for 1997 (HISAR district)

|  | Sex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrolment on 31.8.98 | Boys | 2018 | 2587 | 2490 | 1861 | 1450 | 10406 |
|  | Girls | 1950 | 2386 | 2338 | 1886 | 1287 | 9847 |
|  | Total | 3968 | 4973 | 4828 | 3747 | 2737 | 20253 |
|  | Boys | 330 | 350 | 380 | 283 | 103 | 1446 |
|  | Girls | 301 | 256 | 361 | 206 | 97 | 1221 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{6 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | 741 | 489 | 200 | 2667 |
| Repetition rate | Boys | 13.2 | 12.9 | 17.7 | 15.6 | 6.5 | 13.4 |
|  | Girls | 12.8 | 10.5 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 7.1 | 12.5 |
|  | Total | 13.0 | 11.7 | 17.5 | 14.7 | $\mathbf{6 . 8}$ | 13.0 |
| Repetition rate based <br> on EMIS data for | Boys | 11.6 | 10.6 | 18.1 | 16.2 | 10.8 | 13.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Girls | 10.5 | 10.0 | 16.6 | 14.4 | 7.7 | 11.8 |
| Total | 11.1 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 3}$ | 17.4 | 15.3 | 9.4 | 12.6 |

In Table H6, the repetition rate for 1997 is obtained by dividing the number of repeaters in any given class inı 1998 by the enrollment in that class in 1997 and expressing the same in the form of percentage. We find that $13.0 \%$ the total students enrolled in 1997 (as on 30 September) were repeaters in the same class in 1998 (as on 31 August). The repetition rate is slightly higher for boys (13.4\%) compared to that for girls (12.5\%).

Comparing the repetition rates with those derived from the EMIS data of 1996-97 and 1997-98 for the whole district Hisar, we find that the two are broadly of the same magnitude in classes II, III and IV but the repetition rates obtained from the data of this study for class I is slightly lhigher and that for class V, considerably lower than the corresponding rates of 1996-97 derived from EMIS data.

The repetition rate is highest in class III (17.5\%) and lowest in class V (6.8\%). In the other classes, it ranges between 11.7 and $14.7 \%$. It is worth noting that even though there is state policy of no detentiion in class I, 13.0\% of the pupils of class I in 1997 repeated the class in 1998. The relatively low repetition rate in class V is probably due to many pupils of class $V$ not continuing their education after failing in the examination. However, in the absence of data on those who pass class $V$, it is not possible to comment on the perceentage of children who dropout after failing in class V.

### 2.9 Percentage of repeatiers in different classes

Table H 7 gives the percentage off data of the present study and also according to the EMIS data of the years 1996-97 and 1997-98. This percentage gives some idea of the extent of repetition but differs from the repetition rate discussed in the previous section.

Table H7
PERCENTAGE OF REPEATERS IN DIFFERENT CLASSES FOR 1998-99 baSEd ON THE PRESENT STUDY AND FOR 1996-97 AND 1997-98 aCCODING TO FROM EMIS (HISAR DISTRICT)

|  |  | Percentage of repeaters in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\boldsymbol{I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I} \boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}$ | Total |
| Present study (1998-99) | Boys | 16.4 | 13.5 | 15.3 | 15.2 | 7.1 | 13.9 |
|  | Girls | 15.4 | 10.7 | 15.4 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 12.4 |
|  | Total | 15.9 | 12.2 | 15.3 | 13.1 | 7.3 | 13.2 |
| EMIS (1996-97) | Boys | 8.9 | 8.6 | 13.8 | 12.8 | 12.5 | 11.1 |
|  | Girls | 8.1 | 7.7 | 12.8 | 11.6 | 9.2 | 9.7 |
|  | Total | 8.5 | 8.5 | 13.3 | 12.3 | 11.1 | 10.4 |
| EMIS (1997-98) | Boys | 11.4 | 8.9 | 16.2 | 15.6 | 11.3 | 12.5 |
|  | Girls | 9.8 | 8.5 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 7.9 | 10.8 |
|  | Total | 10.6 | 8.7 | 15.2 | 15.0 | 9.8 | 11.7 |

We find that there is a little higher of repeaters, ( $13.2 \%$ ) among the students according to this study, compared to the percentage of repeaters 10.4 and 11.7 in 1996-97 and 1997-98 respectively according to EMIS data. In particular, the percentage of repeaters in much higher in classes I and II than what the EMIS data show. Apart from the fact that this is a sample study, a possible reason for this difference lies in the way repeaters are defined. For this study, the repeaters are were all those who repeated irrespective of the cause of repeating, the case of EMIS, only those were to be considered repeaters who repeated due to unsatisfactory performance. It implies that there has been under-reporting of repeaters in these classes when the data are collected for EMIS.

### 2.10 Reasons for Repetition

For the children who repeat grades, it is generally presumed that they do so because of unsatisfactory performance in the examinations. But quite a few repeat because of their school attendance being below the minimum $50 \%$ attendance prescribed for eligibility to promotion to the next class. Of course, low attendance and unsatisfactory performance are inter-related and sometimes it may be difficult to distinguish between them when it comes to identifying the reason for detention in the same class.

In this study, the repeaters were divided into 3 categories according to the reason for their detention in the same class. Table H 8 gives the distribution of repeaters according to the reason for repeating.

Table H8
Percentage Distribution of Repeaters according to the Reason for Repeating
(HISAR DISTRICT)

| Reason for repeating | Sex | Percentage of children |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $I$ | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| Failure in the examination | $B$ | 33.0 | 35.4 | 67.8 | 70.0 | 60.2 | 51.9 |
|  | G | 31.5 | 35.5 | 65.1 | 63.1 | 58.8 | 49.8 |
|  | $T$ | 32.3 | 35.5 | 66.4 | 67.1 | 59.5 | 50.9 |
| Attendance being below 50\% | $B$ | 54.6 | 42.9 | 10.3 | 11.3 | 12.6 | 28.6 |
|  | $G$ | 54.5 | 46.5 | 15.0 | 15.5 | 13.4 | 31.3 |
|  | $T$ | 54.5 | 44.4 | 12.6 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 29.8 |
| Other reasons | $B$ | 12.4 | 21.7 | 22.1 | 18.7 | 27.2 | 19.5 |
|  | $G$ | 14.0 | 18.0 | 19.9 | 21.4 | 27.8 | 18.9 |
|  | $T$ | 13.2 | 20.1 | 21.0 | 19.8 | 27.5 | 19.2 |

We find that of the total repeaters, $50.9 \%$ repeated because of failure or poor performance in the examinations, $29.8 \%$ repeated because of the attendance being less than $50 \%$ which is the minimum required for promotion; and the remaining $19.2 \%$ repeated because of other reasons such as illness, inability to sit for the examination due to family related reasons. There is hardly any difference between boys and girls in respect of their distribution according to the reasons for repeating, though the percentage of girls repeating because of low attendance is slightly higher than that of boys repeating because of this reason.

Class-wise differences in the reasons for repeating are significant. In classes I and II, $54.5 \%$ and $44.4 \%$ of the repeaters respectively are detained because of low attendance, while in classes III, IV and V, the percentage of those detained because of this reason is only between 12 and 13 percent. In these classes, $60 \%$ or more of the repeaters are detained because of failure in examinations. Significantly, $32.3 \%$ of the repeaters in class I have been reported to be repeating because of poor performance, which was equated with failure in examination, inspite of the policy of no detention in class I. Actually, most schools consider poor performance in the class as the main reason for not promoting the pupils to the next class and tend to include all repeaters in this category only, even when some may be repeating because of insufficient attendance. Possibly a few of them do not include those repeating because of low
attendance among the repeaters (according to the definition of repeaters used for EMIS) as a result of which the repetition rate gets somewhat under-estimated.

### 2.11 Reasons given by parents for Lateral Entry in Classes II to V

To find out the reasons of lateral entry, that is, why the parents did not get their children admitted in class I itself in a government or recognised private school, some parents of the children who had taken lateral entry, were interviewed. In all, 163 parents / guardians of those children in classes II to V who were studying in an unrecognised school or at home previously, were included in the sample for interviewing. Incidentally, there were only 209 children in this category in our sample. The CRC Coordinators who acted as interviewers, were told to contact all the parents / guardians of such children in the sampled schools and interview those who were readily available to provide information. Some parents gave two or more reasons; here we have analysed the response, according to the first and second reason only. The interviewers who had a check-list of various possible reasons ticked the appropriate reason(s) after talking with them.

Out of the 163 parents / guardians who were interviewed, 111 were those of the children who were studying in an unrecognised school previously and 52 were those of the children who were studying at home orily. Table H9 gives the class-wise distribution of the children whose parents were interviewed.

Table H9
Class-wise Distribution of Children Studying in an Unrecognised School or at Home Previously, whose Parents were Interviewed (Hisar district)

| Category | Sex | Class |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| Children studying in an unrecognised school previously | B | 16 | 19 | 10 | 9 | 54 |
|  | G | 8 | 15 | 20 | 14 | 57 |
|  | $T$ | 24 | 34 | 30 | 23 | 111 |
| Children studying at home previously | B | 8 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 28 |
|  | $G$ | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 24 |
|  | $T$ | 14 | 17 | 13 | 8 | 52 |
| Total |  | 38 | 51 | 43 | 31 | 163 |

## Reasons for Transferring from an Unrecognised School to a Recognised One

In the sample of 111 children who were studying in an unrecognised school previously, there were 54 boys and 57 girls. Table H 10 gives the number of parents who give the different reasons for shifting their wards to government schools.

Table H10
Reasons for Shifting Children from Unrecognised Schools to Recognised Schools (HISAR DISTRICT)

| Reason for shifting from unrecognised school to the present school | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| 1 The previous school was far offf | 16 | 14.4 | 1 | 1.9 |
| 2 The school lacked necessary | 8 | 7.2 | 6 | 11.5 |
| The school did not have the 3 class in which the child is studying now | - | - | - | - |
| 4. The fees was high | 52 | 46.9 | 12 | 23.1 |
| 5 The teaching in the school was not satisfactory | 11 | 9.9 | 10 | 19.2 |
| 6 The family shifted from the place of previous school | 10 | 9.0 | - | - |
| The child could not appear im 7. class V exam. as the school was unrecognised | 7 | 6.3 | 20 | 38.5 |
| 8 Any other reason | 7 | 6.3 | 3 | 5.8 |
| Total | 111 | 100 | 52 | 100 |

We find that the most prominent reason for transferring the child to the government school was the high fees charged by the previous unrecognised school. The second reason which most parents gave was the problem due to the child not being able to appear for the district level class V examination from an unrecognised school.

There was not much gender diifference in respect of reasons given for shifting the child from an unrecognised school to a recognised one.

## A Few Characteristics of Unrecognised Schools from which the Children Shifted

Most of the unrecognised schools from which the children shifted to the government schools are well established schools having classes I to V or I to VIII, with English as the medium of instruction or one of the main subjects taught. In one case, the school was a higher secondary school, but its primary classes were unrecognised. Most schools charged fees ranging between Rs. 30 and Rs. 50 per month, but a few charged a lower fees of Rs. 25 per month, while in one school, the fee was as high as Rs. 100 per month. In general, these schools retained their pupils upto the highest class, but in some cases, parents shifted their wards to government schools where the fees was much less and the facility for taking the class $V$ examination was available. It seems that if a good private school is available and the parents can afford it, they would prefer to send their children there, even if it is unrecognised. Some further detials of the unrecognised schools are given in a note in Annexure II.

## Reasons for Not Sending the Child Earlier to School

Out of the 163 parents who were interviewed, there were 52 who had admitted their wards to school for the first time in class II or a higher class, and not in class I earlier. Table H11 lists the reasons given by parents for not sending the child to school earlier.

Table H11
Reasons for Not Sending the Child to School Earlier (Hisar district)

| Reason for not sending the child to school earlier \& getting him tutored at home | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| 1 The child was too young and shy to go to school | 13 | 25.0 | - |  |
| 2 Tutoring at home was more effective | - | - | - |  |
| The child had to remain at <br> 3 home to help in household chores | 29 | 55.8 | 3 | 11.5 |
| In school, much time is spent 4 on games / sports and less on instruction | - | - | 8 | 30.8 |
| 5 The school was at a distance from home | 2 | 3.8 | 6 | 23.1 |
| 6 The child had to look after younger siblings at home | 8 | 15.4 | 9 | 34.6 |
| 7. Any other reason | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 52 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 |

The major reason for not sending the child to school earlier was the need for keeping him / her at home for attending to household chores and looking after the younger siblings. A few parents ( $25 \%$ ) felt that the child was too young or shy to be enrolled earlier in class I. As a secondary reason, apart from these two, the feeling that at school, sufficient time was not spent on actual instruction was also given by a few parents. The gender differences in respect of the reasons given for not enrolling the child in school earlier, were found to be insignificant. For example, almost equal number of parents of both boys and girls gave the involvement of the child in household work or looking after siblings as the reason. In most cases, the children were tutored at home by their parents or other brothers / sisters and not by hired tutors.

### 2.12 Repetition and Dropout rates corrected for lateral entry and LATE ADMISSION OF CHILDREN

When the late admissions (that is, admissions after 30 September for the purpose of this study) and lateral entry in classes II to V are ignored, the dropout rates tend to get
under-estimated. Sometimes the dropout rate becomes even negative, as is the case in grade I of Hisar.

Here we are going to estimate the actual repetition and dropout rates for each grade which is duly corrected for late admissions in 1997-98 and for lateral entry between 1 April, 1998 and 31 August, 1998. Normally the repetition and dropout rates for grade i and year t (ignoring late admissions and lateral entry) are obtained as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Repetition Rate }=\frac{R(i, t+1)}{E(i, t)} \\
& \text { Dropout Rate }=\frac{E(i, t)-R(i, t+1)-[E(i+1, t+1)-R(i+1, t+1)]}{E(i, t)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $E(i, t)$ denotes the enrolment and $R(i, t)$ the number of repeaters in grade $i$ in year $t$. Here the dropouts are determined by subtracting the repeaters in grade i and promotees in grade $\mathrm{i}+1$ in the year $\mathrm{t}+1$ from the enrolment in grade i in year t .

Table H 12 shows the calculation of repetition and drop-out rates from the grade-wise enrolment and repeaters data of 1997 and 1998 of Hisar (without correction) in the rows (6) and (7) and also with correction for lateral entry and late admissions in rows (15) and (16). It may be pointed out that here only those cases of lateral entry have been considered, in which the students have not come on transfer from other government or recognised private schools. Similarly, in the late admission cases, the children who have shifted from other government/recognised private schools have been excluded. In this table, the overall repetition and dropout rates (with and without correction) have been shown for the total of all the classes. The overall repetition rate is derived from the total enrolment (in 1997) total repeaters (in 1998) of classes I to V while the overall dropout rate is based on the total enrolment and total dropouts of classes I to IV.

Table H12
CALCULATION OF REPETITION AND DROPOUT RATES WITH AND WITHOUT CORRECTION FOR Lateral entry and late admissions (HISAR district)

| - |  | Sex | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | I-V/(I-IV) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Enrolment (30.9.97) | Boys | 2492 | 2723 | 2142 | 1816 | 1587 | 10760/(9173) |
|  |  | Girls | 2357 | 2439 | 2100 | 1514 | 1362 | 9772/(8410) |
|  |  | Total | 4849 | 5162 | 4242 | 3330 | 2949 | 20532/(17583) |
| 2 | Enrolment (31.8.98) | Boys | 2018 | 2587 | 2490 | 1861 | 1450 | 10406 |
|  |  | Girls | 1950 | 2386 | 2338 | 1886 | 1287 | 9847 |
|  |  | Total | 3968 | 4973 | 4828 | 3747 | 2737 | 20553 |
| 3 | Repeaters (31.8.98) | Boys | 330 | 350 | 380 | 283 | 103 | 1446 |
|  |  | Girls | 301 | 256 | 361 | 206 | 97 | 1221 |
|  |  | Total | 631 | 606 | 741 | 489 | 200 | 2667 |
| 4 | Promotees (31.8.98)$(2)-(3)$ | Boys | - | 2237 | 2110 | 1578 | 1347 | - |
|  |  | Girls | - | 2130 | 1977 | 1680 | 1190 | - |
|  |  | Total | - | 4367 | 4087 | 3258 | 2537 | - |
| 5 | Dropouts (1997-98)$(1)-(3)-(4)^{*}$ | Boys | -75 | 263 | 184 | 186 | - | 558 |
|  |  | Girls | -74 | 206 | 59 | 118 | - | 309 |
|  |  | Total | -149 | 469 | 243 | 304 | - | 867 |
| 6 | Repetition Rate (1997)$(3) /(1)^{*} 100$ | Boys | 13.2 | 12.9 | 17.7 | 15.6 | 6.5 | 13.4 |
|  |  | Girls | 12.8 | 10.5 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 7.1 | 12.5 |
|  |  | Total | 13.0 | 11.7 | 17.5 | 14.7 | 6.8 | 13.0 |
| 7. | Dropout Rate( 1997)$(5) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | -3.0 | 9.7 | 8.6 | 10.2 | - | 6.1 |
|  |  | Girls | -3.1 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 7.8 | - | 3.7 |
|  |  | Total | -3.1 | 9.1 | 5.7 | 9.1 | - | 4.9 |
| 8 | Late admissions (1997) excluding transferees from government schools | Boys | 268 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 102 | 413 |
|  |  | Girls | 191 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 94 | 334 |
|  |  | Total | 459 | 30 | 26 | 36 | 196 | 747 |
| 9. | Lateral entrants (1998) excluding transferees from government schools | Boys | - | 34 | 46 | 22 | 19 | 121 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 15 | 25 | 30 | 18 | 88 |
|  |  | Total | - | 49 | 71 | 52 | 37 | 209 |
| 10. | Net Promotees (1998 excluding lateral entrants) (2)-(3)-(9) or (4)-(9) | Boys |  | 2203 | 2064 | 1556 | 1328 | - |
|  |  | Girls |  | 2115 | 1952 | 1650 | 1172 | - |
|  |  | Total |  | 4318 | 4016 | 3206 | 2500 | - |
| 11. | Net Dropouts (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry) (1)-(3)-(10) ${ }^{*}$ | Boys | -41 | 309 | 206 | 205 | - | 679 |
|  |  | Girls | -59 | 231 | 89 | 136 | - | 397 |
|  |  | Total | -100 | 540 | 295 | 341 | - | 1076 |
| 12 | Dropout rate (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry)$(11) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | -1.6 | 11.3 | 9.6 | 11.3 | - | 7.4 |
|  |  | Girls | -2.5 | 9.5 | 4.2 | 9.0 | - | 4.7 |
|  |  | Total | -2.1 | 10.5 | 7.0 | 10.2 | - | 6.1 |
| 13. | Enrolment including late admissions (1997)$(1)+(8)$ | Boys | 2760 | 2737 | 2155 | 1832 | 1689 | 11173/(9484) |
|  |  | Girls | 2548 | 2455 | 2113 | 1534 | 1456 | 10106/(8650) |
|  |  | Total | 5308 | 5192 | 4268 | 3366 | 3145 | 21279/(18134) |
| 14. | Net dropouts (1997-98) from enrolment at (13)$(13)-(3)-(10)^{*}$ | Boys | 227 | 323 | 219 | 221 | - | 990 |
|  |  | Girls | 132 | 247 | 102 | 156 | - | 637 |
|  |  | Total | 359 | 570 | 321 | 377 | - | 1627 |
| 15. | Repetition rate (1997), corrected for late admissions$(3) /(13) * 100$ | Boys | 12.0 | 12.8 | 17.6 | 15.4 | 6.1 | 12.9 |
|  |  | Girls | 11.8 | 10.4 | 17.1 | 13.4 | 6.7 | 12.1 |
|  |  | Total | 11.9 | 11.7 | 17.4 | 14.5 | 6.4 | 12.5 |
| 16 | Dropout rate (1997-98), corrected for both lateral entry and late admissions (14)/(13)* 100 | Boys | 8.2 | 11.8 | 10.2 | 12.1 | - | 10.4 |
|  |  | Girls | 5.2 | 10.1 | 4.8 | 10.2 | - | 7.4 |
|  |  | Total | 6.8 | 11.0 | 7.5 | 11.2 | - | 9.0 |

When the correction for lateral entry only is made, the number of actual promotees decreases in each class (see row 10 of the table) and consequently the number of dropouts increases and so does the dropout rate. The dropout rates corrected for lateral entry are shown in row (12). It may be noticed that the dropout rate for grade I is still negative.

To arrive at dropout rates which are corrected for late admissions also, the enrolment in 1997 has to include their number, since the repeaters and promotees in 1998 include children out of these late entrants also. Correcting for these late admissions as well, the actual dropout rate for each class has been obtained and shown in row (16). The corrected repetition rates are similarly shown in row (15).

We find the corrected dropout rates are significantly higher than the uncorrected ones and the change in class I is particularly significant due to a large number of late admission in this class. The repetition rates decreased slightly when the enrolment of 1997 was corrected to include those who were admitted late (after 30.9.97). The comparisons are shown below:

Uncorrected and Corrected Repetition and Dropout rates

| Class | Repetition Rate |  |  |  |  | Dropout Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | uncorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  | Uncorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| I | 13.2 | 12.8 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | 12.0 | 11.8 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 8}$ | -3.0 | -3.1 | $\mathbf{- 3 . 1}$ | 8.2 | 5.2 | $\mathbf{6 . 8}$ |
| II | 12.9 | 10.5 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 7}$ | 12.8 | 10.4 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6}$ | 9.7 | 8.4 | $\mathbf{9 . 1}$ | 11.8 | 10.1 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0}$ |
| III | 17.7 | 17.2 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 5}$ | 17.6 | 17.1 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 2}$ | 8.6 | 2.8 | $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ | 10.2 | 4.8 | 7.5 |
| IV | 15.6 | 13.6 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ | 15.4 | 13.4 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 5}$ | 10.2 | 7.8 | $\mathbf{9 . 1}$ | 12.1 | 10.2 | 11.2 |
| V | 6.5 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 6.7 | $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 13.4 | 12.5 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | 12.9 | 12.1 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 5}$ | 6.1 | 4.9 | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ | 10.4 | 7.4 | -3 |

As regards the gender differences, the repetition rate of girls are slightly lower than those of boys in each class except class V . The differences are however, quite small. The dropout rate of girls is also somewhat lower than those of boys in all the classes, I to IV, and the difference is quite significant in classes I and III.

## CHAPTER III

## Findings of the study for Kaithal district

### 3.1 SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS

In Kaithal the sample consisted of 56 schools belonging to 9 sampled clusters of the district. The total enrolment in these schools was 18377 on 30.9 .97 and 18140 31.8.98. The 56 schools constituted a $13.6 \%$ sample of schools of Hisar district and the enrolment in these schools was $18.9 \%$ of the total enrolment in classes I to V in the district in 1997-98. Obviously, the sample has over representation of large schools.

### 3.2 Changes in enrolment within the year

The enrolment in 1997/98 declined slightly between 30.9 .97 and 31.3.98, which was the last day of the school year. Table K1 shows the changes in enrolment during the year. We find the enrolment declined by $3.2 \%$ between 30.9 .97 and 31.3.98. But unlike Hisar, the difference between the rate of decline in the number of boys and girls is negligible. While the enrolment decreased in classes II to V , it increased in class I by $2.3 \%$ between 30.9 .97 and 31.12 .97 as a result of late admissions. However, it again decreased to 30.9 .97 level, due to some children dropping out or shifting to other schools. In classes II, III and IV there is steady decline in enrolment between 30.9 .97 and 31.3 .98 ; it declined by $4.5 \%$ in classes II and III, by $6.3 \%$ in class IV and by just $0.6 \%$ in class V .

TAbLE K1
EnROLMENT IN CLASSES I TO V AT THE BEGINNING, THE MIDDLE AND THE END OF SCHOOL YEAR AND INDICES OF CHANGE, 1997-98 (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

| Date | Class-I |  |  | Class-II |  |  | Class-III |  |  | Class-IV |  |  | Class-V |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 30.09.97 | 2446 | 2385 | 4831 | 2194 | 1916 | 4110 | 1991 | 1603 | 3594 | 1683 | 1384 | 3067 | 1556 | 1219 | 2775 | 9870 | 8507 | 18377 |
| 31.12.97 | 2511 | 2430 | 4941 | 2169 | 1887 | 4056 | 1959 | 1571 | 3530 | 1646 | 1358 | 3004 | 1531 | 1228 | 2759 | 9816 | 8473 | 18289 |
| 31.03 .98 | 2454 | 2362 | 4816 | 2066 | 1809 | 3875 | 1871 | 1519 | 3390 | 1606 | 1317 | 2923 | 1539 | 1208 | 2747 | 9536 | 8248 | 17784 |
|  | Indices of change with $\mathbf{3 0 . 0 9 . 9 7}$ figures as 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30.09.97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 31.12 .97 | 102.7 | 101.9 | 102.3 | 98.9 | 98.5 | 98.7 | 98.4 | 98.0 | 98.2 | 97.8 | 98.1 | 97.9 | 98.4 | 100.7 | 99.4 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 99.5 |
| 31.03 .98 | 100.3 | 99.0 | 99.7 | 94.2 | 94.4 | 94.3 | 94.0 | 94.8 | 94.3 | 95.4 | 95.2 | 95.3 | 98.9 | 99.1 | 99.0 | 96.6 | 97.0 | 96.8 |

### 3.3 Children admitted after 30 September, 1997

In Kaithal too, there are relatively more cases of late admission in classes I and $V$ and very few in classes II, III and IV. Table K2 shows the number and percentage of late entrants in different classes. The late entrants constituted $2.5 \%$ of the pupils enrolled on 30.9 .97 . The percentage is the same $2.5 \%$ in the case of both boys and girls. The children who were admitted late (after 30.9.97) in class I constituted $12.5 \%$ of the $30^{\text {th }}$ September class I enrolment. In class IV, this percentage was $5.8 \%$ and in all other classes less than $1 \%$.

Table K2
NUMBER OF LATE ENTRANTS (CHILDREN ADMITTED AFTER 30.9.97) AND TRANSFEREES FROM GOVERNMENT/RECOGNISED PRIVATE SCHOOLS AMONG THEM (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

|  | Item | Sex | Number of pupils admitted after 30.09.97 in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | Totals |
| (a) | Late entrant pupils admitted after 30.09.97 | Boys | 102 | 13 | 21 | 9 | 99 | 244 |
|  |  | Girls | 114 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 63 | 210 |
|  |  | Total | 216 | 24 | 35 | 17 | 162 | 454 |
| (b) | Pupils transferred from other Govt. or recognised private schools out of (a) | Boys | - | 7 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 20 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 8 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 25 |
|  |  | Total | - | 15 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 45 |
| (c) | Late entrants per 100 pupils enrolled on 30.9.97 | Boys | 4.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 6.4 | 2.5 |
|  |  | Girls | 4.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 5.2 | 2.5 |
|  |  | Total | 4.5 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 5.8 | 2.5 |
| d) | (b) as \% of (a) | Boys | - | 53.8 | 19.0 | 33.3 | 6.1 | 8.2 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 72.7 | 50.0 | 87.5 | 4.8 | 11.9 |
|  |  | Total | - | 62.5 | 31.4 | 58.8 | 5.6 | 9.9 |

n classes II and IV, about $60 \%$ of the late entrants were transferees from other oovernment or recognised private schools; but in class V , only $5.6 \%$ were transferees rom such schools; the rest $94 \%$ came from other unrecognised schools or after tudying at home.

## . 4 SCHOOL LEAVERS FROM DIFFERENT CLASSES

'able K3 gives the number of pupils who left school during the school year, that is, ktween 30.9.97 and 31.3.98 and of those who left after 31.3.98, that is, who did not turn to the same school after the summer vacation.

Table K3
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WHO LEFT SCHOOL AFTER 30.9.97 (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

| Item | Sex | Number of pupils who left school |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| Total leavers between 30.09 .97 \& 31.08.98 | Boys | 90 | 169 | 183 | 116 | 135 | 693 |
|  | Girls | 112 | 150 | 139 | 131 | 106 | 638 |
|  | Total | 202 | 319 | 322 | 247 | 241 | 1331 |
| Leavers between 30.09.97 and 31.08.98 | Boys | 89 | 136 | 141 | 83 | 85 | 1969 |
|  | Girls | 109 | 117 | 91 | 90 | 57 | 3300 |
|  | Total | 198 | 253 | 232 | 173 | 142 | 5269 |
| \% of children who left between 30.09 .97 and 31.08.98 | Boys | 3.7 | 7.7 | 9.2 | 6.9 | 8.7 | 7.2 |
|  | Girls | 4.7 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 8.7 | 7.9 |
|  | Total | 4.2 | 7.8 | 9.0 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 7.2 |
| \% of children who left between 30.09 .97 and 31.03 .98 | Boys | 3.6 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
|  | Girls | 4.6 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 4.7 | 5.5 |
|  | Total | 4.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 5.4 |
| \% of children leaving between 30.09 .97 and 31.03 .98 out of total leavers | Boys | 98.9 | 80.5 | 77.0 | 71.6 | 63.0 | 77.1 |
|  | Girls | 97.3 | 78.0 | 65.5 | 68.7 | 53.8 | 64.1 |
|  | Total | 98.0 | 79.3 | 72.0 | 70.0 | 58.9 | 70.4 |

Of the total children enrolled on 30.9.97, $7.2 \%$ left school either during or at the end of the school year. Among these leavers, $70.4 \%$ were those who left during the school year (i.e. before 31.3 .98 ) and the rest $29.6 \%$ after 31.3.98. The percentage of girls among the leavers was almost the same as that of boys.

The percentage of children who left school was lowest in class I (only 4.2\%) while in classes II to V , the percentage of leavers was between $7.8 \%$ and $9.0 \%$. In class I, most of the leavers ( $98 \%$ ) were those who left before the end of the school year; only $2 \%$ of the leavers were those who did not return to the school after remaining in school till the end of the school year. Inc lasses II to IV the percentage of leavers who left before the end of school year was relatively less (between $70 \%$ and $80 \%$ ). In other words, while only $2 \%$ of the leavers were those who did not return to the same school after the summer vacation after remaining in school till the end of school, the percentage of such children in classes II to IV was between $20 \%$ and $30 \%$. All those who left were not necessarily dropouts; some of them would have joined other schools.

### 3.5 DROPOUTS AMONG SCHOOL LEAVERS

For the pupils who left school in 1997-98, information was sought on whether they joined other schools or became a dropout.

The schools reported that out of the 1331 pupils who left, $25.2 \%$ had joined other government or recognised private school, $38.9 \%$ had moved to an unrecognised private school, $13.2 \%$ had simply dropout and the remaining $22.6 \%$ were those about whom no information was available. Assuming that they too were dropouts, the percentage of the school leavers who did not continue schooling but dropped out becomes $35.8 \%$. Among the children who left school, the percentage of those who shifted to another unrecognised school was highest in classes I and II (48.5\% and $49.7 \%$ respectively) and lowest in class V (23.2\%).

Table 4
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL LEAVERS ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY TRANSFERRED TO OTHER SCHOOLS OR DROPPED OUT (KAITIIAL DISTRICT)

|  | Item | Class I |  |  | Class II |  |  | Class III |  |  | Class IV |  |  | Class V |  |  | Totals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 1. | Total Enrolment (30.9.97) | 2446 | 2385 | 4831 | 2194 | 1916 | 4110 | 1991 | 1603 | 3594 | 1683 | 1384 | 3067 | 1556 | 1219 | 2775 | 9870 | 8507 | 18377 |
| 2. | Total School Leavers | 90 | 112 | 202 | 169 | 150 | 319 | 183 | 139 | 322 | 116 | 131 | 247 | 135 | 106 | 241 | 693 | 638 | 1331 |
| 3. | (2) as \% of (1) | 3.68 | 4.70 | 4.18 | 7.70 | 7.83 | 7.76 | 9.19 | 8.67 | 8.96 | 6.89 | 9.47 | 8.05 | 8.68 | 8.70 | 8.68 | 7.02 | 7.50 | 7.24 |
|  | Number of those who: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | joined other Govt./recognised private school | 15 | 11 | 26 | 44 | 23 | 67 | 65 | 44 | 109 | 31 | 35 | 66 | 35 | 33 | 68 | 190 | 146 | 336 |
| 5. | joined unrecognised schools | 43 | 55 | 98 | 84 | 73 | 157 | 71 | 56 | 127 | 38 | 42 | 80 | 35 | 21 | 56 | 271 | 247 | 518 |
| 6. | dropped out | 9 | 21 | 30 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 11 | 17 | 28 | 13 | 18 | 31 | 23 | 24 | 47 | 71 | 105 | 176 |
| 7. | could not be located | 23 | 25 | 48 | 26 | 29 | 55 | 36 | 22 | 58 | 34 | 36 | 70 | 42 | 28 | 70 | 161 | 140 | 301 |
| 8. | (6+7) | 32 | 46 | 78 | 41 | 54 | 95 | 47 | 39 | 86 | 47 | 54 | 101 | 65 | 52 | 117 | 232 | 245 | 477 |
|  | \% of those out of (2) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | joined other Govt./recognised private school | 16.67 | 9.82 | 12.87 | 26.04 | 15.33 | 21.00 | 35.52 | 13.79 | 33.85 | 16.94 | 25.18 | 26.72 | 10.87 | 28.45 | 28.22 | 27.42 | 22.88 | 25.24 |
| 10. | joined unrecognised schools | 47.78 | 49.11 | 48.51 | 49.70 | 48.67 | 49.22 | 38.80 | 40.29 | 39.44 | 32.76 | 32.06 | 32.39 | 25.93 | 19.81 | 23.24 | 39.11 | 38.71 | 38.92 |
| 11. | dropped out | 10.00 | 18.75 | 14.85 | 8.88 | 16.67 | 12.54 | 6.01 | 12.23 | 8.70 | 11.21 | 13.74 | 12.55 | 17.04 | 22.64 | 19.50 | 10.25 | 16.46 | 13.22 |
| 12. | could not be located | 25.56 | 22.32 | 23.76 | 15.38 | 19.33 | 17.24 | 19.67 | 15.83 | 18.01 | 29.31 | 27.48 | 28.34 | 31.11 | 26.42 | 29.05 | 23.23 | 21.94 | 22.61 |
| 13. | (11) + (12) | 35.56 | 41.07 | 38.61 | 24.26 | 36.00 | 29.78 | 25.68 | 28.06 | 26.71 | 40.52 | 41.22 | 40.89 | 48.15 | 49.06 | 48.55 | 33.48 | 38.40 | 35.84 |
|  | \% of those out of (1) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. | joined other Govt./ recognised private school | 0.61 | 0.46 | 0.54 | 2.01 | 1.20 | 1.63 | 3.26 | 2.74 | 3.03 | 1.84 | 2.53 | 2.15 | 2.25 | 2.71 | 2.45 | 1.93 | 1.72 | 1.83 |
| 15. | joined unrecognised schools | 1.76 | 2.31 | 2.03 | 3.83 | 3.81 | 3.82 | 3.57 | 3.49 | 3.53 | 2.26 | 3.03 | 2.61 | 2.25 | 1.72 | 2.02 | 2.75 | 2.90 | 2.82 |
| 16. | dropped out | 0.37 | 0.88 | 0.62 | 0.68 | 1.30 | 0.97 | 0.55 | 1.06 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 1.30 | 1.01 | 1.48 | 1.97 | 1.69 | 0.72 | 1.23 | 0.96 |
| 17. | could not be located | 0.94 | 1.05 | 0.99 | 1.19 | 1.51 | 1.34 | 1.81 | 1.37 | 1.61 | 2.02 | 2.60 | 2.28 | 2.70 | 2.30 | 2.52 | 1.63 | 1.65 | 1.64 |
| 18. | (16)+(17) | 1.31 | 1.93 | 1.61 | 1.87 | 2.82 | 2.31 | 2.36 | 2.43 | 2.39 | 2.79 | 3.90 | 3.29 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 2.35 | 2.88 | 2.60 |
| 19. | (15)+(16)+(17) | 3.1 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 5.4 |

Considering all those who did not shift to another government/recognised private school as dropouts, we find that out of the total students, $5.4 \%$ had dropped out. This dropout rate was lowest in class I (3.6\%) and around $6 \%$ in other classes. The dropout rates were higher for girls in classes I, II and IV and same for boys and girls in class III. The comments about these dropout rates being tentative made in the case of Hisar are applicable here too.

### 3.6 CHILDREN ADMITTED DIRECTLY IN GRADES OTHER THAN GRADE I IN 1998

Table K 5 gives the number and percentage of children admitted directly in grades II, III, IV and V in the school year 1998-99 up to 31.8.98. The table according to whether they were in school or not, last year.

Table K5
NUMBER OF CHILDREN ADMITTED DIRECTLY IN CLASSES II, III, IV AND V IN 1998 UPTO $31^{\text {sT }}$ AUGUST (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

| Item | Sex | Classes |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $V$ | Totals |
| Number of children taking direct admission | Boys | 41 | 49 | 52 | 82 | 224 |
|  | Girls | 26 | 43 | 48 | 58 | 175 |
|  | Total | 67 | 92 | 100 | 140 | 399 |
| $\%$ of such children among the total students of classes II to V | Boys | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 2.9 |
|  | Girls | 1.2 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 2.6 |
|  | Total | 1.5 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 2.8 |
| \% of children coming from unrecog. Schools/homes in total students of classes Il to V | Boys | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
|  | Girls | 07 | 10 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.4 |
|  | Total | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 1.5 |
| Out of the children admitted directly |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\%$ of those transferred from other government or recognised private schools | Boys | 56.1 | 40.8 | 67.3 | 23.2 | 43.3 |
|  | Girls | 42.3 | 58.1 | 52.1 | 36.2 | 46.9 |
|  | Total | 50.7 | 48.9 | 60.0 | 28.6 | 44.9 |
| $\%$ of those who came from unrecognised schools | Boys | 34.1 | 28.6 | 19.2 | 51.2 | 35.7 |
|  | Girls | 34.6 | 18.6 | 31.3 | 46.6 | 33.7 |
|  | Total | 34.4 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 49.3 | 34.8 |
| \% of those who were studying at home | Boys | 9.8 | 30.6 | 13.5 | 25.6 | 21.0 |
|  | Girls | 23.1 | 23.3 | 16.7 | 17.2 | 19.4 |
|  | Total | 14.9 | 27.2 | 15.0 | 22.1 | 20.3 |

Among the total students enrolled in classes II to V on 31.8 .98 , only $2.8 \%$ were those who had come from other schools or after studying at home; the rest $97.2 \%$ were either promotees or repeaters from the same school. The maximum percentage of children admitted directly form outside (i.e. not from the same school where they
were studying last year) was in classes IV and V ( $3.1 \%$ and $5.2 \%$ respectively). In classes II and III the percentage of such children was rather small ( $1.5 \%$ and $2.3 \%$ respectively).

Among the children who came from outside in classes II to V, $44.9 \%$ were those who had came on transfer from other government or recognised private school. They included $82 \%$ promotees from the previous class and $18 \%$ repeaters of the same class.

The children who came from other unrecognised private schools constituted $34.8 \%$ of the lateral intranets in grades II to V. The remaining $20.3 \%$ of the lateral entrants had come after studying at home and not in any school, recognised or unrecognised. In the total enrolment of classes II to V, the percentage of those who took lateral entry in these of classes after studying in an unrecognised school or at home previously, was $1.5 \%$ only. It implies that the remaining $28.5 \%$ children were studying in the same school or another government/recognised private school previously.

There were relatively more boys than girls among the lateral entrants. Among those who entered lateraly in classes II to V after studying in an unrecognised school or at home in the previous year, $58 \%$ were boys and $42 \%$ girls. Class-wise analysis shows that the children coming from unrecognised schools or no school constituted $0.7 \%$, $1.2 \%, 1.2 \%$ and $3.7 \%$ of the total enrolment in classes II, III, IV and $V$ respectively.

Table K6
Total Enrolment and Number of Repeaters in Classes I to V in 1998 and Repetition RATES FOR 1997 (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

| Items | Siex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrolment on$31.08 .98$ | Boys | 1902 | 2328 | 2116 | 1823 | 1522 | 9691 |
|  | Giirls | 1786 | 2240 | 1833 | 1424 | 1166 | 8449 |
|  | Total | 3688 | 4568 | 3949 | 3247 | 2688 | 18140 |
| Number of repeaters on 31.08.98 | Broys | 443 | 308 | 334 | 283 | 168 | 1536 |
|  | Giirls | 400 | 287 | 309 | 208 | 65 | 1269 |
|  | Total | 843 | 595 | 643 | 491 | 233 | 2805 |
| \% of repeaters | Broys | 23.3 | 13.2 | 15.8 | 15.5 | 11.0 | 15.8 |
|  | Giirls | 22.4 | 12.8 | 16.9 | 14.6 | 5.6 | 15.0 |
|  | Total | 22.9 | 13.0 | 16.3 | 15.1 | 8.7 | 15.5 |
| Repetition rate | Boys | 18.1 | 14.0 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 10.8 | 15.6 |
|  | Giirls | 16.8 | 15.0 | 19.3 | 15.0 | 5.3 | 14.9 |
|  | Tootal | 17.4 | 14.5 | 17.9 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 15.3 |
| Repetition rate based on EMIS data for 1996-97 | Boys | 15.1 | 10.6 | 14.6 | 12.5 | 9.3 | 12.6 |
|  | Giirls | 15.2 | 9.5 | 13.9 | 10.5 | 8.6 | 11.9 |
|  | Total | 15.2 | 10.1 | 14.3 | 11.5 | 9.0 | 12.3 |

### 3.7 DROPOUTS RE-ADMITTED IN SCHOOLS AFTER A GAP OF ONE OR MORE YEARS

Very few children among those who had dropped out earlier from a primary class, had joined the school again this year (upto 31.8.98) after remaining out of school for 1 or more years. In classes II to $V$, there were 122 children which is just $0.84 \%$ of the total 14452 enrolled in these classes. Among them, $50 \%$ were boys and $50 \%$ girls. The maximum number of such dropouts who had returned to school were in classes III and IV (43 and 35 respectively out of 122).

### 3.8 Repeaters among the pupils in 1998/99 and Repetition Rate

Table K6 gives class-wise number of students enrolled as on 31.8.98 and the number of repeaters among them, as well as repetition rates and percentage of repeaters in each class.

The over-all repetition rate for 1997 in $15.3 \%$. The difference between the repetition rate of boys and girls is not much, as it is $15.5 \%$ for boys and $14.9 \%$ for girls.

The repetition rate is high in classes I and III ( $17.4 \%$ and $17.9 \%$ respectively); it is lowest in class V ( $8.4 \%$ ). The trend is similar to that of Hisar. The high dropout rate in class I shows that the policy of no detention in class I had not be adhered to.

Comparing the repetition rates with those derived from EMIS data of 1996-97 and 1997-98 for the whole district, we find that the latter are lower than those of this study in all the classes except class V . The overall repetition rate obtained from EMIS data for the year 1996-97 is $12.3 \%$ while the repetition rate for 1997-98 derived from the data of our sample study is $15.3 \%$. Apart from the sampling error a possible reason for the difference is in the definition of repeaters; in our study anyone who repeated the class for whatever reason was considered a repeater, while in the case of EMIS, only those who repeated because of unsatisfactory performance were deemed as repeaters.

### 3.9 Percentage of repeaters in different classes

The percentage of repeaters in different classes which also gives some idea of the magnitude of repetition has been calculated for the year 1997-98 from the data on enrolment and repeaters of this study. The same has been derived from the EMIS data of the years 1996-97 and 1997-98 also and compared with the figures of this study in Table K7.

Table K7
Percentage of repeaters in different classes for 1998-99 based on the present study AND FOR 1996-97 AND 1997-98 ACCODING TO FROM EMIS (HISAR DISTRICT)

| Present study (1998-99) | Sex | Percentage of repeaters in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\boldsymbol{I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I} \boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}$ | Total |
|  | Boys | 23.3 | 13.2 | 15.8 | 15.5 | 11.0 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 9}$ |
|  | Girls | 22.4 | 12.8 | 16.9 | 14.6 | 5.6 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 0}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 5}$ |
| EMIS (1996-97) | Boys | 14.5 | 11.9 | 16.7 | 14.7 | 13.5 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 2}$ |
|  | Girls | 13.5 | 10.6 | 14.6 | 11.3 | 12.3 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 5}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 2}$ | 13.0 | 13.5 |
| EMIS (1997-98) | Boys | 14.2 | 9.9 | 13.7 | 12.5 | 9.2 | 12.1 |
|  | Girls | 13.8 | 8.3 | 12.8 | 10.3 | 8.6 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 6}$ |

We find that the percentage of repeaters ( $15.5 \%$ ) according to this study is much higher than the percentage (11.6\%) according to EMIS for 1997-98. As already pointed out earlier, a possible reason for this difference is the difference in the definition of repeaters used in this study and in the collection of data for EMIS. The difference in the percentage of repeaters in classes I and II is particularly large. In class I, it is mainly due to decline in enrolment between 1997 and 1998.

### 3.10 REASONS FOR REPETITION

In the case of repeaters, the information collected from schools about the reason for repeating shows that the principal reasons were poor progress in learning and the attendance being less than the minimum $50 \%$ required for being eligible for promotion to the next higher class. Table K8 gives the distribution of repeaters according to the reason for repeating.

Table K8
Percentage distribution of repeaters according the reason for repeating (Kaithal DISTRICT)

| Reason for repeating | Sex | Percentage of children |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | Totals |
| Failure in the examination | Boys | - | 22.7 | 73.1 | 81.6 | 90.5 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 4}$ |
|  | Girls | - | 17.4 | 76.4 | 86.5 | 81.5 | $\mathbf{4 0 . 9}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 20.2 | 74.7 | $\mathbf{8 3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 4}$ |
| Attendance being below 50\% | Boys | 74.7 | 57.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | - | $\mathbf{3 3 . 2}$ |
|  | Girls | 64.0 | 47.4 | - | - | - | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{6 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6}$ |
| Other reasons | Boys | 25.3 | 20.1 | 26.6 | 17.7 | 9.5 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 4}$ |
|  | Girls | 36.0 | 35.2 | 23.6 | 13.5 | 18.5 | $\mathbf{2 8 . 2}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 5}$ |

The main reason for repeating in classes III to V is the failure in examinations. In this district, the schools did not report anyone repeating because of failure in examination as there is no examination in class I. All those who repeated because of poor performance in class I were treated as cases of 'shortage of attendance or included under' other reasons. There is not much of gender difference in the causes repetition, but relatively more boys than girls were reported to be repeating because of the shortage of attendance.

### 3.11 REASONS GIVEN BY PARENTS FOR LATERAL ENTRY IN CLASSES II TO V

Parents of 120 students who had taken lateral entry in class II, III, IV or V after studying in an unrecognised school or at home were interviewed to find out the reasons for not taking admission in class I itself or for shifting from an unrecognised school to a recognised one. In our sample of schools, there were 220 students of whom 139 had shifted from an unrecognised school and 81 had been studying at home only previously. In the sub-sample of 120 parents of those children who had shifted from an unrecognised school and 31 of those who had been studying at home previously. The distribution of students by class whose parents were interviewed is given in Table K9.

Table K9
Class-wise Distribution of Children Studying in an Unrecognised School or at Home Previously, whose Parents were Interviewed (Kaithal district)

| Category | Sex | Classes |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $\mathbf{V}$ | Total |
| Children studying in an <br> unrecognised school <br> previously | Boys | 10 | 9 | 16 | 13 | 48 |
|  | Girls | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 31 |
|  | Total | 16 | 16 | 30 | 17 | 79 |
| Children studying at home <br> previously | Boys | 3 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 25 |
|  | Girls | 2 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
|  | Total | 5 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 41 |

## Reasons for transferring from an unrecognised school to a recognised one

In the sample of 79 student: who were studying in an unrecognised school previously, there were 48 boys and 31 girls. Table K10 gives the distribution of their parents according to the reason theyy gave for shifting the child to a government school.

Table K10
Reasons for Shifting Childden from Unrecognised Schools to Recognised Schools (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

| Reason for shifting from unretcognised school to the present schiool | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| 1. The previous school was farr off | 8 | 10.1 | - | - |
| 2 The school lacked necessary facilities | 4 | 5.1 | 3 | 7.7 |
| 3. The school did not have the class in which the child is studying now | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 2.6 |
| 4. The fees was high | 26 | 32.9 | 8 | 20.5 |
| 5. The teaching in the schooll was not satisfactory | 5 | 6.3 | 19 | 48.7 |
| 6 The family shifted from thee place of previous school | 4 | 5.1 | - | - |
| The child could not appear in class $V$ <br> 7. exam. as the schoool was unrecognised | 26 | 32.9 | 8 | 20.5 |
| 8 Any other reason | 5 | 6.3 | - | - |
| Total | 79 | 100.0 | 39 | 100.0 |

The two most prominent reasons for shifting the child from an unrecognised school to a government school are (1) high fees charged by the school which the parents could no longer afford and (2) the child could not appear in class $V$ examination from an unrecognised school.

## Characteristics of the unrecognised schools from which the children shifted

The characteristics of the schools from where the children shifted to their present school are similar to those described in the case of Hisar. The fees charged by them ranged between Rs. 25 to Rs. 50 per month, though in one case it was as high as Rs. $80 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. In general, the perception of parents was these were good schools and if they could afford it, and had there been no technical difficulty in taking the district level class V examination, they would have preferred to keep the child in these unrecognised schools. Some further details of these schools are given in Annex II.

## Reasons'for not sending the child earlier to school

Out of the 39 parents who had got their words admitted in class II or a higher class directly for the first time this year, the reason given by them not getting the child admitted in class I earlier are shown in Table K11 along with the frequency of each reason.

Table K11
Reasons for Not Sending the Child to School Earlier (Kaithal district)

| Reason for not sending the child to school earlier \& getting him tutored at home | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| l The child was too young and shy to go to school | 8 | 19.5 | 14 | 37.8 |
| 2 Tutoring at home was more effective | 2 | 4.9 | 2 | 5.4 |
| 3 The child had to remain at home to help in household chores | 2 | 4.9 | 10 | 27.0 |
| 4 In school, much time is spent on games / sports and less on instruction | - | - | - | - |
| 5 The school was at a distance from home | 7 | 17.1 | 7 | 18.9 |
| 6 The child had to look after younger siblings at home | 20 | 48.8 | 4 | 10.8 |
| 7. Any other reason | 2 | 4.9 | - | - |
| Total | 41 | 100.0 | 37 | 100.0 |

The major reason given by the parents was the need to keep the child at home in order to look after a younger sibling. The next important reason that has emerged from the study, was the reluctance of the parents to send the child to school at an early age, when he/she was "too young and shy to go to school". The need to keep the child at home for helping in the household work has also emerged as an important second reason. So far as the reasons for not sending the child to school earlier are concerned, the parents in the sample did not provide any evidence of gender difference.

### 3.12 Repetition and Drop-out Rates corrected for lateral entry and LATE ADMISSIONS

Table K12 gives the uncorrected and corrected repetition and dropout rates worked out in the same way as in Table H12 for Hisar.

Table K12
CALCULATION OF REPETITION AND DROPOUT RATES WITH AND WITHOUT CORRECTION FOR LATERAL ENTRY AND LATE ADMISSIONS (KAITHAL DISTRICT)

|  |  | Sex | $I$ | II | III | IV | $V$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total }(I-V / \\ I-I V)) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrolment (30.9.97) | Boys | 2446 | 2194 | 1991 | 1683 | 1556 | 9870/8370 |
| 1 |  | Girls | 2385 | 1916 | 1603 | 1384 | 1219 | 8507/7288 |
|  |  | Total | 4831 | 4110 | 3594 | 3067 | 2775 | 18377/15602 |
| 2 | Enrolment (31.8.98) | Boys | 1902 | 2328 | 2116 | 1823 | 1522 | 9691 |
|  |  | Girls | 1786 | 2240 | 1833 | 1424 | 1166 | 8449 |
|  |  | Total | 3688 | 4568 | 3949 | 3247 | 2688 | 18140 |
| 3 | Repeaters (31.8.98) | Boys | 443 | 308 | 334 | 283 | 168 | 1536 |
|  |  | Girls | 400 | 287 | 309 | 208 | 168 | 1536 |
|  |  | Total | 843 | 595 | 643 | 491 | 233 | 2805 |
| 4 | Promotees (31.8.98)(2)-(3) | Boys | - | 2020 | 1782 | 1540 | 1354 | - |
|  |  | Girls | - | 1953 | 1524 | 1216 | 1101 | - |
|  |  | Total | - | 3973 | 3306 | 2756 | 2455 | - |
| 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dropouts (1997-98) } \\ & (1)-(3)-(4)^{*} \end{aligned}$ | Boys | -17 | 104 | 117 | 46 | - | 250 |
|  |  | Girls | 32 | 105 | 78 | 75 | - | 290 |
|  |  | Total | 15 | 209 | 195 | 121 | - | 540 |
| 6 | Repetition Rate (1997)$(3) /(1)^{*} 100$ | Boys | 18.1 | 14.0 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 10.8 | 15.6 |
|  |  | Girls | 16.8 | 15.0 | 19.3 | 15.0 | 5.3 | 14.9 |
|  |  | Total | 17.4 | 14.5 | 17.9 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 15.3 |
| 7. | Dropout Rate( 1997)$(5) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | -0.7 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 2.7 | - | 3.0 |
|  |  | Girls | 1.3 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 5.4 | - | 4.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 3.9 | - | 3.5 |
| 8 | Late admissions (1997) excluding transferees from government schools | Boys | 102 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 93 | 224 |
|  |  | Girls | 114 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 60 | 185 |
|  |  | Total | 216 | 9 | 24 | 7 | 153 | 409 |
| 9 | Lateral entrants (1998) excluding transferees from government schools | Boys | - | 18 | 29 | 17 | 63 | 127 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 15 | 18 | 23 | 37 | 93 |
|  |  | Total | - | 33 | 47 | 40 | 100 | 220 |
| 10 | Net Promotees (1998 excluding lateral entıants) (2)-(3)-(9) or (4)-(9) | Boys | - | 2002 | 1753 | 1523 | 1291 | - |
|  |  | Girls | - | 1938 | 1506 | 1193 | 1064 | - |
|  |  | Total | - | 3940 | 3259 | 2716 | 2355 | - |
| 11. | Net Dropouts (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry)$(1)-(3)-(10)^{\circ}$ | Boys | 1 | 133 | 134 | 109 | - | 377 |
|  |  | Girls | 47 | 123 | 101 | 112 | - | 383 |
|  |  | Total | 48 | 256 | 235 | 221 | - | 760 |
| 12 | Dropout rate (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry)$(11) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | 0.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 6.5 | - | 4.5 |
|  |  | Girls | 2.0 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 8.1 | - | 5.3 |
|  |  | Total | 1.0 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 7.2 | - | 4.9 |
| 13. | Enrolment including late admissions (1997)$(1)+(8)$ | Boys | 2548 | 2200 | 2008 | 1689 | 1649 | 10094/8445 |
|  |  | Girls | 2499 | 1919 | 1610 | 1385 | 1279 | 8692/7413 |
|  |  | Total | 5047 | 4119 | 3618 | 3074 | 2928 | 18786/15858 |
| 14. | Net dropouts (1997-98) from enrolment at (13)$(13)-(3)-(10)^{*}$ | Boys | 103 | 139 | 151 | 115 | - | 508 |
|  |  | Girls | 161 | 126 | 108 | 113 | - | 508 |
|  |  | Total | 264 | 265 | 259 | 228 | - | 1016 |
| 15. | Repetition rate (1997), corrected for late admissions$(3) /(13) * 100$ | Boys | 17.4 | 14.0 | 16.6 | 16.8 | 10.2 | 15.2 |
|  |  | Girls | 16.0 | 15.0 | 19.2 | 15.0 | 5.1 | 14.6 |
|  |  | Total | 16.7 | 14.4 | 17.8 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 14.9 |
| 16 | Dropout rate (1997-98), corrected for both lateral entry and late admissions (14)/(13)*100 | Boys | 4.0 | 6.3 | 7.5 | 6.8 | - | 6.0 |
|  |  | Girls | 6.4 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 8.2 | - | 6.9 |
|  |  | Total | 5.2 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 7.4 | - | 6.4 |

The following table summarisees the results

Uncorrected andd Corrected Repetition and Dropout rates

| Grade | Repetitionn Rate |  |  |  |  | Dropout Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | uncorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  | Uncorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | EBoys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| I | 18.1 | 16.8 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 4}$ | 117.4 | 16.0 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ | -0.7 | 1.3 | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ | 4.0 | 6.4 | $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ |
| II | 14.0 | 15.0 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 5}$ | 114.0 | 15.0 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 4}$ | 4.7 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.4 |
| III | 16.8 | 19.3 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 9}$ | 116.6 | 19.2 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 8}$ | 5.9 | 4.9 | $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ | 7.5 | 6.7 | $\mathbf{7 . 2}$ |
| IV | 16.8 | 15.0 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0}$ | 116.8 | 15.0 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0}$ | 2.7 | 5.4 | $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ | 6.8 | 8.2 | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| V | 10.8 | 5.3 | $\mathbf{8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 . 2}$ | 5.1 | $\mathbf{8 . 0}$ | - | - | - | - | - | $\mathbf{-}$ |
| Total | 15.6 | 14.9 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 3}$ | 115.2 | 14.6 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9}$ | 3.0 | 4.0 | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ | 6.0 | 6.9 | $\mathbf{6 . 4}$ |

We find that the repetition ratess did not change much after making correction for late admissions. Only in classes I aand V , the repetition rates decreased significantly after correction, mainly because of tthe late admission cases being more in number in these classes.

The dropout rate increased signnificantly after making correction for lateral entry and late admissions. In particular thee increase has been quite significant in classes I and V . It is easy to see the effect of iggnoring lateral entry cases and cases of late admission on the repetition and dropout raates. Particularly, the dropout rates were significantly under-estimated in classes I annd V. In class I, the late entrants and in class V, the lateral entry cases made a signifificant difference in the values of dropout rate.

There is not much gender differrence is not much in the overall repetition and dropout rates. The repetition rates are, r however, lower for girls in classes I, IV and V but higher in classes II and III comnpared to those for boys. The dropout rate is a little higher for girls in classes I and I IV, but less in class III than that for boys. In class II, the two are almost equal. The : pattern of gender difference is not similar to that of Hisar and hence no conclusion a about any definite trend in gender disparity in respect of repetition and dropout rates caan be derived from this study.

## Chapter IV

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY FOR JIND DISTRICT

### 4.1 SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS

In Jind the sample consisted of 61 schools from 8 sampled clusters of the district. The total enrollment in these schools was 15888 on 30.09 .97 and 16190 on 31.08.98.

### 4.2 Changes in enrollment within the year

Table J1 shows changes in enrolment between 30.09 .97 and 31.03.98. The enrolment increased slightly (by $1.44 \%$ ) between 30.09 .97 and 31.12 .97 but decreased again. On the last day of the school year (31.03.98) it was $97.2 \%$ of the enrolment on 30.09 .97 . In classes I and V, the enrolment increased initially, then declined while in other classes it continued to decline gradually throughout the year. The overall decline was slightly more in the case of girls.

### 4.3 Children admitted after 30 September, 1997

Like Hisar and Kaithal, in Jind too there are more cases of late admission in classes I and V and very few in classes II, III and IV. Table J2 shows the number and percentage of late entrants in different classes.

The late entrants constituted $6.8 \%$ of the $30^{\text {th }}$ September enrolment in class I and $13.5 \%$ of that in class V . In other classes, the percentage of such students was less than $2 \%$. There is not much of gender difference but there were relatively fewer girls among those who entered late in class V. However, there were more girls than boys among those who shifted from other government schools, while among those who came from unrecognised schools or no school, there were more boys than girls. The transferees from government / recognised private schools constituted only $16.5 \%$ of the total late entrants ( $10.9 \%$ in the case of boys and $23.4 \%$ in the case of girls).

Table J1
Enrolment in classes I to V at the beginning, the middle and the end of school year and indices of change 1997-98(Jind district)

| Date | Class-I |  |  | Class-II |  |  | Class-III |  |  | Class-IV |  |  | Class-V |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 30.09 .97 | 2036 | 2246 | 4282 | 1911 | 1865 | 3776 | 1626 | 1486 | 3112 | 1306 | 1196 | 2502 | 1235 | 981 | 2216 | 8114 | 7774 | 15888 |
| 31.12 .97 | 2067 | 2298 | 4365 | 1951 | 1798 | 3749 | 1615 | 1441 | 3056 | 1294 | 1165 | 2459 | 1360 | 1128 | 2488 | 8287 | 7830 | 16117 |
| 31.03 .98 | 2052 | 2236 | 4288 | 1805 | 1718 | 3523 | 1521 | 1392 | 2913 | 1274 | 1130 | 2404 | 1314 | 1004 | 2318 | 7966 | 7480 | 15446 |

Indices of change with $\mathbf{3 0 . 0 9 . 9 7}$ figures as 100

| 30.09.97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31.12 .97 | 101.5 | 102.3 | 101.9 | 102.1 | 96.4 | 99.3 | 99.3 | 97.0 | 98.2 | 99.1 | 97.4 | 98.3 | 110.1 | 115.0 | 112.3 | 102.1 | 100.7 | 101.4 |
| 31.03 .98 | 100.8 | 99.6 | 100.1 | 94.5 | 92.1 | 93.3 | 93.5 | 93.7 | 93.6 | 97.5 | 94.5 | 96.1 | 106.4 | 102.3 | 104.6 | 98.2 | 96.2 | 97.2 |

### 4.4 SCHOOL LEAVERS FROM DIFFFERENT CLASSES

Table J3 gives the number of pupilss who left school between 30.9 .97 and 31.3.98 and also those who left after 31.3.98, thhat is, who did not return to the same school after the summer vacation.

Table J2
Number of late entratns (Childrren admitted after 30.9.97) and transferees from GOVERNMENT/RECOGNISEED PRIVATE SCHOOLS AMONG THEM (JIND DISTRICT)

|  | Item | Seex | Number of pupils admitted after 30.09.97 in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | Totals |
| (a) | Late entrant (pupils admitted after 30.09.97) | Bopys | 137 | 23 | 20 | 26 | 190 | 396 |
|  |  | Girirls | 153 | 19 | 27 | 17 | 109 | 325 |
|  |  | Totital | 290 | 42 | 47 | 43 | 299 | 721 |
| (b) | Pupils transferred from other Govt. or recognised private schools out of (a) | Boyys | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 19 | 43 |
|  |  | Girirls | 0 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 44 | 76 |
|  |  | Totital | 0 | 12 | 21 | 23 | 63 | 119 |
| (c) | Late entrants per 100 pupils enrolled on 30.9.97 | Boyys | 6.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 15.4 | 4.9 |
|  |  | Girlrls | 6.8 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 11.1 | 4.2 |
|  |  | Totital | 6.8 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 13.5 | 4.5 |
| (d) | (b) as \% of (a) | Boyys | 0.0 | 21.7 | 50.0 | 34.6 | 10.0 | 10.9 |
|  |  | Girlrls | 0.0 | 36.8 | 40.7 | 82.4 | 40.4 | 23.4 |
|  |  | Totital | 0.0 | 28.6 | 44.7 | 53.5 | 21.1 | 16.5 |

In all, $10.0 \%$ of the children enrolledd on 30.9 .97 left school during or at the end of the school year. Of these, $68.7 \%$ left beefore the school year ended (that is, 31.3 .98 ) and the rest $31.3 . \%$ after this date. TThere was hardly any difference between the percentage of boys and percentage off girls who left.

The percentage of those who left wwas lowest in class I (only 4.0\%) and highest in class V (18.3\%). In other classes, itit ranged between $8.3 \%$ (for class IV) and $12.9 \%$ (for class II). Except in class V, the mmajority of the leavers were those who left before the end of the school year. In class I,I, $91.3 \%$ of the leavers were those who left before 31.3.98 and only $8.7 \%$ were those lleft after that, that is, who did not return to the same school after the vacation. In cldass $V, 38.9 \%$ of the leavers (or $7.1 \%$ of the total students enrolled in class $V$ on 30.99 .97 ) were those who left before the end of the school year, that is, 31.3.98. It may ' be pointed out that all those who left were not necessarily dropouts, as some would 1 have transferred to other schools.

Table J3
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WHO LEFT SCHOOL AFTER 30.9.97 (JIND DISTRICT)

| Item | Sex | Number of pupils admitted after 30.09.97 in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | Totals |
| Total leavers between 30.09 .97 \&$31.08 .98$ | Boys | 78 | 278 | 142 | 96 | 215 | 625 |
|  | Girls | 94 | 233 | 170 | 114 | 183 | 733 |
|  | Total | 172 | 511 | 312 | 210 | 398 | 1358 |
| Leavers between 30.09 .97 and 31.03 .98 | Boys | 72 | 225 | 105 | 59 | 95 | 416 |
|  | Girls | 85 | 180 | 133 | 77 | 63 | 515 |
|  | Total | 157 | 405 | 238 | 136 | 158 | 931 |
| \% of children who left between 30.09 .97 and 31.08 .98 | Boys | 3.8 | 14.5 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 17.4 | 10.0 |
|  | Girls | 4.2 | 11.3 | 11.9 | 9.3 | 19.5 | 10.1 |
|  | Total | 4.0 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 8.3 | 18.3 | 10.0 |
| $\%$ of children who left between 30.09.97 and 31.03 .98 | Boys | 3.5 | 11.8 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 |
|  | Girls | 3.8 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.9 |
|  | Total | 3.7 | 10.7 | 7.6 | 5.4 | 7.1 | 6.9 |
| $\%$ of children leaving between 30.09 .97 and 31.03 .98 out of total leavers | Boys | 92.3 | 80.9 | 73.9 | 61.5 | 44.2 | 68.7 |
|  | Girls | 90.4 | 85.7 | 75.1 | 69.4 | 33.0 | 68.7 |
|  | Total | 91.3 | 83.0 | 74.6 | 65.7 | 38.9 | 68.7 |

### 4.5 DROPOUTS AMONG SCHOOL LEAVERS

In order to find out how many among the school leavers were those who had shifted to other schools and how many had become dropouts, information was sought about what the students were doing after leaving the school. For $39.9 \%$ of the leavers, the schools could not provide this information, but $27.9 \%$ of the leavers were reported to have shifted to other government /recognised private schools, $\mathrm{i} 5.1 \%$ were reported to have gone to unrecognised schools and $17.1 \%$ were reported to have dropped out. Assuming that those about whom the schools did not have any information were also dropouts, the percentage of those who became dropouts becomes $57.0 \%$ of the total leavers or $5.7 \%$ of total students enrolled on 30.9.97. If we consider all those who did not shift to other government / recognised private schools as dropouts, the percentage of dropouts becomes $7.2 \%$ of the total enrolment.

The percentage of leavers who had reportedly shifted to other government / recognised private schools was highest in class V (49.0\%) and lowest in class II (13.5\%). The dropout rate was lowest in class I and highest in class II. However, the dropout rates so obtained are only tentative for the reasons already stated in the case of Hisar in section 2.5.

Table $J 4$
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL LEAVERS ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY TRANSFERRED TO OTHER SCHOOLS OR DROPPED OUT (JIND DISTRICT)

|  | Item | Class I |  |  | Class II |  |  | Class III |  |  | Class IV |  |  | Class V |  |  | Totals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 1 | Totals Enrolment (30.9.97) | 2036 | 2246 | 4282 | 1911 | 1865 | 3776 | 1626 | 1486 | 3112 | 1306 | 1196 | 1235 | 981 | 1219 | 2200 | 7860 | 8012 | 15872 |
| 2 | Total School Leavers | 78 | 94 | 172 | 278 | 210 | 488 | 142 | 177 | 319 | 96 | 111 | 207 | 215 | 191 | 406 | 809 | 783 | 1592 |
| 3 | (2) as \% of (1) | 3.83 | 4.19 | 4.02 | 14.55 | 11.26 | 12.92 | 8.73 | 11.91 | 10.25 | 7.35 | 9.28 | 16.76 | 21.92 | 15.67 | 18.45 | 10.29 | 9.77 | 10.03 |

Number of those who:

| 4 | joined other Govt./recognised private school | 23 | 17 | 40 | 37 | 29 | 66 | 34 | 43 | 77 | 29 | 34 | 63 | 111 | 88 | 199 | 234 | 211 | 445 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | joined unrecognised schools | 8 | 4 | 12 | 74 | 24 | 98 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 21 | 12 | 33 | 24 | 31 | 55 | 150 | 90 | 240 |
| 6 | dropped out | 12 | 16 | 28 | 43 | 61 | 104 | 16 | 35 | 51 | 12 | 19 | 31 | 29 | 29 | 58 | 112 | 160 | 272 |
| 7 | could not be located | 35 | 57 | 92 | 124 | 96 | 220 | 69 | 80 | 149 | 34 | 46 | 80 | 51 | 43 | 94 | 313 | 322 | 635 |
| 8 | (6+7) | 47 | 73 | 120 | 167 | 157 | 324 | 85 | 115 | 200 | 46 | 65 | 111 | 80 | 72 | 152 | 425 | 482 | 907 |
|  | \% of those out of (2) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | joined other Govt./recognised private school | 29.5 | 18.1 | 23.3 | 13.3 | 13.8 | 13.5 | 23.9 | 24.3 | 23.9 | 30.2 | 30.6 | 30.4 | 51.6 | 46.1 | 49.0 | 28.9 | 26.9 | 28.0 |
| 10 | joined unrecognised schools | 10.3 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 26.6 | 11.4 | 20.1 | 24.0 | 15.7 | 24.0 | 16.7 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 12.6 | 16.9 | 14.7 | 18.5 | 11.5 | 15.1 |
| 11 | dropped out | 15.4 | 17.0 | 16.3 | 15.5 | 29.0 | 21.3 | 11.3 | 19.8 | 16.0 | 12.5 | 17.1 | 15.0 | 13.5 | 15.2 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 20.4 | 17.1 |
| 12 | could not be located | 44.9 | 60.6 | 53.5 | 44.6 | 45.7 | 45.1 | 48.6 | 45.2 | 46.7 | 35.4 | 41.4 | 38.6 | 15.8 | 24.1 | 17.8 | 38.7 | 41.1 | 39.9 |
| 13 | (11)+(12) | 60.3 | 77.7 | 69.8 | 60.1 | 74.8 | 66.4 | 59.9 | 65.0 | 62.7 | 47.9 | 58.6 | 53.6 | 29.3 | 39.3 | 32.1 | 52.5 | 61.6 | 57.0 |
|  | \% of those out of (1) who |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | joined other Govt./ recognised private school | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| 15 | joined unrecognised schools | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| 16 | dropped out | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| 17 | could not be located | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.0 |
| 18 | (16)+(17) | 2.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 6.4 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 4.4 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 5.7 |
| 19 | $(15)+(16)+(17)$ | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 12.6 | 9.7 | 11.2 | 6.6 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 8.4 | 10.5 | 9.2 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 7.2 |

### 4.6 CHILDREN ADMITTED DIRECTLY IN GRADES OTHER THAN GRADE I IN 1998

Table J5 shows the number of children admitted directly in grades II to V in 1998, and also among them, the number of those who had come from unrecognised schools or directly after studying at home prior to taking admission in school.

Table J5
Number of Children admitted Directly in Classes II, III, IV and V in 1998 upto 31 August (JIND DISTRICT)

| Item | Sex | Classes |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $V$ | Totals |
| Number of children taking direct admission | Boys | 54 | 69 | 68 | 70 | 261 |
|  | Girls | 57 | 52 | 57 | 42 | 208 |
|  | Total | 111 | 121 | 125 | 112 | 469 |
| $\%$ of such children among the total students | Boys | 2.7 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 4.1 |
|  | Girls | 2.6 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.4 |
|  | Total | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 3.7 |
| Out of the total students enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of those who come from unrecognised schools or after studying at home only | Boys | -1.7 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.4 |
|  | Girls | 2.2 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.1 |
|  | Total | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Out of the children admitted directly |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\%$ of those transferred from other government or recognised private schools | Boys | 37.0 | 34.8 | 38.2 | 57.1 | 42.1 |
|  | Girls | 17.5 | 42.3 | 36.8 | 59.5 | 37.5 |
|  | Total | 27.0 | 38.0 | 37.6 | 58.0 | 40.1 |
| \% of those who came from unrecognised schools | Boys | 5.6 | 15.9 | 17.6 | 15.7 | 14.2 |
|  | Girls | 8.8 | 15.4 | 21.1 | 4.8 | 13.0 |
|  | Total | 7.2 | 15.7 | 19.2 | 11.6 | 13.6 |
| $\%$ of those who were studying at home | Boys | 57.4 | 49.3 | 44.1 | 27.1 | 43.7 |
|  | Girls | 73.7 | 42.3 | 42.1 | 35.7 | 49.5 |
|  | Total | 65.8 | 46.3 | 43.2 | 30.4 | 46.3 |

Only $3.7 \%$ of the total students in classes II to V were lateral entrants, that is, admitted for the first time in these classes this year in the schools of our sample. Among the lateral entrants $40.1 \%$ were transferees from other government / recognised private schools, the rest $59.9 \%$ (or $2.2 \%$ of the total students of classes II to V ) were the genuine cases of lateral entry (i.e. children coming from other unrecognised schools or after studying at home).

The percentage of lateral entry cases was highest in classes IV and $\mathrm{V}(4.5 \%$ and $5.2 \%$ respectively). Among the lateral entrants, the percentage of those who came from other government / recognised private schools was highest in class V (58.0\%) and lowest in class II ( $27.0 \%$ ). Also, as in the case of Hisar and Kaithal, in class II most
of the lateral entrants ( $65.8 \%$ ) were those who had not studied in any school earlier while in classes III, IV and V the percentage of such students was less. Those who had come from unrecgonised schools or directly from homes constituted $2.9 \%$ of total students of class II, $2.1 \%$ of totall students of class III, $2.8 \%$ of total students of class IV and $2.2 \%$ of total students of c:lass $V$.

The gender difference in respectt of lateral entry does not appear to be significant. There are, however, relatively fe:wer cases of lateral entry among girls compared to boys. While $2.4 \%$ of the boys entrolled in classes II to V , had come after studying in unrecognised schools or at home, this percentage was $2.1 \%$ in the case of girls.

### 4.7 DROPOUTS RE-ADMITTED IN SCHOOLS AFTER A GAP OF ONE OR MORE YEARS

As in Hisar and Kaithal, in Jind too, very few children joined school again after remaining dropouts for one or morre years. In classes II to V , there were only 71 such children, which is only $0.56 \%$ of the total children enrolled in these classes. Nearly half of them were boys. The maxiimum number of such children were in class II and III ( 35 and 22 respectively); the resst 14 were in classes IV and V.

### 4.8 Repeaters among the prupils in 1998-99

Table J6 gives the enrolment and rnumber of repeaters in each class in 1998 and classwise repetition rates for 1997-98. The repetitions rates have been compared with those of 1996-97 obtained from the EMIIS data for the whole districts.

We find that the overall repetition rate is $12.8 \%$ ( $12.6 \%$ for boys and $13.0 \%$ for girls). The repetition rate is highest in claass I ( $17.1 \%$ ) and lowest in class V ( $4.2 \%$ ). In other classes, it ranges between $11.4 \%$ and $15.0 \%$. The repetition rate of class I is particularly much higher than thatt derived from EMIS data. In classes II to IV, the repetition rates based on EMIS datta for 1996-97 are only slightly lower than those of this study, but in class V , the rerpetition rate obtained form EMIS data is slightly higher.

Table J6
Total Enrollment and Number of Repeaters in Classes I to V in 1998 and RATES FOR 1997 (JIND DISTRICT)

|  | Sex | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrolment on 31.08 .98 | Boys | 1856 | 1979 | 1827 | 1478 | 1133 | 8273 |
|  | Girls | 1713 | 2164 | 1704 | 1317 | 1019 | 7917 |
|  | Total | 3569 | 4143 | 3531 | 2795 | 2152 | 16190 |
| Number of repeaters on 31.08 .98 | Boys | 314 | 230 | 238 | 169 | 68 | 1019 |
|  | Girls | 420 | 200 | 228 | 137 | 26 | 1011 |
|  | Total | 734 | 430 | 466 | 306 | 94 | 2030 |
| Repetition rate | Boys | 15.4 | 12.0 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 12.6 |
|  | Girls | 18.7 | 10.7 | 15.3 | 11.5 | 2.7 | 13.0 |
|  | Total | 17.1 | 11.4 | 15.0 | 12.2 | 4.2 | 12.8 |
| Repetition rate based on EMIS data for 1996-97 | Boys | 12.4 | 9.8 | 12.2 | 11.3 | 6 | 10.4 |
|  | Girls | 12.7 | 10.5 | 13.2 | 11.3 | 5.8 | 10.9 |
|  | Total | 12.5 | 10.1 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 5.9 | 10.6 |

### 4.9 Percentage of repeaters in different classes

Table J7 gives the percentage of repeaters among the pupils enrolled in different classes. These have been compared with the percentage of repeaters obtained from EMIS data for the years 1997-97 and 1997-98.

Table J7
Percentage of repeaters in different classes for 1998-99 based on the present study AND FOR 1996-97 AND 1997-98 ACCODING TO FROM EMIS (JIND DISTRICT)

|  |  | Percentage of repeaters in class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\boldsymbol{I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I} \boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{T o t a l}$ |
| Present study (1998-99) | Boys | 16.9 | 11.6 | 13.0 | 11.4 | $6 . C$ | 12.3 |
|  | Girls | 24.5 | 9.2 | 13.4 | 10.4 | 2.6 | 12.8 |
|  | Total | 20.6 | 10.4 | 13.2 | 11.0 | 4.4 | 12.5 |
| EMIS (1996-97) | Boys | 10.0 | 8.3 | 12.3 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 10.8 |
|  | Girls | 11.0 | 9.1 | 12.5 | 11.9 | 9.8 | 10.8 |
|  | Total | 10.5 | 8.7 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 10.8 |
| EMIS (1997-98) | Boys | 10.9 | 9.2 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 6.8 | 10.1 |
|  | Girls | 10.4 | 9.2 | 12.5 | 11.4 | 6.3 | 10.0 |
|  | Total | 10.6 | 9.2 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 6.6 | 10.1 |

The percentage of repeaters is much higher in class I in our study compared to that of 1996-97 and 1997-98 derived from the EMIS data. In class V, the opposite is true, as the percentage of repeaters according to this study is lower than that obtained from the EMIS data for 1996-97 and 1997-98.
is Table J8 shows, thee main reason for repetition classes III, IV and $V$ is failure in the examination while iin classes I and II it is the shortage of attendance. There is not nuch of gender differemce in either case.

Table J8
Percentage Distribiution of Repeaters according to the Reason for Repeating; (JIND DISTRICT)

| Reason for repeating | Sex | Percentage of children |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | Totals |
| Filure in the e.amination | Boys | 14.3 | 7.8 | 76.9 | 81.7 | 80.9 | 43.1 |
|  | Girls | 11.0 | 19.0 | 71.9 | 81.8 | 61.5 | 37.2 |
|  | Total | 12.4 | 13.0 | 74.5 | 81.7 | 75.5 | 40.1 |
| Atendance being below 51\% | Boys | 77.4 | 86.1 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 10.3 | 46.1 |
|  | Girls | 74.0 | 67.5 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 15.4 | 46.4 |
|  | 'Total | 75.5 | 77.4 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 11.7 | 46.3 |
| Cher reasons | Boys | 8.3 | 6.1 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 8.8 | 10.8 |
|  | , Girls | 15.0 | 13.5 | 22.8 | 13.1 | 26.9 | 16.5 |
|  | Total | 12.1 | 9.5 | 20.0 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.6 |

## 411 Reasons given by parents for lateral entry in classes II to $\mathbf{V}$

Pirents of 184 children ( 47 of those who had shifted from unrecognised schools and $1: 7$ of those who had takem admission after studying at home previously), were interviewed to find out the reason for lateral entry. Table J9 shows the distribution of stidents by class and genider, whose parents were interviewed.

Table J9
(lass-wise Distribution of Childden Studying in an Unrecognised School or at Home Previously, whoise Parents were Interviewed (Jind district)

| Category | Sex | Class |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | II | III | IV | $V$ | Total |
| Chldren studying in an unecognised school prwiously | $B$ | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 17 |
|  | G | 4 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 30 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{T}$ | 4 | 16 | 17 | 10 | 47 |
| Ctldren studying at home previously | $B$ | 14 | 15 | 21 | 21 | 71 |
|  | $G$ | 18 | 20 | 10 | 18 | 66 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{T}$ | 32 | 35 | 31 | 39 | 137 |
| Total |  | 36 | 51 | 48 | 49 | 184 |

## Reasons for transferring from an uncrecognised school to a recognised one

Table J10 gives the distribution of parents according to the reason given by them for shifting the child from an unrecognised school to a government school. The most prominent reasons are (1) the high fees charged in the private unrecognised school and (2) the teaching in the unrecognised school being unsatisfactory.

Table J10
Reasons for Shifting Children from Unrecognised Schools to Recognised Schools (JIND DISTRICT)

| Reason for shifting from unrecognised school to the present school | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| 1. The previous school was far off | 8 | 17.0 | - | - |
| 2 The school lacked necessary facilities | 8 | 17.0 | 4 | 11.8 |
| The school did not have the 3. class in which the child is studying now | 1 | 2.1 | - | - |
| 4 The fees was high | 21 | 44.7 | 7 | 20.6 |
| 5. The teaching in the school was not satisfactory | 2 | 4.3 | 19 | 55.9 |
| 6 The family shifted from the place of previous school | 6 | 12.8 | 2 | 5.9 |
| The child could not appear in 7. class $V$ exam. as the school was unrecognised | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 2.9 |
| 8 Any other reason | - | - | 1 | 2.9 |
| Total | 47 | 100 | 52 | 100 |

## Characteristics of the unrecognised schools from where the children shifted

Most of the schools from where the children had shifted were either full primary or full upper primary schools. None of them was an incomplete primary school. The fees charged by them ranged between Rs. 35/- and Rs. 50/- per month, though in a few cases it was as high as Rs. 70/- per month. For further details about the unrecognised schools, Annex II may be seen.

## Reasons for not sending the child earlier to school

IIn all, 137 parents who had not sent the child to any school before getting him/her admitted in class II, III, IV or V directly for the first time this year, were interviewed tio find out why they had not sent the child to school earlier. As Table J11 shows, the main reasons given by them for doing so are (1) the child had to remain at home to help in household chores, (2) tutoring the child at home was more effective, and (3) the child was too young and shy to go to school.

Table H11
Reasons for Not Sending the Child to School Earlier (Hisar district)

| Reason for not sending the child to school earlier \& getting him tutored at home | Parents giving the reason as the $1^{\text {st }}$ reason |  | Parents giving the reason as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ reason |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| L. The child was too young and shy to go to school | 34 | 24.8 | 1 | 2.3 |
| 2 Tutoring at home was more effective | 34 | 24.8 | 7 | 15.9 |
| The child had to remain at 3 home to help in household chores | 43 | 31.4 | 11 | 25.0 |
| In school, much time is spent 4 on games / sports and less on instruction | 9 | 6.6 | 5 | 11.4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text { The school was at a distance } \\ & \text { from home } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 5.8 | 12 | 27.2 |
| 6 The child had to look after younger siblings at home | 9 | 6.6 | 8 | 18.2 |
| 7. Any other reason | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 137 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 |

### 4.12 Repetition anid Dropout corrected for lateral entry and late ADMISSIONS

The corrected repetition and dropout rates have been derived in the same way as in the case of Hisar and Kaithal. The calculations and the uncorrected as well as the corrected rates are given in Table J12.

Table J12
CALCULATION OF REPETITION AND DROPOUT RATES WITH AND WITHOUT CORRECTION FOR LATERAL ENTRY AND LATE ADMISSIONS (JIND DISTRICT)

|  |  | Sex | $I$ | II | III | IV | $V$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total }(I-V / \\ I-I V)) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Enrolment (30.9.97) | Boys | 2036 | 1911 | 1626 | 1306 | 1235 | 8114/6879 |
|  |  | Girls | 2246 | 1865 | 1486 | 1196 | 981 | 7774/6793 |
|  |  | Total | 4282 | 3776 | 3112 | 2502 | 2216 | 15888/13672 |
| 18 | Enrolment (31.8.98) | Boys | 1836 | 1979 | 1827 | 1478 | 1133 | 8273 |
|  |  | Girls | 1713 | 2164 | 1704 | 1317 | 1019 | 7917 |
|  |  | Total | 3569 | 4143 | 3531 | 2795 | 2152 | 16190 |
| 19. | Repeaters (31.8.98) | Boys | 314 | 230 | 238 | 169 | 68 | 1019 |
|  |  | Girls | 420 | 200 | 228 | 137 | 26 | 1011 |
|  |  | Total | 734 | 430 | 466 | 306 | 94 | 2030 |
| 20. | Promotees (31.8.98)(2)-(3) | Boys | - | 1749 | 1589 | 1309 | 1065 | 5712 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 1964 | 1476 | 1180 | 993 | 5613 |
|  |  | Total | - | 3716 | 3065 | 2489 | 2058 | 11325 |
| 21. | Dropouts (1997-98)$(1)-(3)-(4)^{*}$ | Boys | -27 | 92 | 79 | 72 | - | 216 |
|  |  | Girls | -138 | 189 | 78 | 66 | - | 195 |
|  |  | Total | -165 | 281 | 157 | 138 | - | 411 |
| 22 | Repetition Rate (1997)$(3) /(1)^{*} 100$ | Boys | 15.4 | 12.0 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 12.6 |
|  |  | Girls | 18.7 | 10.7 | 15.3 | 11.5 | 2.7 | 13.0 |
|  |  | Total | 17.1 | 11.4 | 15.0 | 12.2 | 4.2 | 12.8 |
| 23. | Dropout Rate( 1997) <br> $(5) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | -1.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.5 | - | 3.1 |
|  |  | Girls | -6.1 | 10.1 | 5.2 | 5.5 | - | 2.9 |
|  |  | Total | -3.9 | 7.4 | 5.0 | 5.5 | - | 3.0 |
| 24. | Late admissions (1997) excluding transferees from government schools | Boys | 137 | 18 | 10 | 17 | 171 | 353 |
|  |  | Girls | 153 | 12 | 16 | 3 | 65 | 249 |
|  |  | Total | 290 | 30 | 26 | 20 | 236 | 602 |
| 25. | Lateral entrants (1998) excluding transferees from govemment schools | Boys | - | 34 | 45 | 42 | 30 | 151 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 47 | 30 | 36 | 17 | 130 |
|  |  | Total | - | 81 | 75 | 78 | 47 | 281 |
| 26 | Net Promotees (1998 excluding lateral entrants)$(2)-(3)-(9) \text { or }(4)-(9)$ | Boys | - | 1715 | 1544 | 1267 | 1035 | 5561 |
|  |  | Girls | - | 1917 | 1446 | 1144 | 976 | 5486 |
|  |  | Total | - | 3632 | 2990 | 2411 | 2011 | 11044 |
| 27. | Net Dropouts (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry)(1)-(3)-(10) | Boys | 7 | 137 | 121 | 102 | - | 367 |
|  |  | Girls | -91 | 219 | 114 | 83 | - | 325 |
|  |  | Total | -84 | 356 | 235 | 185 | - | 692 |
| 28 | Dropout rate (1997-98, corrected for lateral entry)$(11) /(1) * 100$ | Boys | 0.3 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 7.8 | - | 5.3 |
|  |  | Girls | -4.1 | 11.7 | 7.7 | 6.9 | - | 4.8 |
|  |  | Total | -2.0 | 9.4 | 7.6 | 7.4 | - | 5.1 |
| 29. | Enrolment including late admissions (1997)$(1)+(8)$ | Boys | 2173 | 1929 | 1636 | 1323 | 1406 | 8467/7061 |
|  |  | Girls | 2399 | 1877 | 1502 | 1199 | 1046 | 8023/6977 |
|  |  | Total | 4572 | 3806 | 3138 | 2522 | 2452 | 16490/14038 |
| 30. | Net dropouts (1997-98) from enrolment at (13)$(13)-(3)-(10)^{*}$ | Boys | 144 | 155 | 131 | 119 | - | 549 |
|  |  | Girls | 62 | 231 | 130 | 86 | - | 509 |
|  |  | Total | 206 | 386 | 261 | 205 | - | 1058 |
| 31. | Repetition rate (1997), corrected for late admissions$(3) /(13)^{*} 100$ | Boys | 14.5 | 11.9 | 14.5 | 12.8 | 4.8 | 12.0 |
|  |  | Girls | 17.5 | 10.7 | 15.2 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 12.6 |
|  |  | Total | 16.1 | 11.3 | 14.9 | 12.1 | 3.8 | 12.3 |
| 32 | Dropout rate (1997-98), corrected for both lateral entry and late admissions (14)/(13)*100 | Boys | 6.6 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | - | 7.8 |
|  |  | Girls | 2.6 | 12.3 | 8.7 | 7.2 | - | 7.3 |
|  |  | Total | 4.5 | 10.1 | 8.3 | 8.1 | - | 7.5 |

he following taable shows these rates in a summary form

Unvcorrected and Corrected Repetition and Dropout rates

| irade | Repetition Rate |  |  |  |  | Dropout Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | unccorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  | Uncorrected |  |  | Corrected |  |  |
|  | Boys | (Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| I | 15.4 | 18.7 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 1}$ | 14.5 | 17.5 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 1}$ | -1.3 | -6.1 | $\mathbf{- 3 . 9}$ | 6.6 | 2.3 | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ |
| II | 12.0 | 110.7 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4}$ | 11.9 | 10.7 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 3}$ | 4.8 | 10.1 | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ | 8.0 | 12.3 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 1}$ |
| III | 14.6 | 115.3 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 0}$ | 14.5 | 15.2 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 9}$ | 4.9 | 5.2 | $\mathbf{5 . 0}$ | 8.0 | 8.7 | $\mathbf{8 . 3}$ |
| IV | 12.9 | 111.5 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2}$ | 12.8 | 11.4 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 1}$ | 5.5 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{5 . 5}$ | 9.0 | 7.2 | $\mathbf{8 . 1}$ |
| V | 5.5 | 2.7 | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ | 4.8 | 2.5 | $\mathbf{3 . 8}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| otal | 12.6 | 113.0 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8}$ | 12.0 | 12.6 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3}$ | 3.1 | 2.9 | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | 7.8 | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 5}$ |

The repetition rates have decreased slightly after making correction for the late etrants. The decrease is noticeable only in grades I and V since the late admission cses were very fiew in other grades.

Te dropout rate:s increased significantly after correction for lateral entry and late amissions. The over all dropout rate (cumulative for classes I to IV) had increased frm $3.0 \%$ to $7.5 \%$ after correction. In class I particularly, the dropout rate was irtially negative due to large number of late admissions in this class. These late errants were responsible for making the promotees in class II in 1998 exceed the $31^{h}$ September, 1997 enrolment of class I. After correction for lateral entry and late amissions, the dropout rate became $4.5 \%$ in class I.

Tere is not much gender difference in repetition and dropout rates. Like Hisar but urike Kaithal, the dropout rates of girls were, however, slightly lower than those bos. In particular, the dropout rate of girls is less than that of boys in classes I and IVbut is more tham that of boys in classes II.

## Annex I

## Summary Tables and Charts

Note: In the tables, and charts where "government schools" is written, it is supposed to include private recognised schools also. The number of private recognised schools is, however, comparativelyery small and for all practical purposes the reported figures for "government schools" are for government schools only.)

## Summary Tables and Charts



Figure 1

TABLE 1
Population and SAmple

| District | Population |  | Sample |  | \% of <br> schools | Parents <br> interview <br> ed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Blocks | Clusters | Schools | Blocks | Clusters | Schools |  |  |
| Hisar | 11 | 110 | 878 | 10 | 15 | 90 | 10.3 | 163 |
| Kiathal | 5 | 46 | 413 | 5 | 9 | 56 | 13.6 | 120 |
| Jind | 6 | 54 | 557 | 5 | 8 | 61 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0}$ | 193 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 6}$ |

Table 2
Enrolment on 31 ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ December'97 and 31 ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ March'98 as Percentageof Enrolment on $30{ }^{\text {TH }}$ SEptember'97

|  | Class I |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | Boys | Girls | Total |
| $\mathbf{3 0 . 9 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 1 . 1 2 . 9 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hisar | 103.7 | 95.7 | 95.4 | 96.1 | 104.7 | 97.9 | 101.0 | 99.4 |
| Kaithal | 102.3 | 98.7 | 98.2 | 97.9 | 99.4 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 99.5 |
| Jind | 101.9 | 99.3 | 98.2 | 98.3 | 112.3 | 102.1 | 100.7 | 101.4 |
| 31.3 .98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hisar | 102.5 | 91.0 | 94.3 | 93.3 | 101.4 | 94.8 | 97.9 | 96.3 |
| Kaithal | 99.7 | 94.3 | 94.3 | 95.3 | 99.0 | 96.6 | 97.0 | 96.8 |
| Jind | 100.0 | 93.3 | 93.6 | 96.1 | 104.6 | 98.2 | 96.2 | 97.2 |

## Enrolment Indices with 30.9.97 Enrolment as 100



Figure 2

Table 3
(A)Late Entrannts per 100 Pupils Enrolled on 30.9.97

|  | Sex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hisar | Boys | 10.88 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 4.5 |
|  | Girls | 8.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 8.6 | $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ |
|  | Total | 9.5 | $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ |
| Kaithal | Boys | 4.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 6.4 | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ |
|  | Girls | 4.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 5.2 | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ |
|  | Boys | 6.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 15.4 | 4.9 |
|  | Girls | 6.8 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 11.1 | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ |

(B) Pircentage of Latre Entrants who were Transferees from other

Govt. Schools

|  | Sex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hisar | Boys | - | 46.2 | 61.8 | 44.4 | 18.4 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 2}$ |
|  | Girls | - | 44.8 | 53.6 | 35.0 | 19.7 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 1}$ |
|  | Total | - | $\mathbf{4 5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 1}$ | 40.4 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 6}$ |
| Kaithal | Goys | - | 53.8 | 19.0 | 33.3 | 6.1 | $\mathbf{8 . 2}$ |
|  | Girls | - | 72.7 | 50.0 | 87.5 | 4.8 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 9}$ |
|  | Total | - | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 9}$ |
|  | Boys | - | 21.7 | 50.0 | 34.6 | 10.0 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9}$ |
|  | Girls | - | 36.8 | 40.7 | 82.4 | 40.4 | $\mathbf{2 3 . 4}$ |

## Table 4

(A) Percentage of Childen who left School between 30.9.97 and 31.8.98

| District | I | II | III | IV | $\mathbf{V}$ | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Boys | Girls | Tdal |
| Hisar | 5.6 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 11.3 |
| Kaithal | 4.2 | 7.8 | 9.0 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 72 |
| Jind | 4.0 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 8.3 | 18.3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 |

(B) Percentage of those who left before 31.3.98 among the Total Leaveis

| District | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hisar | 83.5 | 72.9 | 67.8 | 60.5 | 61.8 | 70.0 | 68.4 | 61.3 |
| Kaithal | 98.0 | 79.3 | 72.0 | 70.0 | 58.9 | 77.1 | 64.1 | 71.4 |
| Jind | 91.3 | 83.0 | 74.6 | 65.7 | 38.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 6.7 |

(C) Percentage of Students who reportedly shifted to other Govt. SCHOOLS

| District | I | II | III | IV | $\mathbf{V}$ | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Boys | Girls | Ttal |
| Hisar | 1.3 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.1 | .6 |
| Kaithal | 0.5 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 1.7 | .8 |
| Jind | 0.9 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 9.0 | 2.9 | 2.7 | .8 |

## Table 5

Percentages to Show what the Students wnere reportedly doing after Leaving Schoodl

| District | Left | Joined Other <br> Govt. Schools | Joined Unrec. <br> School | Dropped Out | Could Not Be <br> Located | $\mathbf{b}^{+c+d}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |  |
| Hisar | 10.3 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 6.7 |
| Kaithal | 7.2 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 5.4 |
| Jind | 10.0 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 7.2 |

Table 6
(A) Percentage of Students who had Entered Laterally in Classesi to V among those Enrolled on 31.8.98

| District | Sex | Class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\boldsymbol{I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I} \boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}$ | $\boldsymbol{T o t a l}$ |  |
| Hisar | Boys | 2.8 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 4.2 | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ |  |
|  | Girls | 1.5 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1}$ |  |
|  | Boys | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 5.4 | $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ |  |
|  | Girls | 1.2 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 5.0 | $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ |  |
| Jind | Boys | 2.7 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 6.2 | $\mathbf{4 . 1}$ |  |
|  | Girls | 2.6 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 4.1 | $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ |  |

(B) Percentage of Students who Entered Laterally as Transferes from Unrecognised Schools Or After Studying at Home ony Previously

| District | Sex | Class |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\boldsymbol{I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I I I}$ | $\boldsymbol{I V}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}$ | Total |
| Hisar | Boys | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
|  | Girls | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 3}$ |
| Kaithal | Boys | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
|  | Girls | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.4 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ |
| Jind | Boys | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.7 | $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ |
|  | Girls | 2.2 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 1.7 | $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ |

Table 7 : Distribltion oif ILAteral Entrants according to what they were idcoing in the Previous Year

| Educatiolal <br> Activity il <br> Previous <br> Year | District | Class |  |  |  | Classes II-V |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | III | III | IV | $V$ | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Studying in a govt. schorl | Hisar | 5.5 | 51 | 64 | 67 | 58 | 60 | 59 |
|  | Kaithal | 511 | 49 | 60 | 29 | 43 | 47 | 45 |
|  | Jind | 27 | 38 | 38 | 58 | 42 | 38 | 40 |
| Studying i, an unrecognied school | Hisar | 255 | 28 | 21 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 25 |
|  | Kaithal | 34 | 24 | 25 | 49 | 36 | 34 | 35 |
|  | Jind | 7 | 16 | 19 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 14 |
| Studying a home only | Hisar | 20) | 21 | 15 | 7 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
|  | Kaithal | 155 | 27 | 15 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 20 |
|  | Jind | $66)$ | 46 | 43 | 30 | 44 | 49 | 46 |

Table 8

## Repetition Rate in Classes I to V (1997-98)

| District | Sex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hisar | Boys | 13.2 | 12.9 | 17.7 | 15.6 | 6.5 | 13.4 |
|  | Girls | 12.8 | 10.5 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 7.1 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 5}$ |
|  | Total | 13.0 | 11.7 | 17.5 | 14.7 | 6.8 | 13.0 |
|  | Boys | 18.1 | 14.0 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 10.8 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ |
|  | Girls | 16.8 | 15.0 | 19.3 | 15.0 | 5.3 | 14.9 |
|  | Total | 17.4 | 14.5 | 17.9 | 16.0 | 8.4 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 3}$ |
| Jind | Boys | 15.4 | 12.0 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 12.6 |
|  | Girls | 18.7 | 10.7 | 15.3 | 11.5 | 2.7 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ |
|  | Total | 17.1 | 11.4 | 15.0 | 12.2 | 4.2 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8}$ |

REPETITION RATES FROM EMIS Data FOR 1996-97

| District | Sex | I | II | III | IV | V | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hisar | Total | 11.1 | 10.3 | 17.4 | 15.3 | 9.4 | 12.6 |
| Kaithal | Total | 15.2 | 10.1 | 14.3 | 11.5 | 9.0 | 12.3 |
| Jind | Total | 12.5 | 10.1 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 5.9 | 10.6 |

## DISTRIBUTION OF REPEATERS ACCORDING TO THE REASON OF REPEATING－HISAR
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DISTRIBUTION OF REPEATERS ACCORDING TO THE REASON OF REPEATING－KAITHAL
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Distribution of repeaters according to the reason of repeating－Jind

Class 1

$\square$ Failure in examination四Attendance being below $50 \%$田Other reason

## Class IV


－Failure in examination
Failure in examination
（1ttendance being below $50 \%$ MAttendance be
圌Other reason

Class II

$\square$ Failure in examination
Failure in examination畕Other reason

Class $V$

（1）Failure in examination⿴囗十心 Failure in examination
$\square$ Attendance being below $50 \%$囲Other reason

Figure 6

Class III
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REASONS FOR NOT SENDING THE CHILD TO SCHOOL EARLIER AND GETTING HIM/HER TUTORED AT HOME

Hisar


Kaithal


Jind
The child was too young and shy to go to schoolTutoring at home was more effectiveThe child had to remain at home to help in household choresIn school, much time is spent on games/ sports and less on instructionThe school was at a distance from homeThe child had to look after younger
cihling at hnme
Any other reason
Figure 7Total

## Reasons of shifting from unrecognised school to a government schools



Figure 8

## Corrected and Uncorrected Repetition Rates

## Hisar
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## Corrected and Uncorrected Drop－out Rates
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Figure 10

## Annex II

Some Characteristics of the un-recognised Schools

## SiOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UN-RECOGNISED SCHOOLS*

As a ccomsequence of growing awareness of the people in Haryana about the benefits of primaary education, the demand for primary education has increased and many primaryy schools have come up in the private sector also. Some of these schools get recogniition from the Government and function as recognised private schools, while others copserate as private unrecognised commercial ventures. Many of them have their own pooliicies and programmes, rules and regulations, curriculum, fee structures and procedurres of staff recruitment. They strive to assume the appearance of a public school, adopting an attractive name for the institution. They prescribe school uniform of the ssamme type as the urban public schools do, introduce English as an additional subject riight from grade I, and adopt administrative style which is generally quite differemt from that of the neighbourhood government primary school. Despite their high rattess of fees, the number of such private enterprises has increased considerably in receentt years. These schools maintain good relationship with the neighbouring governrmeent schools so that their students can appear in the public examination conducttecd by them. For admitting the children, the government schools require that the parcemts produce an affidavit stating that their wards were not studying in any governrmeent / recognised private school before and had studied privately at home. The school !geenerally gives a test to find out whether he/she is eligible for admission to a particullarr grade or not, before admitting the child on the basis of an affidavit.

The nurmber of unrecognised private schools varies from block to block and also from cluster to) cluster within the same block. For example, the cluster of Shiv Puri Barnala in the bblock Hansi II of Hisar district has reported that there are 21 unrecognised privatelly managed schools against a figure of 7 Govt. primary schools. In addition, there arre : primary sections of the recognised high schools which are reportedly not covered under DPEP. Thus a large segment of children in the DPEP districts who are

[^0]in private schools get left out when indicators of enrolment and retention are derivid from the EMIS data.

## Enrolment pattern in unrecognised schools and Government Schools

It seems that two parallel systems, one of the government or recognised privae schools and the other of unrecognised schools, exist in every district. Let us look it the enrolment pattern of two schools of each type which are located in close viciniy of each other.

|  | Enrolment in unrecognised schools |  |  | Enrolment in Government Primary Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | School I | School II | Total | School I | School II | Total |
| I | 15 | 40 | 55 | 61 | 21 | 82 |
| II | 10 | 10 | 20 | 80 | 35 | 115 |
| III | 10 | 18 | 28 | 65 | 57 | 112 |
| IV | 10 | 22 | 32 | 45 | 31 | 76 |
| V | 10 | 20 | 30 | 34 | 21 | 65 |
| Total | 55 | 110 | 165 | 285 | 165 | 450 |

While in the unrecognised school, the enrolment is grade II is much less than that of grade ${ }^{1}$, in the government schools, it is just the opposite. It could be due to transfer of children from the unrecognised schools to the government schools. Also it wis noticed that some parents do not like to send their children to class I of a government primary school and prefer an unrecognised school which appears attractive. There ae other reasons also. Mothers in rural areas have taken to productive pursuits $n$ agrarian or allied activities. They prefer to send their children to Nursery and Kindergarten classes as soon as the child attains $31 / 2$ to $41 / 2$ years of age. This facilityis available in almost all unrecognised schools whereas the government primary schods admit children only in class I at the age of $5+$. The CRC Coordinators and DIET staf, who collected data for this study were asked to submit brief notes on their meetin;s with fellow teachers, teachers of unrecognised schools, parents and communiy members on the role of unrecognised schools. The observations one Lateral Enty and Repeaters are based on their observations.

## L/teral Entry

For direct admission in classes other than I class I , an affidavit has to be furnished by paents in a standard form. It is to 1 be stated before Notary Public or Oath Ccmmissioner that the child has studiieed at home and was not enrolled in any recognised or government school. The lhead teacher of the unrecognised school usually takes the responsibility of arramgging the stamp paper, getting the affidavit typed and completing other formalities witthout requiring the parents to go to the court to to the needful. They also lias with tithe local government school to get the child admitted in the appropriate class on the brassis of an admission test.

The interest of the unrecognised institutioon in taking this trouble to help parents is two-fold Firstly, the school gets publicitty' and goodwill of the people, if it provides this service to them. Secondly, it also getts : the goodwill of the head teacher and other staff members of the local government pprimary school, which is conducive to its smooth functioning and getting its studennts admitted in that school in class IV or V without any hassles. It was reported thatt ; about 85 to $90 \%$ cases of lateral entry are thcse of the children, who had been studdying in unrecognised schools, and not at home.

Whereas there is no fee in the governmentt primary schools, the unrecognised schools have heavy fee slabs. These vary from scchool to school but the general pattern is that of Rs. 30/- to Rs. 45/- for the pre-schooll chlasses and between Rs. 40/- to Rs. 60/- for the primary classes. In view of such a heavyy amount fee, generally the children of only middle and upper middle classes seek admiission to these unrecognised schools.

An important point is that many parents feeel that the quality of teaching is better in the unrecognised schools. A significant obbservation made by some parents and community members is that whereas merre presence in the school is considered as performance of duty by the government scchool teachers irrespective of whether they teach or not, the situation in the unrecogmissed schools is different. Their teachers keep children engaged in purposeful academiic activity for as much time as possible. In many a school, special attention is paid to the weak children by organising extra
classes for them. The schools keep pressure on parents for regularity of school attendance of the child and completion of homework. The unrecognised schods also attend to development of proper communication skills, good manners and neahabits in their students. Parents have an appreciation for these and such other featres of these schools.

Further, the parents are keen that the children learn English as a second languae. The private schools do not necessarily pursue the curriculum, textbooks and policie of the Education Department. They decide their own curriculum. English langage is generally introduced as a second language from grade I. Very often evenin the Nursery and Kindergarten classes, poems and short stories in English have to be memorised and importance is given to recitation of poems and rhymes y the children. Another reason for the proliferation of unrecognised private primary chools is that they help in preparing the children for admission tests conducted for Nrodaya Vidalayas and Sainik Schools. The admission in these schools is strictly on the basis of admission tests, and many parents are keen that their children get admitted in these schools. Some private schools attract parents by offering that they would nt only prepare their children for the admission tests of the Navodaya Vidalayas tit also would get them enrolled in government primary school in grade III or a highe grade to ensure eligibility to take these tests. There are also instances of children tho get enrolled in a government schools and their attendance is marked there, bt they continue to attend private schools where their names are not recorded in the attendance registers. The children of well-to-do scheduled caste families alo avail this facility since there is reservation policy for SC \& ST candidates under the Navodaya Vidalaya Scheme

Another contributing factor is that the parents feel that the private schoolsensure regular teaching whereas government schools are either short of staff or have tequent transfers. Some of their teachers are more occupied in non-teaching activitiesind inservice training for improving their teaching competence but there is no mechaism to ensure that the loss of teaching hours due to this is made up in some wayso that students are not adversely affected.

However, inspite of the perceived positive features of the unrecognised schools, their high rates of fees, and other demands such as expenditure on school uniforms, deter many parents from continuing to keep the child in such schools. Also a harsh attitude towards pupils for keeping regularity in attendance and doing home work regularly, results in some children, particularly those of marginal socio-economic group, leaving the private schools to join government schools.

Most of the primary teachers teaching in the government schools are of the opinion that the old practice of survey of children required to be enrolled in the following year should be revived as it is demoralising for them to see that the under- qualified and untrained teachers of private schools have an upper hand and enjoy more popularity.

## Repeaters

The schools keep admitting the children throughout the year and not only at the beginning of the school year. In view of the non-detention policy of the government of Haryana, the teachers take recource to the provision of minimum attendance upto $50 \%$ as the excuse for detaining children in the same class. On the other hand, for some children who are admitted late on the basis of an affidavit, the shortage of attendance is condoned if their performance is satisfactory. Similarly the children who remain weak in studies, get detained on the ground of low attendance, even if they were regular.

Also sometimes children are detained in the same class because parents desire it in the interest of the child. But unfortunately, such children do not get any special attention for enhancing their achievement level. The repetition of the same curricular content with peers of younger age group often creates dis-interest and lowers self-concept of learners. If a child is made to repeat any grade, it should be with a special remedial programme of instruction.

The repetition rate is quite high in all the classes including class $I$, in which the promotion is supposed to be automatic. Efforts should be made to cut down the repetition rate by providing suitable remedial teaching to the weak students in each class right from the beginning.


[^0]:    *This chaapoter is based on a write up prepared by Dr. B. R. Goel on the unrecognised schools.

