ISSN 0975-329X
Artha JSSci, **9**, 2, (2010) 1-11

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN RURAL KARNATAKA - AN ANALYSIS

Nanjunda D C and Ramesh***

Abstract

To spread education in case of highly marginalized section of our society has been a colossal task to any Govt. particularly to the tribal people. The strong point of a society lies in the task of education training, development and allocation of its man power resources. It can be said that education plays an imperative complete development of individuality so that one can make an original contribution to human life according to one's best competence. Making primary or elementary education available for all rural Indian children has been one of the major challenges for the all the Government. Furthermore, the quality of elementary education in rural India has also been a major cause of concern for the any Government. This paper draws attention of the readers about the conditions and settings of the rural schools in Karnataka State, South India.

* Center for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, University of Mysore, Karnataka, E-mail- ajdmeditor@yahoo.co.in

** Center for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, University of Mysore, Karnataka

Key words: *Education, Rural, Schools, Enrollment, Percentage*

Sources: National University of Educational Planning and Administration Survey Report, 2006-07.

Elementary Education in India

Education has been conceived as training for better life and better social adjustment in a community or group. It is a phase of the social process, which is fostered by society for life in-group. The present system of education in India, from the preschool stage to higher education, has been imported from the West in bits and pieces over the last 200 years. Despite provision of schooling facility within the reach and a plethora of incentives for vulnerable sections as part of programme of action under New Educational Policy (Revised 1999) the same ahs not yet been achieved till today and it is more worst in rural areas.. The overall cultural contexts of Indian society and the cultural specialties of its varied segments have been ignored by this system, with the result that it has never been fully accepted by the people. The government has made elementary education compulsory and free. However, the goal of universal elementary education in India has been very difficult to achieve until now. Therefore, it has introduced innovative ways of universalizing elementary education in-India (Thaneswara, 2006)

After the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) of 1994, the govt. has now launched the **"Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan"** or **SSA**. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan was launched in 2001 to universalize and improve the quality of elementary education in India through community ownership of elementary education. In order to effectively decentralize the management, it has involved **Panchayati Raj institutions,** School Management Committees, Village and Urban Slum Level Education Committees, Parents' Teachers' Associations, Mother Teacher Associations, Tribal Autonomous Councils and other grassroots level structures. SSA, apart from being a programme with clear time frame for Elementary Education, also offers opportunities to the states to develop their own vision of elementary education (Leclercq, 2006).

It has set 2007 as the deadline for providing primary education in India and 2010 as the deadline for providing useful and relevant elementary education to all children in the 6 to 14 age group. In order to improve the quality of elementary education in especially in rural India, the SSA has emphasized on improving the student teacher ratio, teachers training, academic support, facilitating development of teaching learning material and providing textbooks to children from special focus groups etc.

Despite all the efforts of the government of India, universalization of elementary education in India remains a distant dream in rural areas. This is because of the persistent poverty and various prejudices prevailing in the rural society. While the growth in female literacy is increasing at a faster rate than male literacy, the gap in the male female literacy in rural context has been a major hindrance in the universalization of elementary education in India (Rath, 2005).

Objective of the present study was to further analyze the fundamental facilities available in rural schools, secondly to estimate rends in gender disparity, enrollment and drops out ratio at primary level and thirdly, to examine the quality of the teaching staff in rural schools.

Methods

The source of data and technique adopted in this paper are mentioned in succeeding sections. Apart from the primary data The secondary data was collected from survey report of National University of Educational Planning and Administration (2006-07) and the selected statistics from the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt of India, (2003; 2005). The analysis of all these data is based on the data available for the specified references period and hence it my not reflect the present situations in rural Karnataka (India). The nature of this study is partly descriptive and partly explorative.

Results and Discussion

More than 90% of the schools are running in Pucca type building and 5% are in partially pucca type building. It is very painful to note that 11% of the schools are running in single room. Around 29 % of the schools are running with two class rooms only while 26% of the schools running in an average of 4-6 classrooms. 71.5% of the rural schools are ruing in overall good condition and 20% need some minor repairs while 7% of the school required a major surgery. It is very pathetic to write that 13.3% schools have single teachers. Around 30% of the schools are running with two teachers. 12% of the schools are running with three teachers. It is obvious that even with 100% enrolment rates, the universal elementary education cannot be archived unless 100% retention rates are achieved for all the children enrolled in both primary and upper primary schools. For this reason, the dropout rates should be reduced to zero among the entire social group up irrespective of the gender. Enrolment is shows an upward movement in primary level and gradually decreased in upper-primary level onwards. At the elementary level (Class 1-7th), the dropout rates are higher as compared tot eh primary level and it is true

in the case of both boys and girls. The dropouts among girls are higher than boys in all class. It is very significant to note that more 97% of the schools are located less then 1Km. for the near by Cluster Resource Centre. 135 of the schools have hand pump dinking water facility. Only 58% of the schools have tap water system for drinking. However, it is need to be noted that more than around 7% of the rural schools in Karnataka has no drinking water facility. Failures in attempts, long absenteeism, problems in re-admissions are some of the common reasons for dropouts among the rural children. Majority of the teachers are middle-aged persons (26-35).At the same time we can notice more or less percentage of the teachers belongs to the middle-aged category. Majority of the teachers teaching in rural schools are belongs to the ST community followed by the SC community. It is noticed that significant number of schools(27%) don't have nay permanent head masters or regular teachers. Around 60% of the teachers have para teaching (drawing, crafting etc.) qualifications and majority of the para teachers have secondary level qualification only.

Table 1: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Type of Building (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT Building Type	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
Pucca	90.98	92.03	89.79	86.62	83.66	91.37
Partially Pucca	5.64	6.11	4.45	8.18	5.23	5.84
Kaccha	1.47	0.85	1.05	3.72	3.27	1.22
Tent	0.62	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42
Multiple Type	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05
No response	1.22	0.79	4.71	1.49	7.84	1.09

Table 2 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Number of Classrooms (By School Category - State Level)

State/UT No of Classrooms	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
1	19.21	0.82	0.52	3.35	0.65	11.05
2	49.87	3.13	3.93	18.59	3.92	29.21
3	15.42	8.38	3.93	16.36	9.80	12.30
4-6	10.56	47.57	18.06	29.37	28.76	26.58
7-10	1.93	34.05	37.70	24.16	22.88	16.13
11-15	0.27	4.15	18.32	3.72	16.34	2.15
>15	0.08	0.91	12.30	1.49	8.50	0.57

Table 3 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Condition of Classrooms (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT Condition of Classrooms	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
Good Condition	62.57	60.15	68.89	8.76	72.16	71.52
Need Minor Repair	20.86	21.57	8.10	13.65	6.41	20.91
Need Major Repair	6.57	8.28	3.01	7.59	1.43	7.57

Table 4 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Number of Teachers (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT No of Teachers	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
1	23.43	2.07	3.14	6.69	4.58	13.99
2	50.08	4.70	7.07	15.61	3.27	30.00
3	15.09	10.30	5.24	18.96	6.54	12.96
4	5.10	19.00	5.76	10.41	5.23	11.07
5	2.24	15.15	6.54	11.90	7.19	7.86
6	1.02	12.82	9.95	7.43	9.80	6.20
7	0.62	11.27	8.38	11.52	17.65	5.35
8	0.44	8.24	11.52	4.46	11.76	3.92
9	0.24	5.42	6.54	2.60	3.92	2.53
10	0.14	3.52	7.07	2.23	7.19	1.68
>10	0.33	7.34	27.75	7.06	21.57	3.66

Table 5 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Enrolment} (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT Enrolment	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
1-25	28.84	1.18	2.88	3.35	3.92	16.59
25-50	35.10	4.05	3.66	10.04	7.19	2'1.35
51-100	23.69	19.04	8.12	25.65	11.11	21.55
101-140	6.61	16.61	12.04	14.87	15.03	11.00
141-220	3.86	24.09	17.28	18.59	35.29	12.80
221-300	1.03	15.92	20.16	8.55	12.42	7.63
Above 300	0.56	19.01	35.08	18.59	11.11	8.87
Missing Enrolment	0.30	0.10	0.79	0.37	3.92	0.23

Table 6 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Distance from CRC (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT Building Type	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
<1	96.07	98.44	99.21	91.45	78.43	97.02
1-5	0.44	0.35	0.79	2.23	3.27	0.43
>5	3.49	1.21	0.00	6.32	18.30	2.55

Table 7 : Percentage Distribution of Schools by Type of Drinking Water Facility (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT Type of Drinking Water Facility	School Category					All School
	Primary only	Primary with Upper Primary	Primary with U.Primary and Sec/ Hr.Sec	Upper Primary Only	Upper Primary with Sec/ Hr.Sec	
Handpump	13.04	13.12	17.28	19.70	28.10	13.20
Well 4.70	7.73	8.64	5.20	15.03	6.06	
Tap Water	50.95	68.06	64.92	62.83	45.75	58.42
Others	0.24	0.19	0.52	0.37	3.27	0.23
None	31.06	10.91	8.64	11.90	7.84	22.08
No Response	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Sources: State Education Department

Table 8 : Teachers Profile by Caste (Including Para-Teachers) (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT	Caste	School Category										Total	
		Primary only		Primary with Upper Primary		Primary with U.Primary and Sec/Hr.Sec		Upper Primary Only		Upper Primary with Sec/Hr.Sec			
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
General		21	26	24	33	2	1	2	0	2	0	51	60
SC		10610	6645	20173	16652	190	243	252	167	81	41	31308	23748
ST		16446	11106	28512	25124	428	588	329	258	73	76	45788	37152
OBC		4073	3425	10091	7807	537	849	134	92	381	260	15216	12433
ORC		953	468	2300	1361	177	203	26	16	214	97	3670	2145
Others		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1
No Response		1027	714	1629	1177	64	55	42	22	25	13	2787	1981
State Total		33130	22384	62730	52155	1398	1939	785	555	777	487	98820	77520

Table 9 : Teachers Profile by Teacher Category (Including Para-Teachers) (By School Category-State Level)

State/UT	Cat-egory	School Category										Total	
		Primary only		Primary with Upper Primary		Primary with U.Primary and Sec/Hr.Sec		Upper Primary Only		Upper Primary with Sec/Hr.Sec			
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Head Teacher		1502	900	7217	2688	135	95	94	38	91	29	9039	3750
Acting Head Teacher		35	18	60	27	3	1	4	0	1	1	103	47
Teacher		30698	20992	51236	47448	1092	1755	630	488	577	414	84233	71097
Para Teacher		4	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
Part Time Teacher		2	1	5	13	0	1	2	0	6	2	15	17
Community Teacher		1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	3
Language Teacher		56	22	178	133	25	28	1	2	22	13	282	198
Others		812	447	4026	1836	140	58	54	27	80	28	5112	2396
No Response		20	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	9
State Total		33130	22384	62730	52155	1398	1939	785	555	777	487	98820	77520

Table 9 : Percentage of Para-Teachers by Professional Qualification (By School Category – State Level)

State/UT	Academic Qualification	School Category										Total	
		Primary only		Primary with Upper Primary		Primary with U.Primary and Sec/Hr.Sec		Upper Primary Only		Upper Primary with Sec/Hr.Sec			
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Below Secondary		21	26	24	33	2	1	2	0	2	0	51	60
Secondary		10610	6645	20173	16652	190	243	252	167	81	41	31306	23748
Higher Secondary		16446	11106	28512	25124	428	588	329	258	73	76	45788	37152
Graducate		4073	3425	10091	7807	537	849	134	92	381	260	15216	12433
Post Graduate		953	468	2300	1361	177	203	26	16	214	97	3670	2145
M.Phil. or Ph.D.		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1
Other		1007	713	1622	1173	64	55	42	22	25	13	2760	1976
No Response		20	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5
State Total		33130	22384	62730	52155	1398	1939	785	555	777	487	98820	77520

Conclusion

Education is an important avenue for upgrading the economic and social conditions of the rural folks. This study shows that generalizations regarding the schools facility and literacy attainment of rural children fail to capture the differential human capital attainment and obstacles in schooling due to the various institutional problems. Consequently, Govt. and NGOs should work to improve the school conditions. This, in turn, would help in formulating appropriate policies in different states and regions in India in order to facilitate quality higher education for rural children. Even though Govt schools teacher are highly paid compared to the private schools it does not match with the quality in the private schools. Perhaps it is the reason why we need to think to decentralize the management of rural schools with adequate functional autonomy of the panchayat raj institutions is essential

References

Chin, A.. (2002), "The Returns to School Quality When School Quality is Very Low: Evidence from Operation Blackboard in India" journal of Development Review. 23 (5): 67-75

Drèze, J. and Geeta Gandhi Kingdon. (2004), "School Participation in Rural India"., Review of Development Economics. **5(1)**:23-34

Leclercq, F., (2006), "Patterns and Determinants of Elementary School Enrollment in Rural North India", Education Prospective.7(1): 3-7

Thaneswara (2006) , "Inputs in Primary Schools with Different Levels of Concentration of Scheduled Tribe Students", Indian Educational Review. Education Today.5(2):78-89

Tilak (2000), "Effectiveness of Various Interventions for Improving Rural Education- a Research Study", Educational Review.12(4): 34-37

Rath, K.B., (2005), "A Study of the Effect of Household, Community and School Factors on the Enrolment, Retention and Achievement of Scheduled Tribe Children at Primary Level, Indian Educational Review 14(4):11-16

Reports

1. National University of Educational Planning and Administration, 2006-07
2. Report of National Sample Survey Organization.
3. Reports of Department of Statistics, Government of India, New Delhi.