Educational Development in India at Elementary Level— An Interstate Perspective

B.M.K. Raju* and Avtar Singh**

Abstract

Educational development is a multidimensional process. As a result, its impact cannot be fully captured by any single indicator. Educational development in different dimensions measured with the help of a number of indicators when analysed individually donot provide an integrated and easily comprehensible picture of reality. Such situation calls for using appropriate composite index, which can optimally combine development in different dimensions. Another issue is identification of indicators that are independent and collectively measure the educational prosperity of a State/UT. Broadly seven dimensions have been identified for this purpose. Some sub-components, which together reflect the main component/dimension, are also identified. The data of 7th All India School Education Survey (7th AISES) conducted by NCERT with reference date of 30th September 2002 has been used in this study. As the reference date coincides with the initiation of implementation of SSA interventions in many states, this work may serve as a baseline for assessment of SSA interventions. Data on the aspects which were not covered under the 7th AISES are taken from SSA, DISE and Achievement Surveys conducted by NCERT. A composite index is given by Narain et. al. while measuring socio-economic development of states

in India was used in this study. On the basis of this index, various States and UTs were compared with respect to systemic quality in the field of elementary education. Kerala stands at No. 1 position when elementary education as a whole is considered. Though, Tamil Nadu is on top position at primary level education, very strong upper primary level education of Kerala pushes the state to fore front at elementary level. The states which are lagging behind at elementary level are Bihar, Jharkhand and Nagaland. The dimensions where these states are lagging behind are identified so that administrators put focused efforts in those weak areas.

1. Introduction

Developmental programmes in various fields were taken up in the country in a planned way through various Five-Year Plans with the main objective of enhancing the quality of life of general masses by providing basic necessities of life as well as effecting improvement in their social and economic well-being. It is an established fact that education is a principal plank to all-round human development. In accordance with the Constitutional commitment to ensure free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of 14 years, provision of universal elementary education has been a salient feature of national policy since independence. This resolve has been spelt out emphatically in National Policy of Education (NPE), 1986 and the Programme of Action (POA), 1992. The 86th Constitutional Amendment Act, 2002 made education a Fundamental Right for all children in the age group of 6-14 years.

The Government of India launched a programme, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) in 2000, a holistic and convergent programme to achieve the long cherished goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education of Satisfactory Quality by 2010. The SSA is an effort to recognise the need for improving the performance of school system and to provide community-owned quality elementary education in a mission mode. It also envisages bridging of gender and social gaps among children.

SSA envisions (1) all children enrol in School, Education Guarantee Centre, Alternative School, Back to School Camps by 2003, (2) all children complete 5 years of primary schooling by 2007 and 8 years of elementary schooling by 2010, (3) elementary education of satisfactory quality with the emphasis on "Education for Life", (4) bridging of all gender and social category gaps at elementary by 2010, and (5) universal retention by 2010.

How far we have achieved various goals of an intervention is a matter of investigation at regular intervals. With a view to keep tracking and monitoring of the interventions, progress of educational development in various facets needs quantification and the resulting statistics be updated periodically to evaluate the current situation and to plan corrective measures, if any, needed. It gives the direction in which further expansion is needed and guides in identifying the emerging thrust areas. If we put it in abstract way it enables the states to formulate policies and plan of action needed to further the development process. India, being a federal country, there has been a wide inter state disparity in pursuing the goals the SSA on account of diversity in geography, culture, linguistics etc. prevailing in the states. Any such effort of monitoring should obviously consider cross-sectional (spatial) analysis taking State/UT as a unit of analysis.

As development is a multidimensional process its impact cannot be fully captured by any single indicator. Statistical measurement of educational development in different spheres is important. But a number of indicators when analysed individually donot provide an integrated and easily comprehensible picture of reality. Hence there is a need for building up of a composite index of systemic quality / educational development based on various indicators. On the basis of this index various States and UTs can be compared to know where they stand in terms of systemic quality/educational prosperity in comparison to other states and UTs.

In view of this background a need is felt to compare various State/ UTs with respect to their educational prosperity using an appropriate composite index. The data of 7th All India School Education Survey (7th AISES) conducted by NCERT with reference date of 30th September 2002 works as baseline for assessment SSA interventions. Data on the aspects which were not covered under the 7th AISES are taken from SSA, DISE and Achievement Surveys conducted by NCERT.

2. Component Indicators

Obviously, before measuring the development in school education, it is necessary to identify the indicators that are independent and collectively measure the educational prosperity of a State/UT. Broadly seven dimensions have been identified for this purpose. Some sub-components, which together reflect the main component/ dimension, are also identified. These sub-components too are measured at primary and upper primary levels separately.

2.1 Access to school within a walkable distance (1km for primary level and 3km for upper primary level)

Access to school within a walkable distance is measured by Percentage population of habitations having access to primary stage within 1 km and Percentage population of habitations having access to upper primary stage within 3 km at the primary and upper primary levels respectively. The relevant data was culled from 7th All India School Education Survey (7th AISES) conducted by NCERT (2007a) with reference date as September 30, 2002.

2.2 Enrolment Ratio

Enrolment Ratio, being a measure of participation of children in school education, has been considered to be a component indicator of the model to be developed. It has been measured by Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) at the primary and upper primary levels. The relevant data have been taken from the 7th All India School Education Survey (AISES) of NCERT (2007b).

2.3 Equity in Educational Opportunities

The sub-components that together represent the main component 'Equity in Educational Opportunities' are i) Gender equity, ii) Social equity, and iii) Equity with regard to Children with special needs.

Gender equity is measured by Percentage of girls in enrolment at the primary and upper primary levels. Classes I-V and Classes VI-VIII are considered as the primary and upper primary levels respectively for this indicator. The data have been taken from the 7th All India School Education Survey (AISES) of NCERT (2007b).

Social equity can not be measured by Percentage of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes children in enrolment at the primary and upper primary levels as their prevalence varies from State to State. Unlike the gender of a child it is not a naturally determined phenomenon. Hence Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) is considered in this study. The data of these indicators have been taken from Selected Education Statistics—2002-03 of MHRD (2004). It is worth mentioning at this juncture that GER is more than 100 in case of certain State/UTs on account of over age and under age children enrolled at a stage. For practical purposes GER is taken as 100 for those State/UTs. The social equity, finally, is measured by simple average of GER of SC children and GER of ST children at the primary and upper primary levels separately. In case of State/UTs not having

SC population (Nagaland), the GER for ST is considered. Similarly for the State/UTs not having ST population (Punjab), the GER for SC is considered.

By the third sub-component, i.e. Equity with regard to Children with special needs, we mean by equity in educational opportunities for disabled children. Being a natural phenomenon, the State-to-State variation in prevalence of disabled children is not expected to be significant; the sub-component can be measured by Percentage of disabled children in the total enrolment, of course, at primary and upper primary levels separately. Data for this indicator is taken from the 7th AISES of NCERT (2007c).

2.4 Infrastructure available in the school

Comfortable physical environment surely complements the quality of learning. That is why physical infrastructure available in the school is considered a crucial input in schooling. Many indicators are available from educational surveys conducted by various agencies that can help in measuring this dimension. It is very important to see that double or triple accounting is not done by including all such indicators. It is to be ensured that the subcomponents identified should together reflect the main dimension. Inclusion of a number of indicators measuring the same subcomponent calls for re-measuring the same thing. Care has been taken while locating the subcomponents that they are independent. Various sub-components considered under this main component are as under.

  (i) Percentage of schools with pucca/partly pucca building
 (ii) Percentage of schools with separate lavatory for girls
(iii) Percentage of schools with drinking water facility
 (iv) Percentage of schools with adequate furniture for students
  (v) Percentage of schools with play ground facility
 (vi) Percentage of schools having electric connection
(vii) Percentage of schools providing health services as measured by average of percentage of schools arranging for annual medical checkup of students and percentage of schools arranging for annual vaccination/inoculation of students

The data for the above indicators is taken from the database of 7th AISES of NCERT (2007d) or various published reports of 7th AISES for the primary and upper primary levels separately.

2.5 Quality Educational Inputs

Physical infrastructure available in the school augments the quality of learning where as quality of educational inputs offered to children

will have a direct bearing on learning process. The subcomponents identified under this main component are as following.

(i) Average Pupil Teacher Ratio

(ii) Curriculum and Teaching Learning Material: At the primary level it is measured by average of Textbook, Workbook, Handbook and Teaching aids availability indices. The data for these indicators is obtained from NCERT (2006) Survey of Baseline Assessment of Learning Achievement at the end of Class V conducted in 2002. At the upper primary level it is measured by simple average of standardised indicators, namely, average number of instructional days and percentage of schools (with upper primary stage) having received TLM grant as available from DISE–2002-03 data.

(iii) Percentage of female teachers

(iv) Percentage of trained teachers

(v) Community Participation (village education committee/school development and monitoring committee) as measured by percentage of villages where village education committee (VEC) met atleast twice to the total villages existing. This indicator will remain same for the primary and upper primary levels.

The data for the above indicators except for (ii) are obtained from the data of 7th AISES of NCERT.

2.6 Efficiency of School System

System efficiency is an important factor in determining the educational development of a State/UT. It may be measured by combining the following subcomponents.

(i) Dropout: Measured by percentage children dropout between beginning class of stage under study and beginning class of the succeeding stage. Dropout at the primary stage (I-V) is taken from Selected Educational Statistics - 2002–03 of MHRD (2004), which used the true cohort of 1997–98. Dropout at the upper primary stage is derived from Dropout reported for elementary level (I-VIII) by Selected Educational Statistics - 2002–03 of MHRD (2004), which used the true cohort of 1994–95. Dropout at the upper primary stage is derived by subtracting the dropout at the primary level from dropout at the elementary level. If the resultant value due to this subtraction is negative, dropout at the upper primary stage is considered as zero (for practical purposes).

(ii) Average repetition rate of the component classes (of stage under study): Class-wise repetition rates as published by NUEPA (2005) and Mehta (2004) (based on DISE 2003-04 data using DISE 2002-03 as cohort) are used to compute the average repetition rate at the primary and the upper primary levels separately.

(iii) Transition rate at terminal class of a stage: Transition rate between terminal class of primary stage and beginning class of upper primary stage is taken from NUEPA (2005) and Mehta (2004) (based on DISE 2003-04 data using DISE 2002-03 as cohort). Due to non-availability of data, transition rate between terminal class of upper primary stage and beginning class of secondary stage is derived from enrollment data of 7th AISES of NCERT. This computation assumes that change in absolute value of enrolment in the beginning class of secondary stage between 2002 and 2003 is negligible. Enrolment in 2002 in terminal class of upper primary stage is considered as cohort. Enrolment in the beginning class of secondary stage in 2002 is taken as Enrolment in the beginning class of secondary stage in 2003. It is now a straight forward method to compute transition rate.

(iv) Average students attendance (as percentage of working days): The data for this indicator is obtained from NCERT (2006) Survey of Baseline Assessment of Learning Achievement at the end of Class V for primary stage. Students attendance data as reported by EDCIL (2007) in a research study under SSA has been used in case of the upper primary level.

2.7 Achievement level

This is an outcome indicator that can be used to monitor whether all the inputs given above are causing improvement in the level of learning in elementary education. The data for the indicator is obtained from NCERT (2006) Survey of Baseline Assessment of Learning Achievement at the end of Class V for primary stage. Examination results conducted by schools is considered to depict the level of Learning Achievement at the end of upper primary stage (class VII/VIII). Two indicators are presented in DISE 2002-03 report, (i) Percentage of passed children to total enrolment in the class, and (ii) Percentage of children passed with 60 per cent and above. For these two indicators average has been taken over boys and girls values. Final indicator has been derived by taking simple average of these two indicators after doing standardisation.

3. Methodology

Mehta (2007) described a procedure for building educational development index which is similar to the method used for computing HDI. In this procedure each indicator was first normalised by using the following formula.

$NV_{ij} = 1 - [(\text{best } X_i - \text{observed } X_{ij})/(\text{best } X_i - \text{worst } X_i)]$

Principal component analysis was used to obtain weights of the component indicators. DISE 2005 data has been used for evaluating the educational development of various state/UTs.

To get normalised value, the method uses range, which is very sensitive to outlier states. As a result, there can be a leverage effect. For eliminating subjectivity, PCA method is being used while deriving weights to be used in building EDI. The method derives weights on the basis of correlations of component indicators with the underlying PCA axes. Correlation coefficient being a measure of only linear relationship, reliability of the weights derived becomes limited. Further some of the correlations entering the factor analysis may be spurious. Considering the limitations of the method this study has considered a different method which less sensitive. The method is delineated as under.

Narain et.al. (1991) proposed a method to develop a composite index to measure socio-economic development for each state. They further examined the statistical significance of change in development indices over two periods. The states have been considered as the unit of analysis. The study utilised the data on various types of socio-economic indicators. The method of analysis given by them is as under.

Let a set of n points represent states 1, 2, … , n for a group of k indicators 1, 2, …, k. As the development indicators are in different units of measurement and the objective is to arrive at a single composite index, there is a need for standardisation of the indicators.

Let $[Z_{ij}]$ denote the matrix of standardised indicators, where $i = 1, 2, …, n$ and $j = 1, 2, …, k$. The best state for each indicator (with maximum/minimum standardised value depending upon the direction of the indicator) is identified and from this the deviations of the value for each state are taken. This procedure is to be adopted for all the indicators under study. They defined

Let $[Z_{ij}]$ denote the matrix of standardised indicators, where $i = 1, 2, …, n$ and $j = 1, 2, …, k$. The best state for each indicator (with maximum/minimum standardised value depending upon the direction of the indicator) is identified and from this the deviations of the value for each state are taken. This procedure is to be adopted

for all the indicators under study. They defined

$$C_i = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left(Z_{ij} - Z_{0j} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

Where Z_{0j} is the standardised value of the jth indicator of the best state and C_i denotes the pattern of development of ith state. The composite index of development is now computed for each state using the following formula.

$$D_i = \frac{C_i}{C}$$

Where

$$C = \overline{C} + 2S$$

Where $\overline{C}$ is Mean of C_i

is Standard Deviation of

The value of composite index is non-negative and it lies between 0 and 1. The value of index closer to zero indicates the high level of development while the value of index closer to one indicates the lower level of development.

4. Inter State evaluation of educational development

Certain states were not covered under DISE-2002, Achievement Survey of NCERT and SSA study. As a result, the data set was having some missing cells for certain indicators. Analysis was carried out by substituting the indicator value of India for the states for which data are not available.

Inter state evaluation of educational development has been done at the primary and upper primary levels separately. Average rank of a state over the primary and upper primary levels has been used to depict the situation at elementary level. The corresponding results are presented in Table 1. Ranking of states with regard to educational development at the elementary level shows that Kerala is at first position followed by Tamil Nadu. Karnataka is standing in third position. Next two positions are taken by UTs Andaman and Nicobar Islands (4th) and Puducherry (5th). Maharashtra is at 6th place. The other state/UTs in which elementary education is well developed is Delhi (7), Lakshadweep (8), Chandigarh (9), Goa (10) and Dadra and

Nagar Haveli (10). These state/UTs may be considered as developed states. The states whose ranks are in the range of 11 to 20 may be considered as developing states. The states falling in this group are Andhra Pradesh (12), Uttaranchal (12), Himachal Pradesh (14), Daman and Diu (14), Haryana (16), Sikkim (17), Gujarat (18), Madhya Pradesh (19) and Rajasthan (19). The remaining states may be considered to possess under developed elementary education. Educational development at the elementary level is utterly poor in Bihar followed by Jharkhand (33) and Nagaland (33). The other states which are showing dismally low development in Elementary education are Arunachal Pradesh (32) and Odisha (31).

At the primary level Tamil Nadu is showing the highest level of educational development followed by Kerala. Andman and Nicobar Islands is at 3rd position. Karnataka and Maharashtra are standing at 4th and 5th places. The other states having well developed primary education system are Puducherry, Uttaranchal, Lakshadweep, Delhi and Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The states which are in middle range are Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Chandigarh, Sikkim, Daman and Diu, Punjab, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. The remaining states may be considered as under developed in primary education sector. Of these Bihar, Jharkhand, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura are to go a long way to reach reasonable standards.

At the upper primary level Tamil Nadu has moved to 3rd position where as Kerala stands at No. 1 position followed by Karnataka. Fourth, fifth and sixth positions are taken by UTs, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Puducherry and Chandigarh. The other states flourished at the upper primary level are Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Maharashtra and Goa. The states which are having developing upper primary level of education are Lakshadweep, Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Sikkim, Rajasthan, Uttaranchal and Punjab. The remaining states are struggling with upper primary level of education. Of these Bihar, Odisha, Nagaland, Jharkhand and Arunachal Pradesh are dismally under developed at the upper primary level.

Ranking of states with respect to educational development at the primary and upper primary levels, to a large extent, looks similar. The exception states are Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Uttaranchal and Chandigarh. The performance of Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and Uttaranchal is better at the primary level as compared to the upper primary level. On the other hand Himachal Pradesh

and Chandigarh are showing better development at the upper primary level as compared to primary level.

Further, analysis of States with respect to development in different dimensions of school education may provide some insight. This kind of analysis may prove to be eye opening for policy planning as it brings out the individual dimensions at which the under developed states are lagging behind. The dimensions at which the developed states are prospered may be useful in setting potential targets for development. The corresponding results at the Primary and Upper primary levels are presented in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Table 2 shows that Lakshadweep is at No. 1 position with regard to providing access to primary stage within 1 km followed by Andhra Pradesh. Arunachal Pradesh, of course with its geographical constraints, lagging behind all the State/UTs in this dimension. Gross enrolment ratio (CER) is 100 or more for 21 State/UTs, assigning rank 1 for all of these State/UTs. It implies that the country would have achieved universalisation of primary education in 2007. However Punjab has to be prepared for a long journey to reach the cherished goal as it stands at bottom point with a GER of 68.33. In the dimension of equity in educational opportunities, Mizoram takes the first rank followed by Himachal Pradesh (2) and Andhra Pradesh (3). Bihar is at the bottom. As far as infrastructure dimension is concerned, Chandigarh (1) and Delhi (2) are ahead of all the State/UTs. Infrastructure is very poor in Meghalaya (35) followed by Jharkhand (34). Tamil Nadu is standing at No. 1 position with regard to providing quality educational inputs to children at the primary level. On the other hand Tripura is at last position followed by Bihar (34) in this dimension. With regard to efficiency of school system, southern part of the country is ahead with Kerala at first, Karnataka at 2nd and Tamil Nadu at 3rd positions. In this dimension too Bihar is at last position. Manipur is at No. 1 position with respect to achievement level followed by Tamil Nadu (2). Unlike in other dimensions, Bihar is at 3rd position in this dimension. Achievement level of students of States, Goa (35) and Himachal Pradesh is found very low.

The results in Table 2 can be seen from another perspective also. Identify the states whose rank is very high at the primary level from Table 1. Now locate the dimensions in which these states are lagging behind from table 2. These states have to concentrate on those weak spots and formulate the appropriate policies. It is apparent from Table 1 that Bihar is lagging behind all other state/UTs in providing quality primary education. The weak spots for Bihar are identified

under the GER, equity, efficiency, quality of inputs and infrastructure. The policy issues emanating for Bihar are to strictly implement free and compulsory education to age group 6-14 years, steps towards reducing gender and social equity gaps, investing in building infrastructure and improving quality of inputs. These steps, to a great extent, improve the efficiency automatically. Jharkhand is weak in access besides the weak areas of Bihar. So, the state has to think for opening new schools with primary stage. Nagaland has to concentrate on almost all components in a holistic manner except access. Arunachal Pradesh is having inherent geographical barriers to provide better access. The other weak spots to be focused are equity and quality inputs. Tripura has to focus on access, equity, infrastructure and quality inputs.

It is clear from Table 3 that four out of the five states lagging behind at the primary level (with rank more than 30) are lagging behind at the upper primary level too. These are Bihar, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland. This implies that these states need to make efforts to overhaul the complete elementary education system in their states. In the case of upper primary stage too, the systemic quality is least in Bihar. The state which is not alarmingly poor at the primary level but is so at the upper primary level is Odisha. The factors that pushed Odisha to bottom line at the upper primary level are infrastructure, GER, equity and achievement level. So, Odisha has some reasons to worry about the upper primary stage education and needs to take steps to correct the situation. Nagaland is one of the weakest states in almost all components except achievement level. Jharkhand is weak in access, GER, equity and infrastructure. Arunachal Pradesh is lagging behind in access, equity and quality inputs*.

Table 1: Educational Development at the Elementary level — An Inter State Perspective

Sl. No.	State/U.T.	Primary level		Upper Primary level		Elementary level	
		Di	Rank	Di	Rank	Avg. Rank	Rank
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0.699	12	0.701	14	13.0	12
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.928	32	0.907	31	31.5	32
3.	Assam	0.874	30	0.884	28	29.0	28
4.	Bihar	1.084	35	1.037	35	35.0	35
5.	Chhattisgarh	0.777	24	0.907	30	27.0	27
6.	Goa	0.711	13	0.665	10	11.5	10
7.	Gujarat	0.756	21	0.718	15	18.0	18
8.	Haryana	0.712	14	0.720	16	15.0	16
9.	Himachal Pradesh	0.765	22	0.645	7	14.5	14
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.840	27	0.787	21	24.0	24
11.	Jharkhand	0.960	34	0.908	32	33.0	33
12.	Karnataka	0.566	4	0.548	2	3.0	3
13.	Kerala	0.542	2	0.529	1	1.5	1
14.	Madhya Pradesh	0.695	11	0.847	26	18.5	19
15.	Maharashtra	0.571	5	0.664	9	7.0	6
16.	Manipur	0.848	28	0.810	23	25.5	26
17.	Meghalaya	0.863	29	0.902	29	29.0	28
18.	Mizoram	0.772	23	0.819	24	23.5	23
19.	Nagaland	0.929	33	0.910	33	33.0	33
20.	Odisha	0.801	26	0.917	34	30.0	31
21.	Punjab	0.717	18	0.775	20	19.0	21
22.	Rajasthan	0.720	19	0.746	18	18.5	19
23.	Sikkim	0.716	16	0.730	17	16.5	17
24.	Tamil Nadu	0.483	1	0.567	3	2.0	2
25.	Tripura	0.890	31	0.862	27	29.0	28
26.	Uttar Pradesh	0.729	20	0.803	22	21.0	22
27.	Uttranchal	0.619	7	0.761	19	13.0	12
28.	West Bengal	0.800	25	0.832	25	25.0	25
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	0.561	3	0.605	4	3.5	4
30.	Chandigarh	0.712	15	0.637	6	10.5	9
31.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0.682	10	0.685	13	11.5	10
32.	Daman and Diu	0.717	17	0.675	12	14.5	14
33.	Delhi	0.667	9	0.652	8	8.5	7
34.	Lakshadweep	0.623	8	0.673	11	9.5	8
35.	Puducherry	0.594	6	0.619	5	5.5	5

* D_i is more than 1 for Bihar State, as the C_i value crossed Average + 2 sigma limits.

**Table 2: Ranking of States with respect to Development in different
Dimensions of Education at the Primary level**

Sl. No.	State/U.T.	Access	GER	Equity	Infrast-ructure	Quality Inputs	Effici-ency	Achie-vement
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	24	3	23	4	27	24
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	35	1	32	24	30	32	5
3.	Assam	28	28	16	28	27	20	30
4.	Bihar	13	32	35	33	34	35	3
5.	Chhattisgarh	15	1	8	22	24	24	31
6.	Goa	10	1	27	7	19	7	35
7.	Gujarat	3	1	26	8	8	34	15
8.	Haryana	5	30	23	3	28	28	7
9.	Himachal Pradesh	33	1	2	20	20	29	34
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	26	29	28	25	18	13	33
11.	Jharkhand	31	31	33	34	29	21	17
12.	Karnataka	12	1	10	18	3	2	16
13.	Kerala	21	22	7	5	7	1	29
14.	Madhya Pradesh	17	25	11	16	15	31	9
15.	Maharashtra	8	1	19	9	6	5	12
16.	Manipur	25	1	21	31	33	15	1
17.	Meghalaya	18	1	12	35	23	26	17
18.	Mizoram	7	1	1	29	25	22	13
19.	Nagaland	9	33	30	32	31	23	22
20.	Odisha	23	1	18	30	11	25	8
21.	Punjab	6	35	20	15	26	11	14
22.	Rajasthan	24	23	24	12	21	30	11
23.	Sikkim	30	1	6	21	9	19	27
24.	Tamil Nadu	14	1	17	13	1	3	2
25.	Tripura	27	1	25	27	35	18	6
26.	Uttar Pradesh	20	26	15	10	17	33	32
27.	Uttranchal	22	1	9	19	5	4	28
28.	West Bengal	16	1	13	26	32	17	4
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	29	1	5	6	2	12	26
30.	Chandigarh	11	34	34	1	10	14	25
31.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	19	1	29	14	12	16	17
32.	Daman and Diu	34	1	22	11	16	9	17
33.	Delhi	32	27	31	2	22	8	10
34.	Lakshadweep	1	1	4	17	14	10	17
35.	Puducherry	4	1	14	4	13	6	23

**Table 3: Ranking of States with respect to Development in different
Dimensions of Education at the Upper Primary level**

Sl. No.	State/U.T.	Access	GER	Equity	Infrast-ructure	Quality Inputs	Effici-ency	Achie-vement
1.	Andhra Pradesh	14	21	18	20	4	18	26
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	35	22	30	24	33	26	6
3.	Assam	18	30	23	34	26	3	8
4.	Bihar	16	35	35	30	30	35	13
5.	Chhattisgarh	29	20	10	26	34	31	32
6.	Goa	12	2	28	4	16	6	28
7.	Gujarat	4	16	5	15	9	29	33
8.	Haryana	5	19	26	2	2	34	5
9.	Himachal Pradesh	21	3	4	22	8	4	20
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	23	27	17	25	14	20	29
11.	Jharkhand	32	34	31	31	20	10	13
12.	Karnataka	10	14	2	16	3	13	4
13.	Kerala	6	6	6	5	6	1	19
14.	Madhya Pradesh	22	28	22	18	31	32	18
15.	Maharashtra	13	10	9	8	18	14	24
16.	Manipur	30	15	16	29	29	17	2
17.	Meghalaya	33	26	13	32	27	24	25
18.	Mizoram	24	11	1	35	25	7	21
19.	Nagaland	34	33	33	28	28	28	3
20.	Odisha	19	29	25	33	19	15	34
21.	Punjab	7	24	20	10	15	25	35
22.	Rajasthan	20	31	34	12	5	19	30
23.	Sikkim	28	18	12	21	17	23	12
24.	Tamil Nadu	26	5	8	9	1	11	10
25.	Tripura	17	17	19	27	23	33	11
26.	Uttar Pradesh	25	32	24	14	24	27	31
27.	Uttranchal	15	12	15	23	32	2	23
28.	West Bengal	27	25	27	19	35	30	1
29.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	31	8	3	6	7	16	27
30.	Chandigarh	11	13	29	1	13	9	9
31.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	9	23	21	11	11	22	13
32.	Daman and Diu	3	4	11	13	22	12	13
33.	Delhi	1	9	32	3	10	21	7
34.	Lakshadweep	1	7	14	17	12	5	13
35.	Puducherry	8	1	7	7	21	8	22

REFERENCES

EdSIL. 2007. Study of students attendance in the primary and upper primary schools. Ed.SIL, New Delhi.

Govt. of India. 1986. **National Policy on Education.** MHRD, Government of India, New Delhi.

Government of India. 1992. **National Policy on Education 1986: Programme of Action 1992,** Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.

Government of India. 2000. **Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan.** Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.

Mehta A C. 2004. Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? **Analytical Report 2003.** National University of Educational Planning and Administration. New Delhi.

Mehta A. C. 2007. Elementary Education in India: Progress towards UEE **Analytical Report 2005-06.** National University of Educational Planning and Administration and MHRD, Government of India, New Delhi.

MHRD. 2004. **Selected Educational Statistics – 2002-03.** MHRD, Government of India, New Delhi.

Narain, P., Rai, S.C. and Sarup, S. 1991. Statistical Evaluation of Development on Socio-Economic Front. **Journal of Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics,** 43(3) : 329-345

NCERT. 2006. **Learning Achievement of Class V Students – A Baseline Study.** National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi.

NCERT. 2007a. **Seventh All India School Education Survey.** Schooling Facilities in Rural Area. National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi.

NCERT. 2007b. **Seventh All India School Education Survey.** Enrolment in Schools. National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi

NCERT. 2007c. **Seventh All India School Education Survey.** Schools for Physically Challenged Children. National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi. (in-print)

NCERT. 2007d. **Seventh All India School Education Survey.** Database. National Council of Educational Research and Training, New Delhi

NUEPA. 2005. Elementary Education in India. **Analytical Report.** National University of Educational Planning and Administration. New Delhi.