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## They reached the remotest Villages of India

ANDHRA PRADESH
Government DIET Colleges
Google Volunteers
Vivekananda B.Ed College, Mahaboobabad
ARUNACHAL PRADESH
Mr. K.P. Singh(NSS)
Dr. A.K. Mishra(NSS)
Mr. M. Dirchi
Mr. R.C. Singh
Mr. Tobam Dai
Mr. Goli Riba(NSS) and Mr. Kento Nagamodir
Mr. M. Yirang
NSS unit, Lower Subansiri
Miss Teetu Yoka
Mr. Manoj Kumar
Mr. Prem Dorji

## ASSAM

Socio-Economic Development Organisation (SEDO)
All India Student's Federation (AISF)
Socio Educational Welfare Association (SEWA)
The East
Assam Mahila Samata Society (AMSS)
Uttaran
NSS Unit
All Dimasa Student Union (ADSU)
Milonjyoti Self-Help Group
Jyotimoy Socio Economic and Welfare Society
Sahuji Asom Vikas Mansho (SAVM)
Raguratuk Club and Library
Wodichee
Society for Progressive Implementation and Development
Nerswn
Karbi Anglong Mountaineering Club
Social Unity Keepers Association For All (SUKAFA)

## BIHAR

Harijan Adiwasi Shikshan Prashikshan Kalyan
Sansthan
Disha Vihar
Sankalp Jyoti
Katavya Welfare Organisation
Akriti Sarva Seva
Disha Vihar
Akriti Samajik Sansthan
Sanjevene Darpan
Khadi Gram Udhyog Sansthan
Jawahar Jyoti Bal Vikas Kendra
Gramin Manav Seva Mandir
A.B.S.B.Y.K. Sansthan

Aakriti Sarva Seva
Samagra Manav Seva Samiti
St. Paul Foundation
Rashtriya Vikash and Samaj Kalyan Parishad
(Ravi Sankalp)
Lakshmi Priya Patliputra Vikash Sansthan
Bihar International Rural Development Society (BIRDS)
Shanti Shilp Kala Kendra
Nar Nari Samta Sansthan
Vindhyachal Samajothan Samiti
Nav Jyoti Kendra
Abhikram Saharsa

Mahila Shishu \& Jan Vikash
lkard
Pragati Shilp Kala Sansthan

## CHHATTISGARH

Jai Sai Seva Samiti, Raipur
Krantimanthan Sewa Samiti
Aasta Umen Social Sansthan
Lokshakti Samiti
Gramin Vikas Sewa Sansthan, Kanker
Chhattisgarh Jan Jati Vikas Parishad
Kulikota Gramin Sewa Samiti
Shrujan Samajik Sansthan
Centre for Action and Welfare Society
Naya Nari Kalyan Samiti, Bilaspur
Sroth Sansthan, Korba
Sanskar Vikas Sansthan, Koriya
Samaj Kalyan Shikshan Samiti, Kawardha
Manav Uthan Shiksha Sansthan, Jagadalpur

## DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI

Khanvel College
Govt. of Dadra Nagar Haveli Education Dept.

## GOA

Sarswat College
D.M.C. College

Dodamarg College

## GUJARAT

Matrubhumi Khadi Gramudhyog Seva Trust
Shikshan \& Samaj Kalyan Kendra
Anmol Rural Development Foundation
Development Support Unit
Aswamegh Charitable Trust
Prakriti Foundation
Laxmi Mahila Mandal
Dalit Sanghathan
MRM Institute Gujarat Vidhyapith Randheja
Pragati Mahila Sangh
Gram Lakshmi Trust
Sahyog Development Foundation
Healing Touch
Shree Lokseva Sarvajanik Trust
Marag
Friends Sport Club
Gramin Mazdoor Sabha
Brotherhood
Gram Seva Trust
Navjagruti Yuvak Mandal
Saurashtra Volunteer Action
Janda Gram Vikas Trust
Shakti Mahila Sangh Federation
Arvalli Gram Vikas Sansthan
Manva Ekta Charitable Trust
Bajrang Gram Vikas Trust
Mahila Samkhya
N.S.S Students, Vadodra

Anarde Foundation
Banas Dalit Sangathan
HARYANA
Dayanand Vedic College (NSS wing), Hisar Bagwan Pashuram College (NSS wing), Kurukshetra
Govt. College (NSS wing), Karnal
Vikas Gram Uday Mandal

Govt.P.G. College (NSS wing), Jind
Manohar Lal College (NSS wing), Fathehabad
Jai Sawachta Samiti
Mukand Lal National College (NSS wing),
Yamunanagar
Radha Krishnan College (NSS wing), Kaithal
Govt. College (NSS wing), Rohtak
Nehru College (NSS wing), Jhajhar
Janta College (NSS wing), Bhiwani
Govt. College (NCC wing), Mahendragarh
Yasin Mave College (NSS wing), Mewat
GGG SD College (NSS wing), Faridabad
Sanatan Dharam College, Ambala
Govt. College (NSS wing), Panchkula
HIMACHAL PRADESH
Govt. Degree College, Bilaspur
Govt. Degree College, Chamba
General Jorawar Singh College
Govt. Degree College, Dharamshala, Kangra
Govt. Degree College, Recongpeo
Govt. Degree College, Kullu
Govt. Degree College, Mandi
Govt. Degree College, Theog, Shimla
Govt. Degree College, Nahan
Vertex Information \& Research Zone (PTU), Solan
Govt. Degree College, Una

## JAMMU \& KASHMIR

Jammu University
Dept.of Med.\& Health Care, Jammu University
Degree College, Udhampur
Dept. of Sheep Husbandry
Degree College, Doda
Degree College, Anantnag
Kashmir University
Degree College, Budgam
Degree College, Baramulla

## JHARKHAND

Samajik Parivartan Sansthan
Sahyogini
Insearch
Jharkhand Gramin Vikash Trust
Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra
Lok Prerna Kendra
Veer Jharkhand Vikas
Seva Manch
Gramin Navodya Kendra
Gramin Samaj Evam Kalyan Vikash Manch
Bihar Pradesh Yuva Parishad
Jan Shabagi Kendra
Abhiyan
Sirjan Foundation
Lok Chirag Sewa Sansthan
Needs
Santhal Pargana Gram Rachna Sansthan
Lohardagga Gram Swaraj Sansthan
Yuva
Pragati Luyabih
Lok Hit Sansthan
NYK
Setu

## KARNATAKA

Bharatiya Grameena Seva Samsthe

Bhoomi Seva Samsthe
B.R. Hiremath BSW College, Mudhol

Akshara Foundation
Mahilla Grameena Vidyabivrudhi Samsthe, Devanahalli
Dept.of MSW , Bangalore City College
Dept.of MSW, Bangalore University
Paresara Mattu Vanya Jeevi Hitarakshana Samsthe
Dept. of MSW ,Ganga Kaveri Institute Of Management Studies
Belgaum Integreted Rural Development
Society
Marss-K
Rural Education And Action Development
Society
Center For Rural Development
Arunodaya Pairada
Neravu Samsthe
Nisarga Samsthe
Friends
Dari Samsthe
Margadarshana Society
Sevalala Rural Development Society
Ambekeves
Organisation For Integral Transformation
Power Organisation (All Bijapur District)
Sadhana Samsthe
Jagadguru Shri Shivarathrware B.Ed College
S.H.Groups

Sadhana Volunteers
Vikasan Samsthe
Prabodhini Trust
Siddeshwar Rural Development Society
Manjula Vidya Samsthe
Rajlakshmi Association
Basaveshwar Integrated Rural
Society Plant For Urban \& Rural Development
Padi-Value Oriented Education (Valored)
Utsavaamba Grameena Abhivrudhi Samsthe
Kuvempu Vishwa Vidyanilaya Samaja Karya
Vibhaga
Shri Vani Mahila Samaja
Meera Foundation
Spoorthy Samsthe
Shrishaila Vagesh Pandita Arathdya Maha
Vidhyalaya Dept. of Journalisam
Dept. of MSW, Karnatak University, Dharwad
Paripoorna Grameena Abhivradhi Samsteh,
Dharwad
Viwada Chemicals, Dharwad
Ujjivana Micro Finance, Dharwad
Srajana Ranga Mandir, Kcd, Dharwad
Karmani Grameena Abhivradhi Seva
Pratisthan
Kalpavraksha Grameena Abhivardhi
Samsthe, Dharwad
Shri Linga Basaveshwar Gramodyoga Seva Sangha
Agricultural Science Foundation Hulkoti
Sarvodaya Samagra Grameena Abhivrudhi
Samsthe
Parivarthana Samsthe
Sahara
Department of Education
Mahila Abhivrahi Resource Group

Asare Samsthe
Pragathi
Harshitha Alur Yojane
Prachodhana
Priyadarshini
Sharavathi Shikshana Samasthe
Spandana
Navodaya Eudational And Envronment
Development Services
Parivarthana Samsthe
Chaitanya Samsthe
Vidyanidhi Samsthe
Tropical Resource And Development Center
Spoorthy Samsthe
Embark Youth Association
Botalappa Youth Organisation
Sri Basaveshwara Yuva Sangha
Yashaswini
Vidyana Education Trust
Sasavi Multi Purpose Social Service
Organization
Sunanda Maitri Sagar
Mahila Kshemabhirudhi Samsthe
MSW DIET College
Child Charitable Trust
Rual Education and Developmnet Society
Center for Rural Studies
Rural Researchment Development Society
Dari Deepa Samsthe
Service Agency for Rural Women and Children
Sarvodaya Grameena Abhivrudhi Samsthe
Samvardhana Samsthe
Birds Society
Samasthi Trust
Bhuvaneshwari Central Foundation
Nisarga
Department of MSW, Manasangangothri, Mysore
J.S.S.- M.S.W. Students

Mahajana - M.S.W.Students
Grameena Mahila Abhivrudhi And Shikshana
Samsthe
Matoshri Shikshana Samsthe
Vivekanand Shikshana Samsthe
Spandana Samsthe
Vikasana Sasmthe
Swami Vivekanand Vidya Samsthe
Malenadu Grameena Abhivrudhi Parivarthana
Trust
Nirantara Social Welfare Society
Dhv India Pvt Ltd
Nirantara Social Welfare Society
Center for Urban and Rural Development Society
Department of Social Work, Tumkur University
Kudremukh Integrated Development Society
(KIDS)
Basaveshwar Integrated Rural Development
Society
Mother NGO
Centre For Rural Studies, Manipal Univeristy
Padi-Value Oriented Education (Valored), Udupi Unit
Shikshana Sampanmula Kendra, Udupi
Govt First Grade College, Dept. of MSW, Tenkanadeyuru, Udupi
Akshara Koragar Abhivaradhi Samsthe, Janapara Vedike, Udupi
Prakrithi Grameena Vikasa Samsthe,

Munuvarika Kalika Kendra, Karkala
Malenadu Education \& Rural Development
Society
Mukta Trust
Safe Star Corporation
Unit Centre, UK
Rural Urban Development Society
Arpana Samsthe
Think Samsthe

## KERALA

Kudumbasree

## MADHYA PRADESH

Krushana Jan Kalyan Sansthan
Nehru Yuva Kendra
Sikshya Prasar Samiti and Samaj Sewa Sansthan
Garima Gayatri Samaj Kalyan Sansthan
Padam Ganesh Sewa Kalyan Samiti
Takshshila Samaj Sevi Sansthan
Adat Samaj Sevi Sansthan
Bhimrao Yuva Jagarukta Vikas Samiti
Ma Sharda Shiksha Samiti
Kabaza Memorial Society
Sewa Bharti Sansthan
Govt. Chandra Vijay Mahavidyalaya
Dayanand Saraswati Vidya Mandir
The Children and Woman Health \& Education
Development Society
Sadhana Shiksha Arogya Avam Krushi
Kalyan Samiti
Anupama Education Society
Samuthan Samiti
Jagruti Nehru Yuva Mandal
Soraj Gramothan Jankalyan Yuva Vikas Samiti
Pragati Krushi Seva Samiti
Prashu Shiksha Prabhandha Samiti
Budhelkhand Mahila Janvikas Avam Samaj
Seva Samiti
Navjagruti Shikshavikas \& Jankalyan
Santhan
Takshila Computer Educational \& Social
Welfare Society
Astha Mahila Samiti
Janshikshan Santhan
Sidhanath Krushak Seva Samiti
Takshila Computer Educational \& Social
Welfare Society
Sendwa Sarwoday Shikshan Samiti
Durga Mandal Samiti
Prathamesh Shikshan Avam Samajkalyan
Samiti
Sawrgiya Khali Ahamad Shikshan Samiti, Khandwa
Ambedkar Vichar Manch
Prathamesh Shikshan Avam Samajkalyan
Samiti
Azad Gramin Samaj Seva Samiti, Jhabua
Motipura Nehru Yuva Mandal Samiti
Pritam Shiksha Samaj Kalyan Samiti
Seva Bharti Samiti
Sanskar Samajik Vikas Seva Samiti Mandal
Gaddi Yuva Mandal, Gaddi
Bharti Mahila Sawshakti Sangh
Aser Samiti

## MAHARASHTRA

Pratham Balvikas Bahu-udeshiya Shikshan Sansthan
Ankur Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Amravati
Avishkar Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan,
Chittapur
Maharashi Valmiki Bahu-udeshiya
Sansthan, Singhanwadi
Sammek Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Wankhede
Samata Sainik Dal
Swayamsewi Sangh, Asara
Manav Sewa Ayurvedic Sansthan, Asegao
Sanket Multipurpose Society, Aurangabad
Prayas Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Aurangabad
Janshikshan Sewabhavi Sansthan, Beed
Jansagar Bahu-udeshiya Sewabhavi
Sansthan,Pmipargwhan
Mauli Bahu-udeshiya Sewabhavi Sansthan, Beed
Tuljabhwani Sewabhavi Sansthan, Zola
Jay Shreeram Sewabhavi Sansthan, Warni
Anurag Adyapak Vidyalaya, Warthi
Samata Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Amravati
Sankalp Bahu-udeshiya Prakalp, Ralegaon
Uday Gramin Vikas Samajik Sansthan, Bramahapuri
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar MSW College, Morane
Kondiba Ghate Foundation, Armori
Snakalp Bahu-udeshiya Ralegaon Prakalp, Aasthi
Bharatiya Sanskruti Vikash Prabodhini, Armori
Udaya Adivasi Gram Vikash Sansthan, Kurza
Prahar Social Welfare Society, Goregaon
ESCEP Berojgar Seva Sahakari Sansthan, Ghoti
Satha Samagik Sanathan, Hingoli
Toshniwal College, Sengon
Shivaji College, Hingol
Mavim, Hingoli
Dyanjyoti Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Jalna
Kolhapur Pragati Shikshan Mandal, Kolhapur
Pratham Saksham Kendra, Kolhapur
D.Ed. College, Rukadi

Jijamata Sevabhavi Sansthan
Navjeevan Gramin Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan
Matrubhumi Gramin Sevabhavi Sansthan
Mannyad Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan
Shahid Bhagat Singh Sansthan
Nabira Mahavidyalay, Katol
Annapurna Sanstha, Pachakhedi
Lemdev Mahavidyalay Mandal
Tejas Mahila Mandal, Nagpur
Vanchit Vikas Loksansthan
Manav Vikas Sansthan
Nisarg Sevabhavi Sansthan
Jawaharlal Nehru College
Yaha Pandhar Adivasi Vikas Sanstha
Samata Bahu-udeshiya Sanstha, Nandurbar
Manasi Mahila Mandal
Manavihak Abhiyan, Naldurg
Krantijot Samajik Sanstha, Kerur
Dyanganga Samajik Shaikshnik Sansthan, Babalgaon
Rachnatmak Sangarsha Samiti, Makani
Sahara Samajik Vikas Sansthan, Kalamb

Hello Medical Foundation, Andur
Beleshwar Sewabhavi Sansthan, Parbhani
Dyan Sarswati Gramin Sevabhavi Sansthan
Nirmik Samjik Sanshdhon Vikas Kendra, Dhanewadi
Swapanbhoomi Kerwadi
Pratham Shikshan Mandal, Pune
Suprabhat Mahila Mandal, Pune
Suvidha Swaymrojgar Sanstha, Pune
Raghunathrao Dhumal Udyogik Prashikshan
Kendra, Bhigwan
Kailasvashi Vandanatai Raghunathrao, Dhumal
Kranti Joyti Mahila Mandal
Anand Bhuvan Hotel
Panchayat Samiti Mangaon Members
Pragat Kakan Sansthan
Gauri Construction
Ratnagiri District Adhyaksha
Lanja Taluka Sabhapati
Rajapur Taluka Aamadaar
Pasayadan Samajik Seva Sansthan, Dapoli
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Ashta
Dyas Samajik Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Jat
Voice Organisation, Satara
Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Mahila Audogik
Sahakari Sansthan, Nune
Krantijyoti Mahila Vikas Sansthan, Nune
Shankarrao Mohite Patil College,
Rahimatpur
Savitribai Phule Smruti Prathistan, Karad
Dodamarg Sabhapati
Yuvak Congress Neta
Union Anganwadi
Taluka Devgad Amdar
Tejomay Samajik Vikas Kendra
Savitibai Phule Shaikshnik \& Samajik BahuSansthan, Akkalkot
Vidyavikas Shikshan Sansthan, Solapur
Dr. Ambedkar Sheti Vikas Sanshodhan, Sangola
Satyashodak Shaikshnik \& Samajik Bahu-
Sansthan, Solapur
Swami Samarth Mahila Bachat Gat
Rahul Shrimant Dhepe
Rashtriya Seva Yojana, Thane
Vartak College, Wasai
Dandekar College, Palghar
Yash Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Hinganghat
Shr Munnati Mahila Vikash Shishayn W
Parshishay Sansthan, Belkheda
Chatrapatti Sanbhaji Maharaj Kardamandal, Virla
Janshishayn Paeshishayn Sansthan, Washim
Mavim, Washim
Shahid Bhagat Singh Yuvak Mandal, Mahagaon
Jeevandhara Bahu-udeshiya Samajik Sansthan, Yavatmal
Hitwad Bahu-udeshiya Shikshan Sansthan, Mankinhi
Bhimasen Bahu-udeshiya Shikshan Sansthan, Khandala
Rabiya Basari Bahu-udeshiya Sansthan, Javala

## MANIPUR

Mr. T. Vunglallian and Mrs Vungi Guite
T.Bimoljit Singh and S.Bijen

Community Development Society (CDS),
Ishok
Democratic Students' Alliance of Manipur (DESAM)
State NSS Cell, Imphal
Expedited Rural Agency, Senapati
N.Y.K, Ukhrul

Ms.Khuigai, Tamenglong
Ms. Dungkham Moyon, Chandel

## MEGHALAYA

NEHU
Martin Luther Christian University, East
Khasi Hills
RERAM NGO.

## MIZORAM

Sarva Siksha Abhiyan

## NAGALAND

Eastern Naga Students Federation (ENSF)
Konyak Students Union (KSU)
Nangland Society
Mokokchung Town Baptist Youth
Hills Club
Eureka Life Foundation
Family Planning Association of India
Peoples Agency for Development
Punoto and Associates
Ejan and Associates
Friends Club, Lanu

## ORISSA

Sri Smanta Chandra Sekhar College
Radheshyam Anchalika Mahavidyalaya
Khaira College, Khaira
Panchayat Samiti College, Ghaislet
Boudh Secondary Teacher Training School
and Boudh ITI (Student Union)
Sewa Bharati, Salandi, Balipatana
Gramin Sevak Samaj
DIET School, Deogarh
Jiral College, Jiral
Khajuripada College
Kukudakhandi Science College
Nabakrushna Choudhury Mahavidyalaya
Jarka College, Jaraka
Mahima College, Lakhanpur, Jharsuguda
Bhawanipatana Govt. Autonomous College
DIET, Tikabali
Bijupatnaik Govt. College, Antei
Rural Develpoment Project, Kendujhar
Pararamanda College, Bolgada
Similiguda College, Similiguda
Malkangiri Arts College, Malkangiri
Mayurbhanj Junior College, Boys Union,
Station Bazar, Mayurbhanj
Nabrangpur College, Nabarangpur
Niswartha, Social Organisation
Khariar College, Khariar
Allarnath Vocational College
Biswa Organisation and MITC (ITI) College
G. M College, and Pratham volunteers

Ullunda Panchayat Samiti Mahavidyalya
Rourkela Municipal College, Rourkela

## PUDUCHERRY

IPRS

## PUNJAB

DAV Police Public School, Amritsar DAV Police Public School, Gurdaspur
Govt. Senior Secondary School, Patiala
Pahal
NSS College, Muktsar
Govt. College, Mansa
Sahara Jan Sewa
Baljinder College, Faridkot
Ranveer College, Sangrur
Bharti
Govt. Senior Secondary School, Fatehgarh Sahib
D. M College of Education, Moga

Shaheed Bhagat Singh Krantikari Society
DAV College, Abhor
Govt. College, Mohali
Shanti Swarup Memorial Education Society
Red Cross Society
DAV Police Public School, Taran Taran

## RAJASTHAN

D.A.V. College, Ajmer

## IBTADA

Association for Sarva Seva Farms (ASSEFA)
Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society
(CECOEDECON)
Lupin Human Welfare Research Foundation, Bharatpur
Jatan Sansthan, Railmagra
Maru Vikas Avam Paryavaran Sudhar Samiti
EIIT Computer Institute, Bundi
Consumer Unity \& Trust Society (CUTS)
Lakshmi and Usha Mittal Foundation
Rajasthan B.Ed College, Dausa
Udghosh Social Welfare Society
Rajasthan Bal Kalyan Samiti
Suratgarh Educational \& Social Welfare Trust
Swami Vivekanand T.T. College,
Hanumangarh
Centurion Institute of Professional Studies
Shree Shanti Nath Vidya Bharti T.T. College,
Jalor
Modern Institute of Computer Science
Grass-root Development Laboratory
Gravis
Vasundhara Seva Samiti
Society for Sustainable Development
Modi Institute of Management and Technology, Kota
Jain Vishva Bharti University, Ladnun
Bangar Govt P.G. College, Pali
Jatan Sansthan, Railmagra
Consumer Legal Help Society
Jivan Mahavidyalaya, Sikar
Jan Chetna Sansthan,Sirohi

## SIKKIM

Rhenock Govt. College
Namchi Govt. College, Kamrong
Tadung Govt.College

## TAMIL NADU

Vidyarambam
People's Watch
Nether's Economic and Educational Development Society
Vidiyal Foundation
Rural Education for Social Transformation

Bharathi
Annai Kasthuri Magalir Mandram
Village People's Education for Rural
Development Association
Tamil Nadu Green Movement
Koodu
Sakthitrust
Aram
Adalayam
Grass roots
Govt. Arts College, Cheyar Block
Swami Vivekandar Kalaikoodam
Helper Education and Learning Project
Social Environment And Resource
Development
Vellore Science Resource Centre
Indira Gandhi Social Development Society
Anasuya Foundation for Women and Children Education

## TRIPURA

Pusporaj Club. Shri.Innamol Huqe
Tripura Adivasi Mahila Samiti
Smt. Siktapal
Chetna Sansthan

## UTTAR PRADESH

Avarti Welfare Society
Goswami Shiksha Prasar Samiti
Narayan Jan Kalyan Welfare Society
Shiya Welfare Society
Boys Scout And Girls Guide Welfare Association
Ragya Scout Guide
Nehru Yuvati Mandal
The Earth Welfare Society
Sewa Jagat Samiti
Social Welfare
Jan Jagran Shiksha Prasar Samiti Daha
Laxmi Jan Kalyan Sansthan
Student Federation Club
Parivartan Samiti
Jagdish Singh Kishan Vidhyalay Seva Sansthan
Mahila Upbhokta Sahkari Samiti Ltd.
Hepesh Garmoudyog Samiti
Mahila Samakhya
Army Man Social Welfare Society
Serva Hitkari Shiksha Prasar Samiti
Udgosh Welfare Society
Awasiya Seva Samiti
Akhand Jyoti Seva Sansthan Samiti
Ashray Sansthan
Nehru Yuva Club
Laxman Mahila Purush Bal Vikas Seva Samiti
Kamlangan Seva Samiti
Hari Kishan Public Inter College
Jan Kalyan Seva Samiti
Lavli Rsayan Sikshan Samiti
Akhil Bhartiya Sravasti Gramdhyog Seva Sansthan
Shiv Shakti Seva Sansthan
Bhartiya Manav Samaj Kalyan Seva Sansthan
Boudh Swyam Sahayta Samuha, Surgahana
Disha
Shradha Jan Shikshan Seva Samiti Mahrajganj
Swargiya Munakka Devi Seva Sansthan
Nehru Yuva Sansthan
Third Eye Society
Radha Krishan Seva Samiti
Sarwagin Vikas Seva Awam Jan Seva Sansthan

Lucknow Yuva Manda
Maa Shraddha Gramouthan Seva Samiti
Manav Seva Kendra
Shah Bal Avam Mahila Kalyan Sansthan
Sarvangin Gramin Vikas Avam Prashikshan
Samiti
Society For People Integrated Development
Samajik Vikas Sansthan
Hakim Singh Jan Kalayan Samiti
G.B Pant College

Prabudhni Sansthan
G. M .G And Samaj Sewa Sansthan

Sani Gram Udhug Sansthan
Nehru Yuva Kendra
Janta Seva Samiti
Institute of Education \& Training
Shiv Poojan Shukla Smarak Samiti
Asha Sansthan
Anuragini Samaj Sevi Sansthan
R.R.S Committee

Parm Lal Sewa Samiti Bhilawan Hamirpur
Rural \& Urban Research And Development
Mahoba

## UTTARAKHAND

Amrit Kunj Bhairav Samiti
Institute for Educational Leadership
Vasudhaiv Kutumbhkam (VK)
Degree College, Uttarkashi
Prerna Sansthan Ukhimath
IIT, Roorkie
Shivalik Vikas Samiti
Badridutt Pandey P.G. College, Bageshwar
Society for Protection of Environment and
Ecological Development
Shristijan Kalyan Samiti
L.P. Govt. College (NNSwing), Bhimtal

Saksham Lohaghat
Uttarakhand Vikash Avampariyavaran Samiti

## WEST BENGAL

Sociology Dept., Bankura Christian College
Burdwan Vivekananda Mahavidyalaya, NSS Unit.
Dept. of Social Work, Visva-Bharati
University B.T \& Evening College
Gangarampur College
St. Joseph College, North Point, \& Loreto College
Dept. of Rural Development \& Management, University of Kalyani
Shibpur Dinobundhoo Institution (NSS Unit)
Mainaguri College
Gour Mahavidyalay
Kajla Janakalyan Samiti
Joy Ma Tara Club,Pachthupi
Sociology Dept., Mrinalini Datta Mahavidyapith
(Birati College)
Purulia J.K. College, NSS Unit
Sabuj Sangha
Raigang University College
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Notes on ASER 2008

## IS IT WORKING?

There is every indication that even the poorest of India want education for their children. The question is whether governments, and their arms that are charged with the responsibility of providing education, are doing their work.

In physics, work is said to be done when a force moves an object through a distance. Mere application of force does not constitute work.

So, is the education system in India "working"? This is what we have been trying to track over the last four years. The UPA government came to power and declared its emphasis on transparency and on outcomes rather than mere outlays. It also took the welcome step of imposing a $2 \%$ cess on all Central taxes so that more force could be added to the ongoing efforts to change the status of education in India. The lack of current, country-wide, reliable, and independently measured information that is easy to understand provided the motivation for ASER in late 2005 when we sensed that in spite of the accepted ideals there was little movement on the governmental side to provide such information.

Four years is a long time in the life of a child, in the life of a school, in the life of a country. Over the last four years, the proportion of children out of school has dropped substantially although as the Government of India-commissioned study of 2007-08 and reports from ASER indicate, increased enrollment has yet to translate into a habit of going to school, especially in some of the Northern states. Alternatively, poor attendance is an indication of schools not functioning. Massive teacher recruitment has happened in a short time in many states and the pupil teacher ratio has improved substantially, at least at the state level. We have included in the annexures tables of approved outlays, expenditure, and some indicators such as PTR, \% out of school children, and \% children in Std I not knowing alphabets over three years. A state-by-state review by the reader is possible. For the first time, ASER has included an article on financing of education for the reader's ready reference.

So, the massive infusion of funds, construction of schools, recruitment of teachers, teacher training programs, mid-day meals, provision of textbooks, and such other actions constitute building up of the 'force'. The question still remains, is this force working against the forces of inertia to move education to higher levels?

It is often said that the impact of education takes a long time to show. In some ways this is obvious and true since a school-going child becomes a productive contributor to the economy and society only after eight or ten years. But, we have already spent four years. What have we achieved? And, how to measure progress? What tools to use? How frequently to measure?

ASER has chosen some simple tools and an annual measurement of learning levels at the very basic level. We test children even in Std $V$ and above to see if they can read a Std II level text. We see if children in Std I can read paragraphs, but if they cannot, we go lower and check whether they can read simple words; if they cannot even do that we see if they know letters. Our assessment of arithmetic is similar.

Over the years, several independent researchers have used ASER tools and found them to work. We also see that several governments are now testing reading at a basic level. Some use ASER-like tools and some do not.

The annual use of this simple and rapid form of testing using over 20,000 volunteers mobilized and trained every year has indicated where change has happened and
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|}\hline \text { States } & \begin{array}{c}\text { NCERT 2007 } \\ \text { Std V } \\ \text { comprehension } \\ \text { "facility value". } \\ \text { Read text, read } \\ \text { question, }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { ASER 2007 \% } \\ \text { Std V } \\ \text { children who } \\ \text { can answer } \\ \text { questions } \\ \text { based on Std } \\ \text { II text orally }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { CERT/ } \\ \text { ASER }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { answer on paper }\end{array}\right]$
where it has not. Tools that aim too high cannot capture the changes happening at the basic level under their radar. The simplicity of the tool enables ASER to capture even small changes effectively.

This raises the question that is asked in some quarters: how good is the ASER tool and technique? Perhaps comparing ASER results with other national level measurements will help answer the question.

The NCERT conducted a mid-term assessment survey of learning outcomes of Std V children some time in 2007. It reports a "facility value" for comprehension which is based on a child reading a 'story', reading questions based on it, and writing the answers. ASER2007 published numbers of children

| States | Census 2001: <br> Rural Female <br> Literacy | ASER2006- rural: \% <br> women who can read |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | age 7-80 | age 17-80 |  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 43.5 | 68.6 | 62.5 |
| Assam | 50.7 | 62.7 | 60.4 |
| Bihar | 29.6 | 44.6 | 32.1 |
| Chhatisgarh | 47.0 | 60.0 | 54.3 |
| Goa | 71.9 | 76.5 | 72.6 |
| Gujarat | 47.8 | 57.4 | 47.0 |
| Haryana | 49.3 | 60.5 | 48.3 |
| Himachal | 65.7 | 72.1 | 66.8 |
| J \& K | 36.7 | 60.2 | 50.2 |
| Jharkhand | 29.9 | 51.7 | 37.8 |
| Karnataka | 48.0 | 50.9 | 45.0 |
| Kerala | 86.7 | 89.3 | 90.3 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 42.8 | 54.9 | 38.5 |
| Maharashtra | 58.4 | 64.1 | 56.3 |
| Manipur* | 57.0 | 69.5 | 70.8 |
| Meghalaya | 53.2 | 72.3 | 75.1 |
| Mizoram | 77.3 | 80.9 | 79.3 |
| Nagaland | 57.5 | 64.3 | 65.2 |
| Orissa | 46.7 | 57.8 | 49.7 |
| Punjab | 57.7 | 65.2 | 61.1 |
| Rajasthan | 37.3 | 68.7 | 62.6 |
| Tamil Nadu | 55.3 | 55.2 | 49.9 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 36.9 | 45.7 | 34.3 |
| Uttarakhand | 54.7 | 68.8 | 59.6 |
| West Bengal | 53.2 | 63.4 | 54.9 |
| D \&N Haveli | 30.8 | 53.8 | 38.6 |
| Daman Diu | 59.3 | 70.1 | 62.6 |
| Pondicherry | 64.4 | 59.8 | 57.6 |
| INDIA | 46.1 | 56.6 | 47.7 |
|  |  |  |  | who could orally answer questions based on a Std II level 'story' regardless of their reading ability and the class in which they studied. The comparison, shown in Table 1, is quite close considering that one test requires written answers and the other oral.

The second comparison is on female literacy. People often wonder what Census of India means by literacy and dismiss it as a mere ability to sign one's name. Table 2 compares rural female literacy of 2001 with ability of women in the age group $7+$ or $17+$ as recorded by ASER2006. Over 550,000 older women and nearly 250,000 school-age girls from over 16,000 villages form the sample from practically all states and rural districts of India. Once again, the national rural female literacy number of 46.13 matches closely with ASER's figure of 47.7\% women in the 17-80 age group being able to read at least simple sentences. The proportion for the 7-80 age group is much higher because school going girls are able to read more. This number -- $56.61 \%$ female readers - is a predictor of India's rural female literacy. We expect female literacy to go up to $60 \%$ by 2010. If girls learn to read better over the next two years, it could be higher by a couple of percentage points.

ASER2006 showed a big jump in learning in Madhya Pradesh. Unfortunately, neither the MP government, nor anyone else took this improvement, or what caused it, seriously at the time. There were doubts raised about how good ASER was in measuring learning. ASER2008 once again shows huge jumps in MP and Chhattisgarh and some improvement in other states. More importantly, it shows no improvement in many states.

ASER is not the platform to discuss what has caused the observed changes. We simply record that whatever force that was applied has caused a movement against inertia. That indicates that something has "worked".

It is important to note what has worked, where efforts have failed to work, and where there were no efforts. ASER provides evidence. If governments do not take a serious note of it, they could be accused of dereliction of duty.

Unfortunately, no one asks for resignations if children's learning does not improve. It is time that we do.

## WHAT ELSE DO CHILDREN KNOW ? NEW TASKS IN ASER 2008¹

Dr. Rukmini Banerji *

Every year in ASER we add something new. Something new about children, something new about their households, about their schools and their villages. While maintaining the consistency and comparability over time with the basic reading and arithmetic assessment tasks each year, the "new" items provide a huge nationwide opportunity to look at different aspects of our children's lives. The "new" items also enable us to explore different influences on children's schooling and basic learning across India. ${ }^{1}$

Until 2008, the children's activities in ASER had focused around basic reading, comprehension and arithmetic. But what about other things that children can do? All around us, in cities and in villages, we can see children engaged in doing many kinds of activities that need cognitive ability and calculations as well. We see children in the market - both buying and selling. We see children helping parents and family members with many tasks. For instance, I recall a conversation with an eleven year old girl in a village in Sitapur district in Uttar Pradesh. In the ASER test, this girl was having difficulty correctly identifying numbers up to 100 . Just to put her at ease I started chatting with her about her daily life. There were nine people in her family. I asked her some questions about them. Very quickly, she could tell me the total number of rotis made in their kitchen for each meal, the number of utensils and vessels that were used in cooking and eating, how many clothes were washed every day, how much fodder was needed to feed the buffaloes that they owned. With a smile she said, "it is easy", she said "I don't have to do this on paper. I can do it in my head because I do much of this work anyway".

In our country in the elementary school age group, some children can read and some cannot; some can do numerical calculations and computations on paper and some cannot. ASER has been reporting on these basic arithmetic and reading abilities. But we know that children are capable of doing many more tasks outside the boundaries of the basic 3 Rs. The challenge is how to design assessment tasks for a large scale exercise like ASER that links what children do and know from their daily life to what they are supposed to know from textbooks and curriculum.

Much of our time in the months before ASER 2008 was finalized was taken up with designing and testing what such tasks could be, keeping in mind the constraints in terms of time, money and considerations of scale. We started off with a series of possibilities: Can children tell time? Can they read a simple school timetable? ${ }^{2}$ Can they use a map? Can they identify famous people? Can they use currency? Not only are all of these daily tasks commonly done in households or schools and in the usual life of children anywhere but they are also part of the curriculum in early grades.

Time: The time task was the simplest one. Telling time is introduced by Std III or IV in almost every state arithmetic textbook. We started our tests using digital clocks as well as the traditional analog clocks. We used a variety of options - easier ones of telling time on the hour, on the half hour, fifteen minute intervals like 3:15, 3:30, 3:45 and then of course telling any time. Using these time tasks across villages in different Indian states, it became obvious that digital clocks were not common everywhere. Interestingly, at the outset we had assumed that being able to tell time on the hour or half hour or in fifteen minute intervals would be easier than being able to tell any time. However the piloting as well as the final results indicate that if a child can tell time, s/he can tell any time or not at all. Telling time was a relatively easy question to ask and straight forward question to answer. So it stayed in the final version of the ASER 2008 tool kit. Nationally, about half of all school going children can tell time correctly by Std 4 or Std 5 and about three quarters of all school going children can tell time correctly by Std 6.

School timetable: When we began to explore whether children can understand and use a timetable, we assumed that a timetable is a regular feature of any school. Like using a clock, it would simply be a matter of showing the child a timetable and systematically assessing how children can use it. Unfortunately, early in the piloting process we observed that in several states like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, children even in Std 5 were not familiar with timetables. Most children needed explanations of what the matrix represented and then a discussion on the contents of the cells. We dropped this task as it seemed too complicated and variable for use in ASER.

[^0]Maps: In most states, maps appear in textbooks by Std III. For example, in Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, and Andhra Pradesh, the map of India is introduced along with the map of the state. In some cases (like Orissa, Karnataka, Gujarat), the state map with districts is introduced in Std III and then the country with state boundaries in Std IV. By Std V, children in all states have been exposed to the map of India with all the state boundaries. Furthermore, in many government primary schools around the country there is a map of the state and/or of India painted on the walls of the verandah or the classroom. Unlike other reading materials which may or may not be available in block head quarters in districts, maps of India and of the state are readily available in stationery shops anywhere. The point is that even for village children, maps are accessible and visible, in textbooks and elsewhere.

Given this context, the experience of using maps with children in the preparatory phase of ASER 2008 was disappointing. We tried variations of maps - all variations were of maps of India with state boundaries. We tried asking children to point to their own state, to neighbouring states on blank maps. We tried the same thing with maps where some state names were included. In each case, a vast majority of children were unable to do any of the naming tasks. In fact, the testing of maps also indicated that the surveyors themselves were struggling with being able to identify the major states and name them correctly.

There is a big lesson from the experience of using maps in the preparatory phase of ASER 2008. We need to work much harder across the country to enable children to be able to do different kinds of visual representation. Deciphering maps and visual representations of known geographies like their home, school and neighbourhood. Perhaps understanding maps of local areas and then of districts, states and countries will come later. ${ }^{3}$

Famous people: Who are people, past or present, whose face every Indian child should be able to recognize by the time he or she is 10 ? We needed pan-Indian famous people because in ASER we ask children across the country to do the same tasks. We started off the famous people exercise with black and white pictures of the founding fathers of the country. But beyond Gandhiji and Nehru, others like Ambedkar, Tilak, Sardar Patel, Maulana Azad, Netaji were not recognized. More recent famous people included Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi, Manmohan Singh, erstwhile President Kalam, current president Pratibha Patil, Atal Bihari Vaipayee, Sonia Gandhi etc. Here too, beyond Indira Gandhi, the percentage of children being able to recognize people was low. People who are well known but not in politics include cricketers and film stars. Although name recognition of Sachin Tendulkar or Dhoni was high, distinguishing them in pictures was much harder for rural primary school children. The same was true for movie stars.

Who do our children meet in textbooks? This was another fascinating exercise. For example, if we compare textbook content across states, we see, for instance, that West Bengal in Std III and IV introduces Subhas Chandra Bose, Swami Vivekananda, Sri Ramakrishna and Jagdish Chandra Bose to its children. In Bihar, the list of famous people starts with Rani of Jhansi, Begum Hazrat Mahal, Tilak and Gokhale, Madame Cama, Sardar Patel, Rajagopalachari, Maulana Azad, Dr, Rajendra Prasad, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and so on. In Karnataka, the focus is on social reformers and on regional leaders.

The famous people task was dropped as we could not come up with a set of comparable options, of contemporary or past Indians across the country. Again, as in the case of maps, the exercise made us all think hard. Is it important for children in primary grades to have a common set of people that they know about? If so, we will need to work hard to figure how who these people should be, on what basis should they be chosen and what should children know about them.

Currency tasks: Children handle money from an early age. In previous years, as part of the arithmetic test, we had asked children several word problems involving transactions like "your mother gave you Rs. 50 to go buy vegetables. You spent Rs. 35, how much was left?" or "I gave you Rs. 50 . You bought notebooks and pencils worth Rs. 28. How much was left? Children could derive answers to these questions in whatever way they liked - they could write, count, use objects etc. Across the country, among school going children, almost half could answer these questions correctly by age 10. This was very similar to their ability level of doing a numerical two digit subtraction problem with borrowing.

But what if we gave children actual money and observed what they can do? In 2008, there were two different money related tasks. The tasks were designed so that even children in early grades could participate.

The first task involved comparisons of ten rupee notes and five rupee coins. The aim was to see if children could compare across different combinations of these notes and coins and say whether the amount was greater or smaller (or equal). In
the second task, children were given some currency notes (combination of hundred rupee notes, fifty rupee notes, ten rupee notes) and asked the total amount that was given to them. The All India findings indicate that a quarter of children in Std I could do both these tasks correctly; this figure is close to $50 \%$ in Std II. It is worth remembering that in an average Std II class in rural India, almost half of all children cannot as yet correctly recognize numbers up to 100, and only 16 percent of children can solve a numerical two digit subtraction problem with borrowing.

The basic design of ASER is simple: only a few tasks are done with all sampled children but they are done on a massive scale - with almost half a million children across India. The architecture of ASER therefore presents both a huge opportunity as well as a challenge. The simplicity is essential given the scale and the speed of ASER. ASER is also intended to be a common man's tool for understanding what children know and should know. The domain of children's learning and student achievement is a vast one. Internationally, this field is an industry in itself. In our country as well, between the existing and on-going NCERT national studies of student achievement and the forthcoming national survey by Education Initiatives, we can look forward to in-depth understandings not only of what children know but also of how to help them better. But in the meanwhile, as citizens of India, as funders of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, and most importantly as parents of children, we need to experiment with tools and methods that we can use easily, that help us know our own children better, and that enable us to help them develop their potential.


## The Shift to Private Schools

For the fourth year running, the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) has taken a snapshot look at children and schools in rural India. Carrying forward a process started in 2005, this year the Report covers 570 rural districts of the country, surveying various aspects of education in rural India, from enrolment and provisioning to learning levels.

As before, the good news is that the increasing trend in school enrolments appears to be holding; more children are enrolled in school than at any previous time in our history, with $95.7 \%$ of children in the age group of 6-14 years enrolled in some form of elementary school. However the official drop out rate of nearly $49 \%{ }^{1}$ implies that much will need to be done to keep in school those who have enrolled, and to retain the half that is likely to leave before completing the elementary stage of education. Rather surprisingly, this trend of increased enrolment is not observed in the 3-6 year age group, where on an all India basis, the number of children not attending either a school or balwadihas increased marginally in 2008 for each age, albeit staying lower than the numbers reported in 2006.

Sadly, even though most children are enrolled in school, they do not appear to be learning very much. In general, learning levels appear to be stagnant or declining, with for instance, only 41 percent across Grades 1 to 8 being able to read simple stories in 2008 as opposed to 43.6 percent in 2005. Similarly, only 27.9 percent children across grades could do simple division sums in 2008 , as compared to 30.9 percent in 2005 . This decline is observed in both government and private schools, even though the latter continue to maintain a marginally higher level than the government schools, at least on an all India basis. However, as has been shown elsewhere in this Report, in many States there is little or no difference in the performance of government and private schools, and in many the performance of the latter is far lower than that of government schools in some of the other, more educationally advanced States. In an uncomfortably large number of cases then, receiving a private school education would clearly seem to be no guarantor of acquiring any significantly better learning.

Despite this, one aspect of ASER 2008 that should cause policy makers some concern is the trend of increasing enrolments in private schools. The all India figure of children in the 6-14 year age group enrolled in private schools has increased from 16.4 percent in 2005 to 22.5 percent in 2008 , with significant increases in many of the States. Given the large scale investment that has taken place in the government education system under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan(SSA), partly financed through the collection of the Education Cess since 2004, the reasons behind this increase bear examination. This trend acquires added significance in the context of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Bill, 2008, introduced in Parliament last month, which mandates all schools, including unaided ones, to provide for at least 25 percent allocation of seats to children from the neighbourhood who belong to economically weaker sections.

It is worth recalling that the number of private and unaided-and in an increasingly large number of cases, unrecognisedschools in India has increased rapidly in the last few years, yet data on these schools is hard to come by ${ }^{2}$ (even ASER does not distinguish between private aided, unaided and/or recognised). A nationally representative survey of rural private schools conducted in 2003 found that 28 percent of the rural Indian population had access to fee-charging private schools in the same village ${ }^{3}$. Such schools provide an alternative to government schools, often perceived as low quality, to those who can afford them. Yet the quality of these private institutions is often questionable, particularly in the case of the hand-to-mouth establishments that have sprung up all over. While the phrase "private school" evokes images of upper crust Doon School-like clones, the fact is that a significant number are little more than teaching shops, run by poorly qualified and untrained staff for whom the school is the source of a meagre livelihood. Despite this, such schools continue to attract increasing numbers of children, leading at times to closure of existing government schools for want of students ${ }^{4}$. Also, many children enrolled in government schools are also going to private schools in clear cases of double enrolment, or as in West Bengal, to schools camouflaged as tuition centres,

[^1]This trend of increased private school enrolments is also interesting for another reason. The five States that report the greatest increase in ASER 2008 are, in decreasing order, Nagaland, Kerala, Goa, Jammu \& Kashmir, and Himachal Pradesh, with Punjab, Rajasthan and Karnataka not far behind. In the case of Kerala and Goa, nearly half of all enrolled children in the 6-14 year age group attend private schools. Four out of five of these States are considered to be reasonably educationally advanced, with significant investment in the public education system, financially and socially. In the case of Nagaland for example, in the immediate aftermath of the introduction of the Nagaland Communitisation of Public Institutions and Services Act, 2002, greater community ownership of schools was seen as having led to a reduction of drop out rates, improvement in teacher attendance, improvement in academic results, as well as a reverse shift of enrolment from private to government schools ${ }^{5}$. This trend now appears to have been reversed in the State yet again, with private school enrolments increasing from 10 percent in 2005 to 41 percent in 2008.

Similarly, Himachal Pradesh has always been considered one of the better performing States when it comes to education. In 2005, when the first ASER was released, the performance of government schools in the State in reading and math was higher than that of private schools; by 2008, this gap appears to have narrowed, with the performance of children from the latter almost equal in reading and better in math. Enrolments in private schools in the State during the same period have increased from 7 percent in 2005 to 24 percent in 2008.

The reasons for the shift to private schools will need to be investigated in some detail by persons more competent than this writer; they are however, likely to at least include any or all of the following: a perception that private schools are better than government ones, improved or enhanced disposable incomes, increased availability of private schools in the neighbourhood, and a demand for so-called English medium education, especially in the wake of the globalised economy. Schools under private management (both aided and unaided) rose from 15.15 percent in 2004-05 to 16.86 percent in 2005-06, and to 18.86 percent in 2006-07 ${ }^{6}$, clearly reflecting an upward trend. Whatever the reason behind increasing numbers of parents preferring private school education, it would seem that privately managed schools are here to stay and will need to be addressed accordingly.

With nearly one-fifth of all schools in the country under private management, it would be useful to examine the manner by which their standards can be improved so that overall learning levels can improve. Part of the answer may lie in The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Bill, 2008, which could allow the government to bring back the concept of the aided school which has fallen into disuse in most States. But no matter what route is taken, it would appear that the role of private schools is likely to be of increasing importance in the years to come; how we make best use of them will determine the future of our children and our own future as a nation.

[^2]
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## Private Schools: Do they provide higher quality education?


#### Abstract

This is the fourth year of ASER and this unique survey of the status of learning in rural India has become a much awaited report for policy makers. Every year state administrations use it to evaluate the impact and progress of their primary education programs. The sheer size of the survey also makes it very amenable for academic research. However, one of the shortcomings of ASER often cited by researchers is that it does not have information on enough "controls".


ASER, as the acronym suggests provides the status of learning, not the reasons behind it. Learning depends on many things. Apart from the child's innate (unobserved) ability, how well the child is learning will depend on the characteristics of the child, the school the child goes to, the household the child lives in. Child characteristics would include things like age, gender, whether the child gets additional help (tuition), etc. School characteristics include the type of school the child goes to, facilities available in the school, teacher characteristics, etc. And, household characteristics include parents' education, household income, etc.

While the ASER survey has information on child characteristics and most importantly on learning, it has not had information on a lot of other variables that might affect learning. Given the purpose of the survey and how it is conducted, collecting data on additional demographic characteristics has not been one of its priorities. However, over the years ASER has collected information on additional variables that might affect learning outcomes.

The core of ASER has been information on basic reading and arithmetic. This information, therefore, is collected and disseminated every year since ASER's inception in 2005. However, every year ASER adds information on additional variables --- demographic, school as well as testing information from new tools. In 2005, ASER investigators visited one government private school in each of the sampled villages and collected data on school facilities and teacher and student attendance. This was repeated in 2007. In 2006, the mother's education level was recorded and mothers were also tested for basic reading. Since 2006, ASER has continued to record the mother's education level, though they have not been tested in 2007 and 2008. In 2007, children were also asked whether they paid for additional tuition. ASER 2008 adds information on household assets and village infrastructure variables.

In the households the investigators were asked to enquire about the availability of various assets like phone, electricity, television, and livestock. Whenever possible they were asked to observe the presence of the asset. In addition, they noted what type of house the child lived in --- katcha, semi-pucca or pucca. In the absence of income data, household assets are the most reliable proxy for the affluence of the household. Income/affluence is found to be correlated with learning outcomes via providing access to better learning inputs.

Similarly, ASER investigators this year were asked to record village infrastructure variables. They were asked to observe whether the sampled village had a pucca road leading to it, whether it had a bank, post office, STD booth, PDS shop, government primary school, government middle school, government secondary school and whether it had a private school. Like the household variables, village infrastructure variables might proxy for certain educational opportunities.

There is a huge debate on whether private schools provide better education. Indeed, there is plenty of anecdotal evidence about parents' perceptions about the better quality of private schooling. According to ASER, between 2005 and 2008, the percentage of rural 6-14 year olds going to private schools has increased from $16.4 \%$ to $22.5 \%$ at the All India level. However, there are wide variations across states. Kerala more than doubled private school enrolment between 2005 and 2008 --- from $22.4 \%$ to $49 \%$. UP and Punjab are the other high private school states. Private school enrolment in these states increased from $27.9 \%$ to $35.9 \%$ and $25.3 \%$ to $41.7 \%$, respectively, between 2005 and 2008. On the other hand, Bihar, Chattisgarh and West Bengal have very low enrolment in private schools. For instance, in Chattisgarh private school enrolment increased from $4 \%$ in 2005 to $10 \%$ in 2008. On the other hand, in Bihar, it has fluctuated between 8 and 10\% and in West Bengal between 3 and 8\%.

What the above numbers imply is that regardless of the initial level, private school enrolment has been increasing steadily in rural India in the last 4 years. So the obvious question is: Why? The most logical answer maybe because they provide better education. ${ }^{1}$ Indeed that is the story one hears from many parents. They would rather send their children to private
schools because the inputs (teachers, facilities, etc.) are better there - the link between inputs and learning is assumed to exist. This hypothesis seems to be borne out by the data as well. In class 5 , the proportion of fluent readers in private schools was $68 \%$ as compared to $53 \%$ in government schools. ${ }^{2}$

The question then is that can one safely say that this large learning differential is entirely attributable to the better quality of education being provided in private schools? Is it not possible that a particular type of child goes to private schools and this kind of child finds it easier to learn? It is not difficult to construct scenarios where the difference in educational outcomes is entirely due to factors other than school inputs.

For instance, the positive correlation between household income and private schooling is well documented. In the ASER 2008 sample, about $50 \%$ of private school children came from homes which had "pucca" walls and roof. The corresponding number for government school children was only $25 \%{ }^{3}$ Now, it is possible that richer households have more educated parents who help their children with school work or get them additional help in the form of, say, private tuition. Therefore, the children perform better and the better performance is not due the better quality of school inputs but is attributable to home inputs.

The point of the above example is that there are many factors that affect how children learn. Therefore, drawing conclusions from simple correlations may not be the right thing to do. To see the impact of private schools, one will first have to control for the effect of other factors that affect learning outcomes.

In the past many of these controls have been missing from the ASER dataset. ASER 2008, for the first time, has information on household assets that can be used as a proxy for household income. It also has mother's schooling data, which is a very important determinant of not only whether the child goes to school but also of the child's learning levels. A serious shortcoming of the dataset, however, is the absence of school level variables. ${ }^{4}$ Keeping this caveat in mind, we proceed with the following analysis.

A simple model was estimated for learning in classes 1-5. The outcome variable was whether the child is able to read a Std. 1 text or more. This was related to the following characteristics: ${ }^{5}$

- Age of the child (and any non-linear effects associated with age)
- Gender of the child
- Whether the child's mother had gone to school (and any differential impact of this variable across gender)
- Type of school the child goes to (government/private/other) ${ }^{6}$
- Type of house the child lives in (katcha/semi-pucca/pucca)
- Other household assets (phone, television, electricity)
- Characteristics of the village the child lives in (whether a pucca road leads to the village, whether the village had a bank, post office, STD booth, PDS shop, government primary school, government middle school, government secondary school and whether it had a private school)
- Which state the child lived in (to capture different educational policies across states)

Controlling for everything else, a child with an educated mother has a higher probability (by about 6 percentage points) of being a reader. Girls have a lower probability of being readers (by about 1 percentage point) compared to boys. However, this gender bias disappears for girls whose mothers have been to school. All households asset are positively correlated with learning and as discussed earlier, this is because they capture the effect of higher household income. However, among household assets the largest effect is that of having a "pucca" house and that of having a phone in the house. Once we control for household characteristics, most of the village level variables are not significant determinants of primary school learning levels. This is understandable, since household characteristics are likely to be highly correlated with village infrastructure. For instance, if the village is electrified, houses located in it are likely to have electricity. There are two exceptions however. Even after controlling for household assets, children living in villages with a government secondary school and/or an STD booth are likely to have higher learning outcomes.7 So connectivity matters for learning - at both the household as well as the village level. Similarly, villages with a government secondary school might be more "developed"

[^3]which might be correlated with learning. For instance, it is possible that government primary schools that are a part of a larger secondary school are of a better quality because these larger schools have access to greater and better resources.

Once we control for all these factors, children going to private schools still have a learning advantage over their government school counterparts. However, this advantage which is about 9 percentage points for children in class 5 at the All India level varies a lot across states. Recall that the difference in learning levels in class 5 was 15 percentage points. Of this differential then, about $40 \%$ is attributable to factors other than the fact that the child goes to a private school.
Figure 1 shows the differential in learning levels in government and private schools for children in class 5 across different states. For each state, the "observed" and the "predicted" differential has been plotted. The "observed" differential refers to the difference in class 5 learning levels computed directly from the data and the "predicted" difference refers to the differential computed from the model after controlling for all the other variables that might affect learning. There are a few points that emerge from Figure 1.

- In most states (13 out of 20), the observed difference is greater than the difference after we control for other factors. Therefore, the "school effect" is not as much as it seems.
- In Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttarakhand and West Bengal, once we control for other factors, the differences between government and private schools get exacerbated. In these states, private schools are doing better than what the data would suggest at first glance.
- In Himachal, Maharashtra and Orissa there is no narrowing in the differential after controlling for other factors.
- In some states the difference between government and private learning outcomes completely disappears once we control for other factors - Chattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamilnadu. All these are very interesting states: Kerala has the highest learning levels and also the largest proportion of children in private schools. Chattisgarh had large gains in learning in 2008 and has only $10 \%$ children in private schools. Similarly, Madhya Pradesh made huge improvements in learning in 2006 and has managed to retain the gains. Tamilnadu, is at the other end of the spectrum, with consistently low levels of learning since 2005, despite having probably the best supply of educational inputs. Madhaya Pradesh and Tamilnadu have similar levels of private school enrolment - about 15\%.

So, we return to our fundamental question: do private schools deliver better learning outcomes? The answer from this preliminary analysis is "it depends". Clearly, more analysis needs to be done. Until recently there have been few nationally representative samples of households with children's learning data and with information on households and villages. ${ }^{8}$ The availability of such data opens up greater opportunities to get a better understanding of the differences between private and public provision of elementary education in rural India. This research is critical in today's India. On the one hand, we see big increases in private school enrollment each year and on the other hand, we see large scale attempts by governments to enhance learning in primary grades. Holding other things constant, it is imperative that we understand where children are likely to learn better.

Figure 1: Differences between Learning Outcomes between Government and Private Schools
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## Who is learning to read? A preliminary exploration

Four years of ASER data provide a wealth of possibilities for exploring trends in children's educational status over time. One fact that emerges in any such exploration is that in a country as large and varied as India, every state has a unique story to tell.

The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan framework on quality issues in primary education cites the 1992 National Policy on Education: "...irrespective of caste, creed, location or sex, all children must be given access to education of comparable standards". We can use ASER data to analyze what progress has been made on a very basic task -- teaching primary school children to read.

This question has an overall "quality" dimension (are there changes in overall reading levels among children in government primary schools?) and an "equity" dimension (are all children learning to read, or only some?).

This preliminary analysis looks at Std II text readers in Std 3-5 in government schools across the country. ASER classifies children as Std II text readers if they can read a text whose level of difficulty is equivalent to that of the Std 2 textbook in use in the state.

ASER data reveal that at the national level, the percentage of children in Std 3-5 in government schools who are Std II text readers has hardly changed in the last three years: $35 \%$ in $2006,37 \%$ in 2007, and $36 \%$ in 2008 (inset graph on Chart 1). However, these aggregate figures mask substantial differences between groups of students:

- Children whose mothers did not attend school achieve a far lower level of reading proficiency than children whose mothers did attend school.
- Within the category of children whose mothers did not attend school, girls achieve consistently less than boys.

These findings are based on the hypothesis that if we divide the total student population into distinct subgroups, each subgroup should - in a perfectly equitable, even if flawed, learning situation - be represented among Std II text readers in the same proportion as their representation in the population as a whole. To use an example, if 30 out of every 100 students enrolled are girls whose mothers are uneducated, then the same proportion ( 30 out of every 100 , or $30 \%$ ) of all Std II text readers should also be girls whose mothers are uneducated. And if these two percentages are the same, the ratio between them gives us $0.3 / 0.3=1$. By the same logic, in a perfectly equitable learning situation, every other group of students (girls with educated mothers, boys with uneducated mothers, boys with educated mothers) would also be represented among Std II text readers in the same proportion as their representation in the total population of students, giving us a ratio of 1 . Therefore, if we were to plot the proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment for each of these four groups of students, a perfectly equitable learning situation would show all four plotted points coinciding at 1.00 .

As Chart 1 shows, this is far from the case in India.

Children whose mothers attended school are substantially overrepresented among Std II text readers in Std 3-5. In 2006, for example, boys whose mothers went to school comprised $21 \%$ of total Std 3-5 enrollment but $25 \%$ of all Std II text readers, giving us a ratio of 1.17. Similarly girls whose mothers attended school comprised 19\% of Std 3-5 enrollment but 22\% of all Std II text readers, giving us a ratio of 1.16. Similar ratios are observed for 2007 and 2008.

[^5]Chart 1. Proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment Std 3-5 by groups of students: National trends, 2006-2008


If children whose mothers did go to school are overrepresented among Std II text readers, then children whose mothers did not go to school are by definition underrepresented. As Chart 1 shows, in 2006, the ratio of Std II text readers to total population works out to 0.87 for girls and 0.91 for boys.

This situation has shown practically no change over the last three years. Disparities are, if anything, increasing.
Mothers' education is used in this analysis as a proxy for non-school variables that affect children's learning. Children whose mothers did not attend school are more likely to face a range of social and economic constraints on their opportunities to learn. Although school systems cannot affect children's socioeconomic characteristics, they can take these into account in the design of interventions intended to improve learning outcomes. The obvious conclusion is that government primary schools have consistently failed to address the learning needs of disadvantaged students.

Once we look at individual states, however, it turns out that the "story" at the national level hides far more than it reveals.

There are states like Assam and Gujarat, where overall reading levels show a steady decline and differences between groups are growing. Then there is Karnataka, where overall reading levels are increasing - but so are differences between groups (Chart 2). There are also states like Maharashtra (Chart 3), where overall reading levels first improved and then worsened, but differences between groups have declined over the three years (greater equity).

## Chart 2. Proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment Std 3-5 by groups of students: Karnataka, 2006-2008
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Chart 3. Proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment Std 3-5 by groups of students: Maharashtra, 2006-2008


Chart 4. Proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment Std 3-5 by groups of students: Madhya Pradesh, 2006-2008


There is, fortunately, some good news as well. Two states in the country have shown that it is indeed possible to ensure that all children enrolled in government primary schools learn to read. Madhya Pradesh has demonstrated close to the ideal trajectory for several years now (Chart 4), while Chhattisgarh has shown dramatic progress during this last year (Chart 5).

Chart 5. Proportion of Std II text readers to total enrollment Std
3-5 by groups of students: Chhattisgarh, 2006-2008


Clearly this preliminary analysis only provides the introduction to the story. As we inch closer to universal primary enrollment, only the hardest to reach children are still out of school. At the same time, the shift from government to private schools is gaining momentum, leaving only those unable to access private schooling within the government system. Therefore the question of what interventions can best enhance learning for students from disadvantaged backgrounds becomes increasingly important for government departments of education. Many questions could be explored, perhaps the most important of these being:

- Within the primary education sector, what has enabled Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh to achieve such impres sive results, and what can be learnt from their experience?
- Beyond the primary education sector, to what extent do women's literacy programs demonstrate awareness of the clear link between mothers' education and children's learning?

More rigorous statistical analysis of ASER data will doubtless add detail and generate many more questions. And an infinity of entirely different stories are waiting to be discovered.

# ASER 2008: Financing Universal Elementary Education 

Dr. Anit Mukherjee*, Satyam Vyas* and Yamini Aiyer*

India's universal elementary education initiative known as Sarva Shikha Abhiyan (SSA) is one of the largest such programs anywhere in the world. Started in 2001-02, SSA has marked a watershed in publicly funded basic education in the country. During the first five years of SSA until 2006-07, the total expenditure in the program was around Rs.36,000 crore, shared by the Centre and State governments. Considering that there are nearly 21 crore children in the elementary school age, the expenditure per child works out to be just over Rs. 1700 over five years in addition to the expenditure that the states have been incurring annually.

These numbers must be looked at in its proper context. Before SSA came into existence, elementary education was predominantly financed by State governments. Even with the substantial expenditure through SSA, only 20 percent of the total public expenditure on elementary education is being spent by the Central government. What the extra resources of SSA has done, however, is to increase the level of spending in school infrastructure, appointment and training of teachers, and inputs for enhancing learning outcomes. These are the very areas where the State governments were not being able to provide enough resources in the decade of the 1990.

Financing a program of the size of SSA requires both revenue mobilization and implementation capacity. During the first phase of SSA, the Central government contributed 75 percent of the total releases, while the State government filled in the rest 25 percent. Resources from lenders and donors such as the World Bank, DFID and European Union (EU) were pooled with the budgetary support from the Central government. Allocations were made on the basis of annual plans drawn up by the States. These were supposed to be the outcome of a planning exercise starting from the school and local community at the bottom and worked upwards as per the needs of the block and district levels. Finally, the UPA government imposed an education cess of $2 \%$ on all taxes in the 2004-05 budget as additional revenue mobilization to fund both SSA and the mid-day meal (MDM) programs.

Figure 1: Progress in SSA expenditure


Figure 1 shows the progress of resources released by the Central government from 2001-02 to 200607 . The expenditure to approval ratio increased steadily from $15 \%$ in 200102 to just over 70\% in 2006-07. Moreover, the contribution of the State governments has also increased to the requisite $25 \%$ of total SSA funding, denoted by the excess of expenditure over releases by the Centre. Looking at the figures from the other side, $30 \%$ of the approved budget of SSA is not being utilized. This indicates that the size of the annual work plans submitted by most state governments is beyond their implementation capacity.

One rationale for the Central government financing is to ensure equity in elementary education provision across states. The objective of putting all children in school means that those states with high proportion of out-of-school children would require higher resources than others. In terms of financing, the difficulty in India is that the states that are most populous have the highest proportion of out-of-school children.

As per an MHRD-sponsored study, 70 percent of out-of-school children in 2005 were concentrated in five states - UP, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal. In 2006-07, the share of these states in Central allocations for SSA just exceeded 50 percent. On the whole, therefore, SSA resources have been allocated to those States that needed it the most to ensure that all children are in school. The following pie chart also shows that the BiMaROU states (including Orissa, Jharkhand, and Chattisgarh) obtained 62 percent of Central releases compared to their population share of around 46 percent.


The per-child expenditure in various states shows a mixed picture, presented in Table 1. Although UP has the highest share of the Central releases, its per child expenditure in SSA is less than that of Haryana. On the other hand, Chattisgarh's per child SSA expenditure is more than double that of West Bengal. Bihar's per child SSA expenditure is nearly the same as Tamil Nadu, which has about one-third of Bihar's share in Central releases. This essentially means that even with increased resource transfers from the Centre through SSA, the gap in per child expenditure in educationally backward states still exists.

Table 1: Central Releases and Per Child Expenditure in SSA: 2006-07

| State | Centre's <br> Release <br> (Rs.Crore) | Centre+State <br> Expenditure <br> (Rs.Crore) | Share in total out- <br> of-school children <br> (2005) | \% of <br> Centre's <br> Release | Per child <br> SSA |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| spending (Rs.) |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Going forward, the next phase of SSA will see the share of the States increasing progressively to 50 percent at the end of the $11^{\text {th }}$ Plan in 2011-12. In case additional Central transfers do not increase, states like UP, Bihar, West Bengal and Assam will need to mobilize their own revenues to sustain the expansion in annual SSA plan size. However, the ultimate outcome of increased expenditure is reflected in better infrastructure and improved learning achievement. As ASER 2008 shows, some states have performed admirably, while others have not. The crucial question is how to eliminate the inequities in quality of learning across the country. The SSA financing architecture may need to be re-evaluated keeping this goal in mind.

## About the survey

## Sampling Strategy : ASER 2008 Rural

Dr. Wilima Wadhwa*

## What's new in ASER 2008

The purpose of the ASER 2008's rapid assessment survey in rural areas is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading and arithmetic level) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions are added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning in the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2006 and 2007 tested reading comprehension for different kinds of readers. ASER 2008 has for the first time questions on telling time and oral math problems using currency. In addition, this year's ASER survey has incorporated questions on village infrastructure and household assets. Investigators were asked to record whether the village visited had a pucca road leading to it, whether it had a bank, ration shop, etc. In the sampled households, information on assets like type of house, phone, television, etc was recorded. This will be able to better establish the links between household affluence and learning.

As compared to previous years, ASER 2008 is fairly lean in the number of variables on which information has been collected. Instead the attempt this year has been to strengthen and streamline the process. Master trainers were trained for 4 days and before they conducted training in each district. In each district $2-4$ villages were re-visited after the survey in order to check how the survey was conducted.

Sampling Strategy (Household sample - children's learning and enrolment data)
The sampling strategy used will help to generate a representative picture of each district. All rural districts will be surveyed. The estimates obtained will then be aggregated (using appropriate weights) to the state and all-India levels. Like last year, the sample size is 600 households per district. The sample is obtained by selecting 30 villages per district and 20 households per village.

The villages were randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 census. The sampling was done using the PPS (Probability Proportional to Size Sampling) technique. The PPS is a widely used standard sampling technique and is the appropriate technique to use when the sampling units are of different sizes. In our case, the sampling units are the villages. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample.

The ASER sample is a rotating panel of villages. Every year, 10 old villages are dropped, and 10 new villages are added, giving a common sample of 20 villages. In ASER 2008, the 10 villages from 2005 were dropped. The villages from 2006 and 2007 were retained in the sample and 10 new villages were added. The 10 new villages were also chosen using PPS. The 20 old villages and the 10 new villages will give us a "panel" of villages, which generates more precise estimates of changes. Since, one of the objectives of ASER is to measure the change in learning, creating a panel is a more appropriate sampling strategy.

## Challenges of Generating district level estimates

Dr. Wilima Wadhwa*

One of the key elements that went into the design of ASER was that it should provide district level estimates of learning. This had clear implications for the sample size. Therefore, the sample size at the district level would have to be large enough so as to get reliable estimates at the district level. In ASER 2005 we started with 400 households per district, but found it to be insufficient and increased it to 600 households per district in 2006.

With 600 households, we get in excess of 1000 children per district, which is a reasonably large sample. However, the problem is that often we are not interested in the entire population of children, but rather in sub-populations. For instance, we might be interested in children in a particular class. At the sub-population level, the sample size becomes much smaller, which creates jumpiness in the estimates. ${ }^{1}$ This problem is mitigated to some extent by merging sub-populations so as to get sufficient observations. For example, we look at classes 3 - 5 together.

A more serious problem is that while we are interested in child characteristics, our sample is household based. ${ }^{2}$ The consequence of this is that we cannot control the distribution of children we get in the survey. ${ }^{3}$ In one year we may get more children in class 1 compared to other classes and this will be reflected in learning levels. If the following year the distribution changes in favor of higher classes, one will observe fluctuating learning levels.

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the age-class distribution is also highly variable. This gets averaged out at the state level, but can create jumpiness at the district level. The tables below give the age-class distribution of the same district in 2006, 2007 and 2008. In 2006, there were about 15\% five year olds in class 1. This increased to $29 \%$ in 2007 and then fell to $19 \%$ in 2008. Similarly, in class 3, 61\% were 8 year olds. This fell to $36 \%$ in 2007 and $30 \%$ in 2006. In the same district, the percentage of children in class 1-2 who could recognize numbers or more fell from $76.1 \%$ in 2006 to $52.5 \%$ in 2007 and then increase slightly to $53.7 \%$ in 2008. In class $3-5$, the percentage of children who could read at least a Std 1 level text, fluctuated even more - between $62 \%$ in $2006,37.7 \%$ in 2007 and $27.1 \%$ in 2008.

|  | 2008 Class |  |  |  |  | 2007 Class |  |  |  |  | 2006 Class |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 18.8 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0 | 28.8 | 4.6 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 14.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 35.8 | 7.4 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 43.7 | 16.5 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 71.9 | 17.0 | 5.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| 7 | 26.7 | 26.5 | 9.8 | 4.5 | 2.2 | 16.2 | 25.6 | 11.9 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 51.7 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| 8 | 9.1 | 33.3 | 29.9 | 16.2 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 28.9 | 35.8 | 18.7 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 20.3 | 60.9 | 11.0 | 11.1 |
| 9 | 4.2 | 9.9 | 19.5 | 11.7 | 14.4 | 1.8 | 11.6 | 24.7 | 18.7 | 12.4 | 1.8 | 8.2 | 17.9 | 44.8 | 7.6 |
| 10 | 2.4 | 14.2 | 20.7 | 35.1 | 34.4 | 0.9 | 7.9 | 11.5 | 33.9 | 34.0 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 7.3 | 31.0 | 47.5 |
| 11 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 3.7 | 9.9 | 13.3 | 0 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 8.1 |
| 12 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 11.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 19.6 | 0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 17.2 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 7.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 3.5 |
| 14 | 0 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 |
| 16 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |

The point is that ASER district level estimates can and do fluctuate. There can be several reasons behind that including an insufficient sample size. However, we need to investigate these reasons, not disregard the estimates. If we could double the sample size, do a complete houselist, control the population of children we get, the estimates could be improved. However, there is a tradeoff between costs (monetary, time and manpower) and the greater precision of estimates - these are the challenges of generating district level estimates.
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## What to do in the village?

## Instructions given to volunteers

## A list of 30 villages with block names for each district will be provided to each district team. If is VERY IMPORTANT that each and every village on the list is visited and 20 randomly selected households per village are surveyed. <br> This note outlines basic instructions of what to do in a village. Surveyors need to follow these instructions in the field strictly.

Contact Sarpanch : Introduce yourself to the Sarpanch or to other senior members of the Panchayat. Tell them about ASER. Get the approximate number of households in the village from the Sarpanch. Often the number of households can be used to figure out if you are in the correct village.

## HOW TO MAKE A MAP AND MAKE SECTIONS

To start MAKING A MAP - walk \& talk:

- To get to know the village, walk around the whole village first before you start mapping.
- Talk to people: How many different hamlets/sections are there in the village? Where they are located? What is the social composition of the households in each hamlet/section? What is the estimate of households in each hamlet/section? Tell them about ASER. This initial walking and talking may take more than an hour.

Map:

- Rough map : It is often helpful to first draw all the roads or paths coming into the village and going out of the village. It helps to first draw a map on the ground so that people around you can see what is being done. Use the help of local people to show the main landmarks - temples, mosques, river, road, school, bus-stop, panchayat bhavan, shop etc. Mark the main roads/streets/paths through the village prominently on the map. If you can, mark the directions - north, south, east, west.
- Final map : Once everyone agrees that this map is a good representation of the village, and it matches with your experience of having walked around the whole village, then copy it on to the map sheet that has been given to you.
Village with hamlets:



## ONCE THE MAP IS MADE, HOW TO MAKE SECTIONS IN THE MAP:

- Marking and numbering sections on the map you have made
- If it is a village with hamlets:
o Mark the hamlets on the map and indicate approximate number of households in each hamlet.
- If the village consists of more than 4 different hamlets, then make chits with numbers for each hamlet. Randomly pick 4 chits.
o On the map, indicate which hamlets were randomly picked for surveying. If there are 4 or less hamlets, then go to all of these hamlets.
o Do not worry if there are more people in one hamlet than in other. We will survey that hamlet as long as there are househols in it.
- If it is a village with continuous habitation:
o Divide the entire village into 4 sections geographically.
o For each section, note the estimated number of households.


## What to do in each section/Hamlet

- In the entire village, information will be collected for 20 randomly selected households: 5 households from each of the 4 hamlets/sections.
- Go to each hamlet/section. Try to find the central point in that hamlet/section. Stand facing dwellings in the center of the habitation.
- Conduct the survey with every 5th household rule. While selecting households count only those dwellings that someone lives in. In every 5th dwelling (ghar/house):
o Multiple kitchens : Ask how many kitchens or 'chulhas' there are? If there is more than one kitchen, then randomly select any one of the kitchens in that household. After completing survey in this house proceed to next 5th house. (House in this case refers to the every 'door or entrance to the house'). In each selected household, ask about all children in the age group 3 to 16 who eat from the same kitchen.
o No children : If there are no children in the age group 3-16 in a household but there are inhabitants, INCLUDE THAT HOUSEHOLD. Take the following information like name of head of the household and total number of members of the household. Such a household WILL COUNT as one of the 5 surveyed households in each hamlet/ section.
o House closed : If the selected house is closed or if there is nobody at home, note that down on your compilation sheet as "house closed". THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD. DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move to the next/adjacent open house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which there were inhabitants.
o No response : If a household refuses to participate, note that down on your compilation sheet as "No response". However, as above, THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD. DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move on to the next house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which not only were the inhabitants present, but they also participated in the survey.
- Stop after you have completed 5 households in each hamlet/section. If you have reached the end of the section before 5 households are sampled, go around again using the same every 5th household rule. If a surveyed household gets selected again then go to the next household. Continue the survey till you have 5 households in the section.
- Now move to the next selected hamlet/section. Follow the same process.
- Make sure that you go to households ONLY when children are likely to be at home. This means that it should be on a Sunday.


## How to Sample households in a hamlet in a Village?



## What to do in each household

IN EACH SAMPLED HOUSEHOLD: We will note information about the household. We will take information about children in that household who live there on a regular basis.

Household with multiple kitchens : In case of a household with multiple kitchens, randomly pick one and record the total number of members who eat from that chosen kitchen.

- Children 3 to 6: On the household sheet, note down the child's name, age, whether they are attending anganwadi (ICDS) or any kind of pre-school center. This applies to children who are in nursery, LKG, UKG, etc. We will not test these children if they are under 5. If the child is not going to any anganwadi/preschool, etc., note it down under the "Not going to Anganwadi" section.
- Children 5 to 16: On the household survey sheet, note down child's name, age and all other details. All children in this age group will be tested in basic reading, basic math and bonus test questions. (We know that younger children will not be able to read much or do sums but still follow the same process for all children so as to keep the process uniform). Ensure that the child is comfortable before and during the test and that sufficient time is given to each child.
- Mothers: Note down information about the mother for each child in the age group 3 to 16, e.g., mother's age, whether she has attended school or not and up to what class she has studied. Please ensure that the mother's data is recorded for every child (each row).
- Dropped out children who are not currently in school:
o Probe carefully to find out the class in which the child was in when she left/dropped out of school. Note the drop out class irrespective of the fact whether the child passed or failed in that class.

0 Record the actual year when the child left school. E.g. if the child dropped out in 2002 write ' 2002 '. Similarly if the child dropped out in the last few months write '2008'.

Other things to remember:
Ask members of the household as well as neighbours about who all live in the sampled household on a regular basis. We will take information only about these children.

- Older children: Often older girls and boys (in the age group 11 to 16) may not be thought of as children. Be sensitive to this issue. Avoid saying "children". Probe about who all live in the household to make sure that nobody that is in this age group gets left out. Often older children who cannot read are very shy and hesitant about being tested. Be sensitive to this issue.
- Children who are not at home but somewhere in the village: Often children are busy in the household or in the fields. If the child is in the village, but not at home, take down information about the child, like name, age, schooling status. Ask family members to call the child so that you can speak to her directly. If she does not come immediately, mark that household and revisit it once you are done surveying the other households.
- Children out of the village: If there are children in the family but who are not present in the village on the day of the visit, do not take their details.
- Visiting children : Do not survey or test children who are visiting their relatives or friends in the sampled village or household.

Many children may come up to you and want to be included out of curiosity. Do not discourage children who want to be tested. You can interact with them. But concentrate on the fact that data must be noted down ONLY for children from households that have been randomly selected.

Test Children: Details of testing given later.
Household indicators: All information on household indicators are to be recorded based, as much as possible, on observation and evidence. However, if for some reason you cannot observe it note down what is reported by the household. This information is being collected in order to link education status of the child with household economic conditions.

- Type of house the child lives in: Types of houses are defined as follows:

0 Pucca House: A pucca house is one, which has walls and roof made of the following material.

- Wall material: Burnt bricks, stones (packed with lime or cement), cement concrete, timber, ekra etc
- Roof Material: Tiles, GCI (Galvanised Corrugated Iron) sheets, asbestos cement sheet, RBC,(Reinforced Brick Concrete), RCC ( Reinforced Cement Concrete) and timber etc.
o Kutcha House: The walls and/or roof of which are made of material other than those mentioned above, such as un-burnt bricks, bamboos, mud, grass, reeds, thatch, loosely packed stones, etc. are treated as kutcha house.
o Semi -Pucca house: A house that has fixed walls made up of pucca material but roof is made up of the material other than those used for pucca house.
- Electricity in the household:
o Mark yes or no by observing if the household has wires/electric meters and fittings or not. Note this information irrespective of the fact whether electricity connection in the household is legal or illegal.
o Observe if bulbs/tube lights/electric appliances can be put to use to check if there was electricity in the household at the time of the visit.
- Television and phone:
o Phone can include mobile phones, wireless handsets as well as landlines.
- Livestock in the household:
o For each of the given types of livestock record appropriate numbers. Tick against 'none at all' in case of zero livestock.

Be polite. Often a lot of people gather around and want to know what is going on. Explain what you are doing and why. Tell them about ASER. Remember to thank people after you have finished surveying the household.


## From 2005 to 2008: Evolution of ASER



Age group 6-14
Children were asked
Enrollment status
Type of school

Children also did:
Reading tasks
Arithmetic tasks

## School visits

## Sampling:

20 randomly selected villages

## ASER 2007

Age group 3-16
Children were asked
Enrollment status
Type of school
Tuition status
Children 5-16 also did:
Reading tasks
Arithmetic tasks and
Comprehension tasks
Problem solving tasks
English tasks
Mothers education
School visits

## Sampling:

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2005 villages
10 ASER 2006 villages
New 102007 villages

## ASER 2006

Age group 3-16
Children were asked
Enrollment status
Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:
Reading tasks
Arithmetic tasks
And
Comprehension tasks
Writing tasks
Mothers education
Mothers were also asked to read a simple text

## Sampling :

20 ASER 2005 villages
Randomly selected 10 new villages

## ASER 2008

Age group 3-16
Children were asked
Enrollment status
Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:
Reading tasks
Arithmetic tasks
Telling time
Currency tasks

Mothers education
Household characteristics
Village information

## Sampling:

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 ASER 2007 villages
New 102008 villages

## ASER 2008: Tests and Testing

- All efforts are made to ensure that ASER 2008 tools are consistent with and comparable to ASER 2007 tools.
- A common framework is followed across all states in developing and refining tools to ensure that all elements in each tool are the same in every language.
- The content of all tests is cross-checked with state textbooks of Std 1 and 2 for equivalence. (In the case of English, the textbook for the year in which English is introduced was taken as the reference point).
- All tools go through a process of extensive field-testing with children across the country before finalization.
- All surveyors in all districts spent a "practice day" in the field during training.
- Children can choose the language that she/he is most comfortable to be tested in.

ASER 2008 asked ...
Pre-schooling/Schooling status
Children in the age group 3 to 6 were asked if
they go to any kind of pre-school.
Children in the age group 5 to 16 were asked if
they go to school or not. If they go to school
they are asked about the type of school (gov-
ernment or private).

## Learning status

Children in the 5 to 16 age group are asked to do tasks that included

- Reading
- Arithmetic
- Telling time
- Currency tasks


## Children were tested at home.

In a selected household, efforts are made to locate all children in the age group 3 to 16.

Before starting to test children, it is important that both the surveyor and the child are relaxed. The primary aim of the assessment exercise is to understand what children can do comfortably in reading, arithmetic, comprehension. Given this, it is essential that children are at ease and not worried about how they are going to perform. To help children to relax, surveyors chat with them or play simple games. Once the child is ready, then the testing tools are shown. The child has to be given sufficient time to read, to solve and to think. Often children will try to do a series of tasks until it is clear what he/ she can do confidently. It is critical that the surveyor appreciates what the child is doing.


All children were assessed using a simple reading tool.
The reading test has 4 categories:

- Alphabets : Set of common alphabets
- Words: Common familiar words with 2 letters and 1 or 2 matras
- Level 1 (Std 1) text: Set of simple 4 linked sentences. Each no more than $4-5$ words. These words or their equivalent are in the Std 1 text book of the state.
- Level 2 (Std 2) text: "Short" story with 7-10 sentences. Sentence construction is straightforward, words are common and the context is familiar. These words (or their equivalent) are in the Std 2 textbook of the state.


## पढ़ने की जाँच (2)

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| रमेश और महेश मित्र थे। एक | गाँव में एक सड़क है। | Sample: |
| दिन वे दोनों आम के बगीचे में |  | Hindi basic reading test |
|  | वह काफी पुरानी है। |  |
| घूमने गये। अचानक दोनो ने वहाँ साँप और नेवले को लड़ते |  |  |
|  | वहाँ साँप और नेवले को लड़ते |  |
| देखा। उन्होंने लड़ाई रोकने | इससे सब दुखी हैं। |  |
|  |  |  |
| महेश ने जल्दी से नेवले की ओर |  |  |
| डी फैंकी। नेवला डर | गाँव में भाल वाला आया। |  |
|  |  |  |
| गया। साँप भी बिल में छिप | या | can choose the |
| रमेश और महेश यह | गोो को मज़ा आया। | language |
|  | बने ताली बजाई | in which she |
| देखकर खुश हुये। |  |  |

In developing these tools, in each state language, care is taken to ENSURE

- comparability with the previous years' tool with respect to word count, sentence count, type of word and conjoint letters in words
- compatibility with the vocabulary and sentence construction used in Std 1 and Std 2 language textbooks of the state
- familiarity with words and context through extensive field piloting


## How to test reading?

## LEVEL 1 (Std. 1 TExT)

## START HERE:

Present the easy paragraph to the child. Ask her to read it. Listen carefully to show she reads.

The child may read slowly. She may read haltingly; she may make 3 or 4 mistakes in not reading words correctly.
However, as long as the child reads the text like she is reading a sentence, rather than a string of words, mark her as a child who "can read LEVEL 1 text".

If the child reads the paragraph fluently and with ease, then ask her to read the long text. This is also called LEVEL 2 text.

While reading the paragraph, if the child stops very often, has difficulty with more than 3 or 4 words and reads like she is reading a string of words not a sentence, then show her the list of words.

## WORDS

Ask the child to read any 5 words from the word list. Let the child choose the words herself. If she does not choose, then point out words to her.

If she can correctly read at least 4 out of the 5 words with ease, then ask her to try to read the Level 1 text again.

If she can correctly and comfortably read words but is still struggling with the Level 1 text, then mark her as a "word" level child.

If she cannot correctly read at least 4 out of the 5 words she chooses, then show her the list of letters.

## LETTERS

Ask the child to read any 5 letters from the letters list. Let the child choose the letters herself. If she does not choose, then point out letters to her.
If she can correctly recognize at least 4 out of 5 letters with ease, then show her the list of words again.

If she can read 4 out of 5 letters but cannot read words, then mark her as a child who "can read letters".

If she cannot read 4 out of 5 letters correctly, then mark her as a child who "cannot even recognize letters" or as "nothing".


All children were assessed using a simple arithmetic tool. The arithmetic test has 3 categories:

- Number recognition 1 to 9 : randomly chosen numbers from 1 to 9
- Number recognition 11 to 99 : randomly chosen numbers from 11 to 99
- Subtraction: 2 digit numerical problems with borrowing
- Division: 3 digit by 1 digit numerical problems.

MATH TEST/गणित SAMPLE(3)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { अंक पहचान } \\ 1-9 \end{gathered}$ | संख्या पहचान $11-99$ | घटावं | भाग |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 5283 | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ -29 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $7 \longdiv { 8 7 9 }$ |
| 73 | $37 \quad 27$ | 47 <br> -28 | $6 \longdiv { 8 2 4 }$ |
| 69 | 55 <br> 28 | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \\ -76 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $8 \longdiv { 9 8 5 }$ |
| 5 <br> 2 | $91 \quad 65$ <br> 36 <br> 43 | $\begin{array}{rr} 52 & 66 \\ -14 & -48 \end{array}$ | 4) 517 |
|  |  |  |  |

## How to test Arithmetic?

## SUBTRACTION: 2 DIGIT WITH BORROWING

## START HERE

Show the child the subtraction problems. She can choose, if not you can point.
Ask the child what the numbers are. She should be able to correctly identify the 2 digit numbers and the subtraction symbol.

Now ask her to write and solve the problem. Observe to see if she does it in the correct written numerical form.

Ask her to do a second one.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION

(11-100)
Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify numbers.
If she can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 11-100."

If she cannot recognize numbers from 11-99, then give her the number recognition (1-9) task.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION (1-9)

Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify numbers.
If she can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 1-9."

If not, mark her as a child who "cannot recognize numbers" or "nothing".


If she does both the subtraction problems correctly, ask her to do a division problem.

## DIVISION <br> 3 DIGIT BY 1 DIGIT

Show the child the division problems. She can choose one to try. If not, then you pick one. Ask her to tell you what the problem is and what she has to do.

Ask her to write and solve the problem.
Observe what she does. If she is able to correctly solve the problem, then mark her as a child who can do "division"

If she is unable to do one problem, give her another problem from the sheet.
If she is unable to solve any division problem correctly, mark her as a child who can do "subtraction".


## Tasks related to daily life:

How well can children do tasks related to daily life?

At home or in school, several times a day people look at a clock or watch. In most states, maths textbooks teach children how to tell time from Std III onwards.

There were two tasks for telling time
Clock One had telling time in 15 minute intervals; for example : on the hour, 15 mins past the hour, 30 mins past the hour or 45 mins past the hour.

Clock Two had telling time in 5 minute intervals.

Children were marked for each of these tasks. The findings reported in the report are for children who could tell time correctly in both clocks.


## Tasks related to daily life:

Children are familiar with money. From a young age, they observe and they participate in money transactions. In many states, textbooks have currency related tasks from Std 3 onwards.

Apart from the usual arithmetic questions that are asked each each year, in 2008, children were asked to do two currency related tasks that are described below.



## ASER 2008 Rural: Findings

## INDIA rural

## Std. III-V READING

Statewise map showing \% children in Std. III-V who can read Level I (Std. I) text or more
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## INDIA rural

Std. III-V MATH

Statewise map showing \% children in Std. III-V who can do subtraction or more
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## ASER 2008 Findings

Percentage of children not in school is dropping. Bihar has done well.

- Nationally, the proportion of 7-10 year-olds not-in school is at 2.7\%, and proportion of 11-14 year olds not inschool is at 6.3\%.
- All India proportion of 11 - 14 year old out of school girls remains steady at $7.3 \%$ over 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of out of school children in most states has decreased since 2007. UP and Rajasthan are exceptions.
- In Bihar, children (6-14 year old) not on school have dropped steadily over the last four years from $13.1 \%$ in 2005 to $5.7 \%$ in 2008 . Over the same period, the proportion of girls 11-14 not in school has dropped from 20.1\% to 8.8\%.

Enrollment in private schools is increasing.

- Among all 6-14 year olds, the proportion of children attending private schools has increased from $16.4 \%$ in 2005 to $22.5 \%$ in 2008.. This increase in private school enrollment represents a 37.2 percent increase over the baseline of 2005. This increase is particularly striking in Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan.
- In 2008, private schools have $20 \%$ more boys than girls in both age groups; 7-10 and 11-14.
- Half of all school going children in Kerala and Goa go to private schools. (According to DISE, $95 \%$ of private schools in Kerala and $70 \%$ of private schools in Goa are government aided.)
- Between 32\% to 42\% of all school going children In Nagaland, Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan go to private schools. (DISE data indicates that In these states private schools are mostly unaided).

Too young to be in school? More and more 5 year olds entering schools.

- $24.75 \%$ of an average Std I class in India has children under 6 years of age.
- $56.6 \%$ of all 5 year-olds are enrolled in schools rather than in pre-schools.
- In Rajasthan, J\&K, Punjab, Himachal, and Haryana over 70\% of 5 year-olds are in schools and comprise 25-40\% of the Std I class.
- In Himachal, Haryana, and Tamil Nadu the proportion of 5 year olds going to school has increased by 16 to 20 percentage points over the last three years.

Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh show dramatic improvement in reading.

- Chhattisgarh has shown a dramatic improvement in children's reading ability. The proportion of children in Std III who could read a Std I level text has increased from $31 \%$ in 2007 to $70 \%$ in 2008 . The proportion of Std V children who could read a Std II level text in 2007 was $58 \%$. By 2008, this figure had gone up to $75 \%$ in 2008. Reading levels in Chhattisgarh have improved dramatically across the board.
- In Madhya Pradesh too, reading levels in 2008 show a big jump at every level over 2006, and 2007. With $86.8 \%$ government school children in Std V being able to read Std. II level text, Madhya Pradesh tops the ASER scale of reading among all states including Kerala and Himachal where $73-74 \%$ children in Std V can read a Std II text in government schools.
- Madhya Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh, and Himachal Pradesh are states that lead the country in terms of children's basic reading fluency. In these states children who can read letters or more in Std I are over $85 \%$ and those who can read Std II text or more in Std V is over $75 \%$.
- Madhya Pradesh has achieved progress in two stages with the first jump coming in 2006 and the next in 2008.
- Karnataka, and Orissa show a steady increase in proportion of children who can read from Std II to Std IV. Over 2006 to 2008, the reading levels recorded show about 5-6 percentage point improvement.
- ASER has used essentially the same tool and the same method for four years. ${ }^{1}$ Barring some states such as Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal, Andhra, and Chhattisgarh, no major change has been observed in basic reading in other states.


## Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh show improvement in arithmetic also

- ASER tests indicate that Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh have made remarkable strides in improving basic math skills over the last year. In both states more than $91 \%$ children in Std I can identify numbers 1-9 or more. Although in Kerala this proportion is $96 \%$ in Std I, the highest literacy state loses its lead by Std III.
- In Std III, the proportion of children in Madhya Pradesh who can solve at least a subtraction problem has jumped from $61.3 \%$ in 2007 to $72.2 \%$ in 2008, while Kerala is at $61.4 \%$.
- In 2008, $78.2 \%$ of children in Std V in Madhya Pradesh, could correctly solve a division problem. This is the highest recorded in the country. In several other states, this figure is around $60 \%$; for example in Himachal, Chattisgaroh, Manipur and Goa.
- In Chhattisgarh, the improvement in arithmetic is dramatic, indicative of a focused intervention. In 2008, Std II children who could identify numbers up to 100 or do higher level operations was at 77.8 . This figure for Std II in 2007 was $37.2 \%$. Similarly, those who could at least solve subtraction in Std III jumped from $21.8 \%$ in 2007 to 63.5\% in 2008.


## Telling time:

- $61 \%$ of children in Std V in India can tell time on a clock correctly.
- In states such as UP, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, about $50 \%$ children in Std V can tell time. Bihar, Jharkhand, Orissa, Haryana, J\&K, Punjab, Uttarakhand are all above the national average.
- In Madhya Pradesh, Kerala, Chhattisgarh and Maharashtra, where math and reading ability is recorded to be much better than the national average, more than $75 \%$ children in Std V can tell time.


## Other interesting findings from the survey:

- ASER2008 also explored village infrastructure and household characteristics to find links with education. The links will be explored later. However, here are some findings.
- Primary schools are available within 1 km of $92.5 \%$ rural habitations and $67.1 \%$ villages have government middle school, and $33.8 \%$ have government secondary schools. Private schools are available in $45.6 \%$ Indian villages.
- STD booths are present in $58.5 \%$ villages while $48.3 \%$ village households have a cell phone or a land line connection.
- Electrical connections were available in $65.9 \%$ households surveyed.
- Pukka road connects $71.9 \%$ villages to the outside world. Lowest numbers are Assam (32.7\%), West Bengal ( $44.2 \%$ ), Bihar ( $53.2 \%$ ) and Madhya Pradesh ( $58.9 \% \%$ ) are states among the poorest connected states.



## INDIA rural

Out of school
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Statewise map showing
$\%$ of $\mathbf{7}$ to 10 year-old GIRLS who are not in school
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## ARE CHILDREN STILL OUT OF SCHOOL IN INDIA?

Dr. Rukmini Banerji *
One of the main achievements of Indian school education in recent years is the steady increase in numbers of children in school. Both international MDG goals and Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan targets aim for universal enrollment. For rural India in 2008, ASER indicates that $95.7 \%$ of children in the age group 6 to 14 are enrolled in school.

Where are the remaining children? What are the changes over time in the proportion of children of different age groups who are out of school? Where do we see significant declines?

Using ASER data from 2006 to 2008, Table 1 tracks changes over time for out of school children in major Indian states. For the age group 6 to 14, there is a decline in the percentage of children out of school in practically every state between 2006 and 2008. Among the major states, in 2006, there were only two states, Kerala and Himachal that had less than two percent children out of school. By 2008, the number of states meeting this criteria had grown to six states. Kerala and Himachal were joined by Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. For the 11-14 age group, in 2008 there were four states - Kerala, Tamil Nadu, HImachal and Uttarakhand where the percentage of out of school children was two percent or less.


## Source: ASER 2006, 2007 and 2008.

Bihar stands out as a state that has worked consistently across the years to bring out of school numbers down for each age group. From 2006 to 2008, Bihar shows the steepest drop in proportion of children out of school. In both age categories, the decline is more than 7 percentage points. Despite major floods this year, Bihar has witnessed a reduction in the percentage of children out of school.

The hardest group to keep in school are girls above the age of 10. In 2005, in poor and educationally backward states like Bihar and Rajasthan, the percentage of girls of this age group who were out of school in 2005 was above 20 percent. How much progress have states made in reducing out of school numbers for girls in this age group?

Table 2 focuses on states that had more than ten percent of girls (age 11-14) were out of school in 2005. All of these states indicate reduction over time. The sharpest drop again is seen in Bihar where the figure has dropped from $20.1 \%$ in 2005 to $8.8 \%$ in 2008 (Chart 1).

| Table 2 | Percentage of girls age 11-14 out of school |  |  |  |  | Percentage point drop over time in OOS 11-14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| States in | 00S | 11-14 Girls | 11-14 Girls | 11-14 Girls | 11-14 Girls | Change since 2005 | Change since $2006$ |
|  | Year | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2005-2008 | 2006-2008 |
|  | AP | 11.4 | 8.6 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 2.0 |
|  | UP | 13.8 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 10.3 | 3.5 | 0.8 |
| $\underline{L}$ | JH | 15.9 | 13.0 | 8.0 | 9.7 | 6.2 | 3.3 |
| E | OR | 16.5 | 13.7 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 4.5 | 1.7 |
|  | BH | 20.1 | 17.6 | 9.7 | 8.8 | 11.4 | 8.9 |
|  | RJ | 23.8 | 19.6 | 14.4 | 14.8 | 9.0 | 4.8 |

Source: ASER 2005, 2006, 2007 \& 2008.

India has come a long way towards meeting the target of universal enrollment. In a marathon, the proverbial "last mile" is often the hardest mile to run. Thus, persistence and innovation will be needed to cover the last five percent of children still out of school and greater efforts will have to made to ensure that once a child enters school, he or she remains in school and learns well all the way till the end of the elementary stage and hopefully beyond.

## Chart 1: Trends over time (2005 to 2008)

 \% Girls (Age 11 to 14) not in school


Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations
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Std. V Can Tell time

## Statewise map showing \% children in <br> Std. V who can tell time
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Std. V Reading
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## The National picture



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 564 OUT OF 583 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 71.9 | 22.5 | 1.3 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 70.0 | 22.4 | 1.2 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 73.8 | 22.1 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 72.1 | 24.1 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 75.9 | 19.7 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 70.1 | 22.5 | 1.0 | 6.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 69.0 | 24.5 | 1.0 | 5.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 71.6 | 20.1 | 1.1 | 7.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 57.2 | 23.4 | 0.8 | 18.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 58.2 | 23.8 | 0.7 | 17.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 56.1 | 22.8 | 0.9 | 20.2 | 100 |



NOTE: 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $78.2 \%(42.5+24.4+11.3)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 72.0 |  |  |  | 28.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 79.9 |  |  |  | 20.1 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 33.9 | 37.6 | 17.7 | 1.3 | 9.5 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 7.7 | 64.3 | 22.4 | 1.6 | 4.1 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $12 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.


## Children not in pre-school over the years

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children (AGE 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other)

ASER 2005 covered 489 districts. ASER 2006 covered 557 districts and ASER 2007 covered 570 districts.

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 34.9 | 41.9 | 16.4 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 100 |  |
| II | 13.0 | 31.9 | 31.2 | 15.1 | 8.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 6.0 | 18.1 | 25.6 | 28.1 | 22.2 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.2 | 10.1 | 17.3 | 28.6 | 40.9 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.9 | 6.2 | 11.1 | 24.6 | 56.2 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.1 | 3.7 | 7.1 | 18.6 | 69.6 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.8 | 2.4 | 4.5 | 14.3 | 78.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.5 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 10.4 | 84.8 | 100 |  |
| Total | 9.0 | 16.4 | 15.6 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 50411 umi |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{nai}}{\square}$ |
| बलुत दिन्दो को बनिश तो रही यी। गीन म्न सरीं जाए गेदा यानी मर गया ला। स्रमी लारिता के रालने ती राह यंज रहे चे। | नीतू को BR उस्रा रंग गाय हरी $\quad$ घा वह बहुता न | गत्य है। बत्या है। वर्तो है। दी |
| मी। उूरफ़ विफल जायाया काष तोम सुरा हो गये। आासमान में मिड्रियौं उदने जर्गी। होग उपने कपडे चुखाने नवे। तह्व यी पर्षो ती बाए निकलनख स्लनी लगे। | $\begin{aligned} & \text { न च स } \\ & \text { च त } \\ & \text { व ग त } \\ & \text { न च } \end{aligned}$ |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 34.7 | 43.3 | 17.6 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 12.6 | 35.5 | 35.3 | 12.8 | 3.9 | 100 |  |
| III | 5.6 | 21.4 | 34.3 | 27.9 | 10.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.8 | 12.7 | 27.3 | 33.2 | 24.0 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.8 | 7.9 | 20.7 | 32.8 | 37.0 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.0 | 4.8 | 15.7 | 28.6 | 50.0 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.7 | 3.2 | 12.4 | 25.7 | 58.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.9 | 9.2 | 21.6 | 66.9 | 100 |  |
| Total | 8.8 | 18.4 | 22.4 | 22.5 | 27.9 | 100 |  |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 7.0 | 21.4 |
| II | 17.6 | 42.6 |
| III | 32.9 | 61.9 |
| IV | 47.6 | 75.0 |
| V | 60.9 | 83.2 |
| VI | 72.1 | 89.3 |
| VII | 79.5 | 92.3 |
| VIII | 85.9 | 94.6 |
| Total | 46.4 | 66.6 |
|  |  |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


INDIA ruaal

## Performance of staste

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| States | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std 3-5) <br> who CAN <br> TELL TIME <br> of both <br> clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Andhra Pradesh | 87.9 | 3.4 | 27.6 | 87.0 | 87.9 | 72.1 | 63.4 | 32.7 | 77.3 |
| Arunachal Pradesh*† | 54.5 | 5.0 | 17.2 | 93.8 | 94.1 | 64.9 | 72.6 | 66.5 | 80.0 |
| Assam | 75.0 | 5.9 | 13.4 | 76.3 | 78.6 | 59.4 | 45.3 | 44.0 | 73.4 |
| Bihar | 60.8 | 5.7 | 8.3 | 68.2 | 70.0 | 67.7 | 62.2 | 52.3 | 75.4 |
| Chhattisgarh | 82.8 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 93.8 | 94.4 | 85.1 | 79.9 | 60.9 | 80.3 |
| Dadra and Nagar Haveli | 87.1 | 2.2 | 10.1 | 94.7 | 93.8 | 83.6 | 75.8 | 80.6 | 83.5 |
| Daman and Diu | 87.9 | 0.7 | 27.5 | 91.5 | 87.4 | 64.3 | 49.6 | 48.8 | 74.8 |
| Goa | 93.3 | 0.2 | 50.3 | 98.6 | 97.3 | 83.9 | 80.6 | 76.4 | 83.7 |
| Gujarat* | 83.6 | 4.2 | 8.2 | 72.3 | 72.3 | 59.6 | 43.1 | 40.6 | 61.2 |
| Haryana | 84.5 | 2.9 | 40.3 | 77.2 | 78.5 | 73.3 | 65.7 | 49.0 | 70.7 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 91.9 | 0.6 | 24.3 | 89.7 | 91.6 | 84.3 | 77.6 | 55.7 | 79.1 |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 61.5 | 2.7 | 37.5 | 89.0 | 90.2 | 55.0 | 54.2 | 50.9 | 74.0 |
| Jharkhand* | 69.4 | 5.9 | 9.9 | 68.8 | 68.1 | 61.9 | 49.9 | 44.0 | 69.5 |
| Karnataka | 89.9 | 3.6 | 18.1 | 83.4 | 83.0 | 60.6 | 41.1 | 39.8 | 76.6 |
| Kerala* | 88.3 | 0.2 | 49.1 | 98.6 | 97.8 | 85.9 | 75.8 | 72.1 | 87.6 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 91.1 | 1.9 | 16.2 | 96.6 | 95.7 | 91.7 | 85.9 | 70.5 | 87.2 |
| Maharashtra | 93.6 | 1.5 | 25.9 | 91.1 | 90.1 | 85.3 | 66.4 | 60.9 | 80.3 |
| Manipur | 59.7 | 2.6 | 63.7 | 96.7 | 98.0 | 80.3 | 80.2 | 63.3 | 91.3 |
| Meghalaya | 77.2 | 3.1 | 45.6 | 90.3 | 92.7 | 66.6 | 64.5 | 54.7 | 76.9 |
| Mizoram* ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 84.5 | 3.8 | 22.9 | 95.4 | 96.4 | 87.2 | 92.0 | 75.3 | 87.6 |
| Nagaland* | 70.5 | 4.5 | 41.6 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 71.7 | 68.6 | 70.4 | 86.0 |
| Orissa | 76.5 | 7.2 | 4.5 | 78.1 | 76.0 | 69.4 | 57.4 | 54.3 | 74.2 |
| Puducherry | 96.6 | 0.6 | 24.7 | 73.5 | 78.3 | 49.8 | 29.3 | 60.6 | 77.5 |
| Punjab | 80.1 | 2.7 | 41.7 | 86.2 | 84.6 | 69.7 | 64.2 | 50.9 | 70.2 |
| Rajasthan | 62.4 | 7.1 | 32.7 | 66.0 | 66.8 | 62.0 | 47.6 | 47.0 | 67.6 |
| Sikkim | 70.4 | 3.3 | 24.2 | 96.5 | 96.5 | 75.8 | 76.8 | 64.7 | 83.4 |
| TamilNadu | 89.4 | 0.6 | 20.6 | 54.7 | 62.6 | 45.7 | 36.3 | 35.8 | 63.2 |
| Tripura | 90.1 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 78.9 | 78.8 | 56.7 | 47.0 | 40.8 | 78.6 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 62.4 | 5.6 | 35.9 | 62.1 | 61.1 | 50.7 | 35.2 | 36.5 | 64.9 |
| Uttarakhand* | 89.8 | 1.0 | 27.9 | 79.8 | 79.4 | 75.2 | 59.8 | 48.7 | 73.2 |
| West Bengal | 75.9 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 84.0 | 84.8 | 67.7 | 55.5 | 36.9 | 74.0 |
| Total | 76.4 | 4.3 | 22.5 | 75.4 | 75.7 | 66.6 | 54.9 | 46.9 | 73.1 |

[^7]
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## ANDHRA PRADESH ruaal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 22 OUT OF 22 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 68.9 | 27.6 | 0.1 | 3.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 69.0 | 25.0 | 0.1 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 66.6 | 31.8 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 63.6 | 34.9 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 69.7 | 28.6 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 73.9 | 20.2 | 0.1 | 5.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 70.9 | 24.1 | 0.1 | 4.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 77.0 | 16.3 | 0.1 | 6.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 60.2 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 61.9 | 20.4 | 0.1 | 17.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 58.6 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 100 |



NOTE: 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 24.9 | 51.6 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.5 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 2.0 | 12.7 | 56.6 | 20.1 |  |  |  | 8 | . 5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | . 6 | 11.3 | 60.6 | 16.5 | 6.0 |  |  |  | . 0 |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | 3.1 |  | 12.2 | 59.3 | 19.3 |  |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 100 |
| Std V |  | 4. | 1 |  | 9.0 | 60.9 | 18.1 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 54.7 | 26.1 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 | 64.0 | 20.0 | 5.4 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.1 | 63.9 | 16.7 |  |  | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $83.1 \%(60.6+16.5+6.0)$ children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $9.6 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008
Table 3: \% Children who attend
different types of pre-school \& school

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\widetilde{0}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 82.0 |  |  |  | 18.0 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 92.7 |  |  |  | 7.4 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 30.0 | 30.5 | 36.0 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 4.4 | 53.3 | 41.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100 |

In Andhra Pradesh, ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 22 districts.

## ANDHRA PRADESH ruaal

## Reading Level

| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 20.5 | 51.2 | 22.6 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 100 |
| II | 4.6 | 28.7 | 43.3 | 15.4 | 8.0 | 100 |
| III | 2.3 | 12.5 | 32.2 | 27.9 | 25.2 | 100 |
| IV | 1.4 | 5.0 | 18.2 | 29.7 | 45.8 | 100 |
| v | 0.5 | 2.9 | 9.9 | 26.6 | 60.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.5 | 1.7 | 6.9 | 19.5 | 71.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.5 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 13.9 | 79.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 0.8 | 3.2 | 9.7 | 86.1 | 100 |
| Total | 4.0 | 13.5 | 17.9 | 18.5 | 46.1 | 100 |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eormatimer |  |  |
|  botace ais yg rcy odim <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  handiofl invotion at atose scyas Jotes albs oft <br>  <br>  <br>  Dobooki is E5 naid word <br>  | $\leq d e n$ acies es <br> thnef बेerot <br> ancobs <br> 봅 <br> t. <br> 18 <br> $\theta$ <br> $\pm$ <br> - 5 㨁 <br> (1) 5 | ats <br> prsis <br> baboc. <br> ball <br> Do Soo 21 Lis utau suro In ot as 3 닌 |

## READING TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008


## ANDHRA PRADESH ruara

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 19.6 | 44.4 | 32.9 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 100 |
| II | 3.6 | 21.6 | 57.4 | 14.8 | 2.5 | 100 |
| III | 1.5 | 8.6 | 45.7 | 35.5 | 8.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 3.4 | 28.6 | 43.5 | 23.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 1.7 | 19.8 | 41.8 | 36.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 1.2 | 14.3 | 35.6 | 48.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 1.0 | 13.1 | 28.0 | 57.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.5 | 8.2 | 25.6 | 65.6 | 100 |
| Total | 3.5 | 10.8 | 27.8 | 28.4 | 29.5 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008

## Chart 9: Arithmetic levels in govt and pVt schools IN DIFFERENT CLASSES



Chart 10: Arithmetic levels of boys and girls in Std III



## ANDHRA PRADESH ruaal

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Adilabad | 80.9 | 8.1 | 27.2 | 77.6 | 82.7 | 47.6 | 39.6 | 29.5 | 54.6 |
| Anantapur | 83.7 | 4.6 | 22.4 | 81.1 | 83.9 | 70.0 | 65.5 | 29.2 | 82.0 |
| Chittoor | 84.9 | 1.9 | 24.7 | 94.6 | 94.6 | 77.8 | 68.3 | 41.2 | 79.0 |
| Cuddapah | 86.6 | 2.1 | 58.8 | 95.7 | 94.5 | 78.7 | 79.5 | 66.9 | 75.2 |
| East Godavari | 98.3 | 2.6 | 24.2 | 86.3 | 89.0 | 65.1 | 58.7 | 27.1 | 83.9 |
| Guntur | 81.7 | 2.6 | 22.1 | 94.3 | 93.8 | 70.0 | 58.3 | 37.8 | 67.4 |
| Karimnagar* |  | 4.0 | 45.9 | 83.4 | 87.7 | 71.4 | 58.4 | 20.6 | 76.7 |
| Khammam | 67.3 | 5.6 | 23.0 | 91.4 | 92.5 | 69.2 | 71.7 | 30.8 | 81.4 |
| Krishna* |  | 1.5 | 32.0 | 89.7 | 90.2 | 79.1 | 64.9 | 25.6 | 78.1 |
| Kurnool | 98.6 | 6.2 | 26.1 | 87.8 | 88.1 | 75.1 | 71.7 | 39.5 | 76.1 |
| Mahbubnagar | 83.6 | 3.8 | 26.3 | 79.2 | 81.4 | 64.4 | 52.3 | 39.9 | 73.1 |
| Medak | 78.6 | 2.5 | 24.7 | 75.8 | 81.1 | 69.6 | 50.9 | 29.7 | 81.7 |
| Nalgonda | 88.7 | 2.5 | 25.9 | 88.0 | 89.8 | 77.9 | 66.6 | 30.1 | 71.4 |
| Nellore | 93.5 | 4.3 | 22.5 | 96.3 | 95.4 | 78.5 | 73.3 | 35.2 | 90.9 |
| Nizamabad | 95.0 | 2.9 | 28.5 | 88.1 | 87.6 | 77.3 | 69.4 | 22.3 | 78.4 |
| Prakasam | 96.4 | 1.9 | 22.8 | 83.0 | 82.4 | 78.6 | 76.1 | 41.7 | 83.4 |
| Rangareddy | 78.8 | 1.8 | 30.8 | 81.6 | 84.5 | 61.6 | 47.6 | 23.5 | 75.2 |
| Srikakulam | 89.1 | 3.1 | 14.4 | 90.1 | 87.3 | 81.9 | 75.9 | 31.8 | 88.2 |
| Visakhatnam | 98.3 | 3.1 | 15.5 | 78.8 | 76.8 | 65.5 | 52.8 | 13.5 | 71.9 |
| Vizianagaram | 88.7 | 3.1 | 17.6 | 87.5 | 85.7 | 69.3 | 61.7 | 24.8 | 75.6 |
| Warangal* |  | 3.0 | 44.8 | 91.8 | 90.6 | 70.4 | 58.8 | 47.6 | 68.3 |
| West Godavari | 81.8 | 5.0 | 27.6 | 91.7 | 93.7 | 82.4 | 71.1 | 25.9 | 85.9 |
| Total | 87.9 | 3.4 | 27.6 | 87.0 | 87.9 | 72.1 | 63.4 | 32.7 | 77.3 |



* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 23 OUT OF 23 DISTRICTS

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 75.3 | 13.4 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 72.7 | 13.8 | 4.9 | 8.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 78.4 | 12.5 | 5.6 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 76.5 | 14.1 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 80.3 | 10.9 | 5.8 | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 71.1 | 14.5 | 4.7 | 9.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 69.4 | 14.9 | 4.9 | 10.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 72.9 | 14.2 | 4.6 | 8.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 57.9 | 16.3 | 3.2 | 22.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 55.8 | 15.9 | 3.1 | 25.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 59.6 | 17.1 | 3.3 | 20.0 | 100 |


nOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 28.3 | 39.9 | 18.8 | 8.2 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 3.9 | 14.8 | 37.1 | 28.4 | 7.1 | 5.8 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | . 4 | 15.1 | 40.4 | 23.2 | 10.9 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 4.8 |  |  | 13.9 | 26.4 | 38.5 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 3.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 5.3 |  |  |  | 7.5 | 38.5 | 26.4 | 14.3 | 4.4 | 3.7 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 4.2 |  |  |  |  | 11.8 | 24.0 | 40.2 | 10.8 | 6.0 | 3.0 |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.7 | 31.1 | 34.2 | 14.8 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 | 29.6 | 38.2 | 11.2 | 6.7 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 74.5\% (40.4+23.2+10.9) children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.7 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Assam, ASER 2005 covered 8 districts. ASER 2006 covered 17 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 23 districts.

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 32.0 | 43.8 | 16.9 | 5.5 | 1.8 | 100 |  |
| II | 12.9 | 30.3 | 35.5 | 13.7 | 7.6 | 100 |  |
| III | 8.0 | 17.6 | 32.2 | 24.2 | 17.9 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.6 | 8.9 | 23.1 | 32.1 | 32.4 | 100 |  |
| V | 2.4 | 6.9 | 17.5 | 29.7 | 43.5 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.4 | 4.3 | 10.5 | 24.8 | 59.0 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.4 | 7.4 | 18.2 | 71.4 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 13.4 | 79.7 | 100 |  |
| Total | 9.7 | 17.4 | 19.5 | 19.4 | 34.0 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 50181 ma $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008


Chart 7: Reading levels of boys and girls in Std III



## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 29.3 | 50.9 | 16.6 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 10.9 | 40.3 | 34.7 | 12.3 | 1.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 5.7 | 26.3 | 36.3 | 26.9 | 4.7 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.7 | 16.7 | 32.7 | 34.5 | 13.4 | 100 |  |
| V | 2.4 | 11.3 | 29.0 | 39.1 | 18.2 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.3 | 7.0 | 22.3 | 38.9 | 30.4 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.7 | 4.3 | 17.6 | 36.6 | 40.9 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 2.5 | 13.2 | 35.3 | 48.7 | 100 |  |
| Total | 8.5 | 23.3 | 25.6 | 26.0 | 16.7 | 100 |  |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI or Balwadi | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Barpeta | 89.5 | 4.9 | 15.9 | 71.4 | 72.9 | 63.9 | 41.0 | 51.0 | 81.8 |
| Bongaigaon | 55.6 | 4.2 | 15.7 | 75.4 | 77.1 | 61.0 | 43.5 | 47.5 | 65.8 |
| Cachar | 60.8 | 4.1 | 7.3 | 79.9 | 82.5 | 40.5 | 31.6 | 20.6 | 71.9 |
| Darrang | 59.5 | 12.8 | 20.8 | 72.1 | 79.7 | 73.2 | 63.1 | 54.3 | 70.5 |
| Dhemaji | 50.0 | 3.1 | 11.3 | 63.4 | 69.9 | 42.8 | 21.7 | 34.5 | 71.2 |
| Dhubri | 84.8 | 9.1 | 5.4 | 65.8 | 70.4 | 52.8 | 49.0 | 43.1 | 65.8 |
| Dibrugarh | 80.0 | 4.3 | 25.0 | 80.6 | 85.7 | 67.7 | 58.8 | 56.7 | 79.4 |
| Goalpara | 84.2 | 4.4 | 11.9 | 73.1 | 76.2 | 65.0 | 50.0 | 58.1 | 81.1 |
| Golaghat | 66.7 | 4.5 | 20.6 | 76.5 | 78.6 | 63.3 | 45.2 | 38.8 | 63.3 |
| Hailakandi | 60.1 | 4.2 | 7.0 | 81.6 | 68.3 | 64.4 | 51.4 | 57.0 | 71.0 |
| Jorhat | 80.5 | 3.5 | 15.2 | 90.4 | 87.5 | 66.7 | 50.4 | 44.4 | 66.4 |
| Kamrup | 86.4 | 4.7 | 18.1 | 78.4 | 81.3 | 61.4 | 52.1 | 50.4 | 65.4 |
| Karbi Anglang | 22.4 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 98.3 | 97.7 | 56.6 | 54.1 | 68.1 | 78.7 |
| Karimganj | 74.1 | 4.6 | 8.6 | 85.4 | 82.9 | 55.4 | 34.2 | 45.6 | 69.0 |
| Kokrajhar | 62.5 | 4.7 | 19.7 | 65.0 | 68.7 | 55.2 | 31.8 | 21.1 | 57.2 |
| Lakhimpur | 81.2 | 4.9 | 11.5 | 69.0 | 69.0 | 56.9 | 50.3 | 55.4 | 68.4 |
| Marigaon | 94.9 | 6.1 | 9.4 | 59.7 | 66.9 | 61.2 | 49.2 | 38.1 | 78.4 |
| Nagaon | 85.3 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 78.7 | 80.8 | 59.2 | 40.8 | 36.4 | 79.7 |
| Nalbari | 89.4 | 4.1 | 19.2 | 84.6 | 82.9 | 76.7 | 65.8 | 55.8 | 92.9 |
| North Cachar Hill | 65.6 | 2.4 | 19.7 | 93.2 | 91.5 | 72.8 | 74.9 | 73.1 | 75.1 |
| Sivasagar | 68.3 | 4.6 | 11.6 | 79.3 | 85.6 | 74.4 | 56.9 | 37.0 | 78.2 |
| Sonitpur | 81.3 | 11.3 | 15.7 | 74.4 | 75.2 | 51.0 | 29.0 | 33.3 | 73.0 |
| Tinsukia | 52.2 | 14.5 | 26.4 | 71.8 | 77.1 | 58.5 | 42.5 | 43.3 | 73.9 |
| Total | 75.0 | 5.9 | 13.4 | 76.3 | 78.6 | 59.4 | 45.3 | 44.0 | 73.4 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 35 OUT OF 37 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 83.6 | 8.3 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 83.0 | 7.8 | 2.3 | 6.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 83.8 | 9.1 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 83.6 | 10.2 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 83.9 | 7.7 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 83.7 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 7.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 84.3 | 7.8 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 83.1 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 76.5 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 17.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 77.3 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 16.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 75.7 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 17.1 | 100 |


| CHART 1: TRENDS OVER TIME |
| :--- |
| \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER |
| 25 |

nоte: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 18.8 | 36.5 | 18.8 | 15.5 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 3.4 | 14.3 | 21.7 | 31.6 | 8.9 | 12.6 | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 4 | 6 | 9.1 | 30.7 | 16.9 | 22.4 | 5.2 | 7.4 | 3.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | 5.7 |  | 14.9 | 13.9 | 32.8 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 4.3 | 4.6 |  |  | 100 |
| Std V |  | 2.1 |  | 6.6 | 7.1 | 30.9 | 13.5 | 22.4 | 8.5 | 5.6 | 3.4 |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 5.6 |  |  |  |  | 17.0 | 14.7 | 34.0 | 12.9 | 9.7 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Std VII | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.6 | 32.7 | 21.8 | 17.5 | 8.6 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.9 | 23.1 | 28.9 | 15.6 | 8.4 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $70.0 \%(30.7+16.9+22.4)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $12 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.


In Bihar, ASER 2005 covered 36 districts. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 37 districts.

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 45.0 | 34.1 | 12.2 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 100 |  |
| II | 16.4 | 32.4 | 26.3 | 13.7 | 11.3 | 100 |  |
| III | 6.5 | 18.7 | 23.3 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.0 | 8.8 | 15.7 | 27.0 | 45.6 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.8 | 5.6 | 7.7 | 21.0 | 63.9 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.0 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 14.0 | 77.3 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.8 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 9.5 | 85.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 91.4 | 100 |  |
| Total | 13.4 | 17.4 | 14.1 | 15.4 | 39.6 | 100 |  |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## READING TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot EVEN IDENTIFY Letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 43.2 | 37.1 | 12.9 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 14.8 | 36.4 | 27.7 | 13.8 | 7.3 | 100 |
| III | 5.7 | 21.3 | 28.3 | 27.2 | 17.5 | 100 |
| IV | 2.9 | 10.8 | 19.5 | 31.7 | 35.1 | 100 |
| V | 1.7 | 5.9 | 11.1 | 28.9 | 52.4 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 3.1 | 8.1 | 18.9 | 68.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 14.1 | 77.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 9.4 | 86.5 | 100 |
| Total | 12.7 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 18.2 | 33.0 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


BIHAR ruval

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | PRIVATE <br> SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std $3-5$ ) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Araria | 10.3 | 12.3 | 2.8 | 48.9 | 57.4 | 58.8 | 49.3 | 39.7 | 77.7 |
| Aurangabad | 80.3 | 1.9 | 9.0 | 76.6 | 79.4 | 70.2 | 53.7 | 49.3 | 70.9 |
| Banka | 52.9 | 7.4 | 6.3 | 71.4 | 73.7 | 69.8 | 67.4 | 53.7 | 68.5 |
| Begusarai | 50.3 | 5.8 | 7.3 | 69.9 | 71.1 | 72.8 | 69.3 | 59.1 | 80.2 |
| Bhagalpur | 73.9 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 68.2 | 66.3 | 58.9 | 59.2 | 53.5 | 77.8 |
| Bhojpur | 75.6 | 4.3 | 14.2 | 89.2 | 89.9 | 85.2 | 85.5 | 70.5 | 86.4 |
| Buxar | 99.1 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 97.0 | 96.8 | 87.5 | 86.4 | 78.7 | 78.7 |
| Darbhanga | 39.2 | 4.0 | 7.6 | 63.4 | 67.4 | 68.5 | 68.4 | 53.4 | 74.8 |
| Gaya | 76.4 | 4.9 | 17.2 | 78.2 | 78.8 | 77.8 | 74.9 | 41.1 | 62.1 |
| Gopalganj* |  | 1.2 | 18.8 | 70.9 | 69.8 | 79.2 | 78.6 | 64.3 | 76.3 |
| Jamui | 66.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 72.1 | 66.6 | 73.1 | 70.1 | 61.0 | 72.8 |
| Jehanabad | 73.5 | 4.9 | 7.8 | 71.7 | 81.0 | 77.6 | 67.4 | 55.6 | 77.2 |
| Bhabua | 84.8 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 76.5 | 77.8 | 60.0 | 50.8 | 51.8 | 77.0 |
| Katihar | 79.8 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 87.2 | 83.4 | 55.5 | 51.0 | 39.9 | 70.9 |
| Khagaria | 84.5 | 3.4 | 7.6 | 76.2 | 73.8 | 67.3 | 61.5 | 47.0 | 72.7 |
| Kishanganj | 42.0 | 3.8 | 12.1 | 64.4 | 61.4 | 65.0 | 50.5 | 69.0 | 68.1 |
| Lakhisarai | 40.9 | 8.4 | 4.0 | 65.8 | 68.6 | 74.3 | 61.7 | 58.9 | 67.1 |
| Madhubani | 55.2 | 7.3 | 3.0 | 64.4 | 64.8 | 62.8 | 52.6 | 49.6 | 74.3 |
| Munger | 50.0 | 3.5 | 13.9 | 72.8 | 75.0 | 75.4 | 70.1 | 66.3 | 78.4 |
| Muzaffarpur | 74.4 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 55.1 | 61.0 | 57.7 | 46.7 | 33.3 | 72.9 |
| Nalanda | 88.1 | 5.6 | 12.2 | 59.3 | 57.9 | 58.0 | 55.6 | 51.4 | 63.8 |
| Nawada | 67.6 | 4.8 | 9.2 | 77.8 | 71.0 | 66.7 | 57.5 | 63.7 | 84.5 |
| Pashchim Champaran | 59.5 | 8.1 | 10.8 | 68.4 | 72.8 | 65.9 | 58.5 | 46.3 | 77.3 |
| Patna | 53.9 | 2.4 | 17.0 | 81.5 | 82.4 | 65.5 | 62.3 | 69.3 | 84.6 |
| Purbi Champaran | 39.2 | 7.4 | 4.2 | 51.8 | 60.1 | 61.8 | 56.3 | 38.5 | 81.2 |
| Purnia | 62.3 | 10.0 | 2.5 | 80.1 | 74.8 | 70.9 | 67.6 | 63.8 | 72.1 |
| Rohtas | 83.7 | 2.3 | 9.7 | 79.2 | 77.5 | 73.5 | 67.5 | 59.9 | 81.5 |
| Saharsa | 64.4 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 75.2 | 75.7 | 68.3 | 64.4 | 53.3 | 80.3 |
| Samastipur | 70.8 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 45.3 | 51.3 | 54.2 | 53.4 | 33.8 | 70.2 |
| Saran | 65.0 | 4.8 | 12.2 | 67.7 | 68.6 | 72.6 | 66.1 | 52.7 | 72.2 |
| Sheikhpura | 63.1 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 66.4 | 71.2 | 73.7 | 73.6 | 61.1 | 78.8 |
| Sheohar | 70.7 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 79.6 | 79.7 | 77.6 | 73.8 | 64.9 | 86.5 |
| Sitamarhi | 46.6 | 11.7 | 4.8 | 57.1 | 62.4 | 71.3 | 61.8 | 58.5 | 77.9 |
| Siwan | 62.3 | 6.1 | 15.0 | 68.3 | 70.6 | 65.1 | 58.4 | 56.4 | 73.3 |
| Vaishali | 35.4 | 4.5 | 16.1 | 89.9 | 89.1 | 73.9 | 64.2 | 51.7 | 83.7 |
| Total | 60.8 | 5.7 | 8.3 | 68.2 | 70.0 | 67.7 | 62.2 | 52.3 | 75.4 |

[^8]* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## CHHATTISGARH ruaal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 15 OUT OF 16 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008



NOTE : 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $86.6 \%(34.9+42.2+9.5)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 80.2 |  |  |  | 19.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 85.7 |  |  |  | 14.3 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 60.1 | 22.0 | 10.1 | 0.4 | 7.4 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 5.3 | 78.3 | 14.3 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $13.0 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.


In Chhattisgarh, ASER 2005 covered 15 districts. ASER 2006 covered all 16 districts. ASER 2007 covered 15 districts.

## CHHATTISGARH rưal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 9.3 | 58.2 | 24.7 | 5.4 | 2.3 | 100 |
| II | 2.8 | 20.0 | 49.2 | 22.1 | 5.9 | 100 |
| III | 0.6 | 5.2 | 24.6 | 47.0 | 22.7 | 100 |
| IV | 0.2 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 35.9 | 56.1 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 20.6 | 75.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 8.9 | 89.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 4.9 | 94.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 96.8 | 100 |
| Total | 1.9 | 12.6 | 15.5 | 20.1 | 49.9 | 100 |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| पन्न क men (i) |  |  |
| जहुत दिनो को बनिश तो रही यी। गीन में सरी जगए गेदा पानीी मर गया का। समी बत्रिग竕 खातने सी राह यैज्ञा रहे चे। अक्नानक एक दिन बतरिश एक नी। चूरफ़ विफल जाया ( थक्ष बौग सुरा हो गये। आसमान में मिड्रियी उदने जगीं। लोग उपने कपडे चुखाने लवे। तह्य यी पर्षो ती बहर गिफलसीर खेलने लेगे। | इुधा के पार उचकी गी वढ़ बहुए समा खा |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## CHHATTISGARH <br> RURAL

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 8.3 | 41.2 | 44.3 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 100 |
| II | 2.8 | 19.4 | 56.6 | 18.4 | 2.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.5 | 5.5 | 30.6 | 47.6 | 15.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.1 | 2.1 | 11.9 | 46.4 | 39.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 0.8 | 6.6 | 32.4 | 60.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 19.8 | 74.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 14.9 | 81.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 12.4 | 85.2 | 100 |
| Total | 1.8 | 10.1 | 22.3 | 25.6 | 40.2 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

| CHART 8: \% CHILDREN WHO CAN DO DIVISION |
| :--- |
| (in govt schools in Std III - VIII) 2006-2008 |
| 100 |

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

Table 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT
CLASSES who CAN

| Std. | Tell time | currency <br> tasks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 10.1 | 26.3 |
| II | 21.8 | 48.4 |
| III | 44.1 | 69.7 |
| IV | 64.4 | 82.8 |
| V | 76.8 | 90.0 |
| VI | 87.8 | 95.8 |
| VII | 93.0 | 97.9 |
| VIII | 95.2 | 98.0 |
| TOTAL | 57.4 | 73.1 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


## CHHATTISGARH ruaal

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | PRIVATE SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bastar | 90.7 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 97.1 | 95.8 | 93.5 | 78.9 | 42.1 | 82.3 |
| Bilaspur | 67.3 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 83.8 | 84.1 | 90.3 | 85.6 |
| Dhamtari | 87.5 | 2.9 | 10.0 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 91.0 | 88.5 | 59.0 | 79.2 |
| Durg | 75.9 | 4.7 | 8.6 | 99.1 | 97.4 | 90.7 | 86.6 | 64.7 | 83.7 |
| Janjgir Champa | 67.5 | 3.9 | 24.9 | 94.7 | 94.3 | 83.5 | 77.2 | 55.8 | 73.9 |
| Jashpur | 80.2 | 3.3 | 16.0 | 94.7 | 97.4 | 84.7 | 75.8 | 33.0 | 73.3 |
| Kanker | 95.1 | 1.2 | 6.8 | 88.2 | 91.6 | 82.5 | 85.5 | 70.0 | 75.1 |
| Kawardha | 97.9 | 3.5 | 11.3 | 96.5 | 97.3 | 82.9 | 76.8 | 67.8 | 77.7 |
| Korba | 78.4 | 5.2 | 3.0 | 93.9 | 95.1 | 92.0 | 92.3 | 43.1 | 84.6 |
| Koriya | 89.5 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 97.1 | 97.4 | 91.4 | 90.6 | 81.9 | 88.2 |
| Mahasamund | 91.3 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 92.6 | 93.6 | 77.7 | 70.1 | 46.6 | 61.4 |
| Raigarh | 77.7 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 88.1 | 86.4 | 79.1 | 69.2 | 54.0 | 72.7 |
| Raipur | 84.5 | 6.6 | 11.1 | 91.3 | 93.6 | 82.4 | 70.7 | 66.8 | 88.0 |
| Rajnandgaon | 94.7 | 3.0 | 6.9 | 92.1 | 92.6 | 89.5 | 86.7 | 54.7 | 80.7 |
| Surguja | 85.1 | 7.3 | 10.8 | 92.2 | 94.0 | 81.1 | 81.4 | 59.4 | 79.4 |
| Total | 82.8 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 93.8 | 94.4 | 85.1 | 79.9 | 60.9 | 80.3 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Enrollment

## SChOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN 2008

| Table 1: \% Child | IFFER | PES | H00LS | \% Out of school |  | CHART \% CHIL | ENDS OVE OUT OF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { CHOOL BY } \end{aligned}$ | P AND | ENDER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 49.4 | 50.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 100 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 50.5 | 49.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 48.4 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 50.4 | 49.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 | $\stackrel{\text { 늘 }}{\substack{c}} 10$ |  |  |  |  |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 45.7 | 54.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 51.1 | 48.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 100 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 55.6 | 43.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 45.1 | 54.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100 |  | $2005$ | 2006 | 2007 | $2008$ |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 54.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 | Year |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 54.7 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 | $\begin{array}{ll} \because-10 \text { boys } \\ 7-10 \text { girls } \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \text { 11-14 boys } \\ \text { 11-14 girls } \end{array}$ |  |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 53.6 | 46.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: 'отHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $90.3 \%$ (55.8+28.3+6.3) children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | 픙 |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 85.3 |  |  |  | 14.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 97.2 |  |  |  | 2.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 96.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 35.5 | 27.4 | 37.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $8.8 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% Children who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 3.3 | 40.9 | 44.3 | 9.0 | 2.5 | 100 |  |
| II | 0.0 | 7.9 | 50.0 | 28.4 | 13.7 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.0 | 6.7 | 20.9 | 37.6 | 34.7 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 3.7 | 12.3 | 46.9 | 37.1 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.0 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 29.4 | 64.5 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 25.6 | 70.5 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 7.7 | 90.2 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 94.1 | 100 |  |
| Total | 0.3 | 7.3 | 16.2 | 24.2 | 52.0 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| वाचन चाचणी (?) |  |
| 04-7tum |  |
| जाह <br> आयक गाजेक सेन पिसाषी स्तमी इ्याता. कार्न लागऐ करतन प्रगडता <br>  करी कमाखा दकरलेखे चवे कगझे पात्रून मावा हात्से. आईन वातडा <br>  चामेत चवरे कानिताषे पाय सारको <br>  <br>  बावपाक लमाईे. तरी नामख्या पायाक स्वो बाषस्योंन चमितन्या चस्ध सलत्र आमी धाल पुपशे | पात्बद <br> सेन्यु पए सोमीत भासा फलणन अलिप नायूप गचल्ड <br> सेन्क जाखख बरी का बापूय सोताक अपूर्यव करता. <br> 4nixays <br> एक पाणद अख्य गक्ता पष्या <br>  <br> एक उचह गतन पडता अचन-मोश वाला एसले |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


COMPARISION OF READING LEVELS 2008


GOA rural

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 5.1 | 59.0 | 30.9 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
| II | 0.9 | 13.9 | 59.3 | 23.6 | 2.3 | 100 |
| III | 1.0 | 5.7 | 32.0 | 51.3 | 10.0 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 2.6 | 13.4 | 61.5 | 22.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 32.1 | 61.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 31.4 | 63.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 11.9 | 85.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 93.5 | 100 |
| Total | 0.9 | 9.4 | 18.1 | 27.9 | 43.7 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008

Chart 9: Arithmetic levels in govt and pvt schools in different classes


■PVT Govt


Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  |  | Std 3-5 : LeArNing Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std $3-5$ ) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| NorthGoa | 94.2 | 0.2 | 48.0 | 97.3 | 95.5 | 83.8 | 78.4 | 76.5 | 81.9 |
| SouthGoa | 91.6 | 0.2 | 54.0 | 100.0 | 99.3 | 84.1 | 84.1 | 76.2 | 86.8 |
| Total | 93.3 | 0.2 | 50.3 | 98.6 | 97.3 | 83.9 | 80.6 | 76.4 | 83.7 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 25 OUT OF 26 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 87.4 | 8.2 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 83.2 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 6.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 92.0 | 6.1 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 91.8 | 6.7 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 92.3 | 5.3 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 80.4 | 11.3 | 0.4 | 7.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 81.3 | 12.7 | 0.4 | 5.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 79.3 | 9.5 | 0.3 | 10.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 57.0 | 18.2 | 0.5 | 24.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 59.9 | 18.8 | 0.7 | 20.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 52.9 | 17.3 | 0.3 | 29.6 | 100 |


| CHART 1: TRENDS OVER TIME |
| :--- |
| \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER |
| 25 P |

NOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'кот in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $94.2 \%(8.8+68.5+16.9)$ children are in age range 7 to 9

## Young Children

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008
TABLE 3: \% Children who attend
different types of pre-school \& school

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 78.6 |  |  |  | 21.4 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 87.7 |  |  |  | 12.3 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 28.0 | 62.1 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 2.6 | 91.0 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $12.3 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## GUJARAT runal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

## READING

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 41.9 | 40.2 | 14.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100 |
| II | 14.1 | 37.8 | 32.2 | 11.4 | 4.5 | 100 |
| III | 5.3 | 24.3 | 31.4 | 25.4 | 13.7 | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 | 11.8 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 30.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.4 | 6.3 | 15.5 | 31.5 | 45.3 | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 | 4.7 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 59.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 2.9 | 5.8 | 19.6 | 71.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 13.2 | 82.6 | 100 |
| TotaL | 8.7 | 17.1 | 18.1 | 20.2 | 35.9 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9 l |  |
| SEl whend filephlu st d. <br>  <br> tane ai. <br> nal yac ndad at. <br> asb Eblich wiv4 in. <br> Sbl dy v shat wel wrs है | *ily <br>  <br>  <br> ally mal umen होड है. |  |
| naver swil vidu mbl. <br> idfo meen zand uide bith orz enad unsed yaid dal neak muall dea日 |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008

Chart 6: Reading levels in govt and pVt schools in
DIFFERENT CLASSES

$\square$ Pvt Govt

Chart 7: Reading levels of boys and girls in Std III



## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std． | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1－9 | 10－99 |  |  |  |
| I | 40.2 | 48.4 | 9.0 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 100 |
| II | 15.8 | 44.7 | 33.0 | 5.6 | 0.9 | 100 |
| III | 6.6 | 28.7 | 44.0 | 17.4 | 3.3 | 100 |
| IV | 3.4 | 14.9 | 37.0 | 32.0 | 12.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 9.8 | 25.5 | 38.3 | 24.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 8.3 | 21.0 | 33.4 | 35.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 4.1 | 15.2 | 31.7 | 48.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 3.4 | 11.3 | 24.9 | 60.2 | 100 |
| Total | 9.1 | 21.3 | 25.5 | 23.0 | 21.1 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child．Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction，can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 ．

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6：\％Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std． | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 5.2 | 13.5 |
| II | 11.0 | 27.9 |
| III | 24.5 | 43.0 |
| IV | 40.0 | 62.7 |
| V | 56.2 | 77.1 |
| VI | 65.0 | 80.6 |
| VII | 77.0 | 88.7 |
| VIII | 82.9 | 92.1 |
| TOTAL | 43.0 | 58.9 |
|  |  |  |


| TESTING TOOL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { sita } \\ 910 \end{gathered}$ |  | cexsen | T⿴囗十⺀⿺𠃊⿻丷木大 |
|  | 7 7 | 42 63 | $\begin{array}{r}34 \\ -84 \\ \hline 8.34 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 6） 600 |
| Currency Tasks | $3$ | $30 \quad 20$ | $\begin{array}{rr} 3 w \\ -k c & -4 v \end{array}$ | $5) \longdiv { \operatorname { c e r } ( }$ |
|  |  | $69 \quad 54$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ -6 f \\ -6 y \end{array}$ | e） $6 \times 4$ |
|  | $4 \geqslant$ | 3983 | $\begin{array}{r} 96 \\ -8 y \quad-8 c \\ \hline \end{array}$ | v） 5 ＊＊（ |
|  |  | －30\％ | $\operatorname{lin} 4 \sqrt{4} 4 \pi x=1 x$ $1 / 4$ | $\lim _{\cos } 4 t x+\cos$ |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | PRIVATE <br> SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more |  | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Ahmadabad | 87.1 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 58.3 | 65.8 | 51.5 | 40.1 | 27.7 | 44.3 |
| Amreli | 80.7 | 3.5 | 11.6 | 72.3 | 70.6 | 57.8 | 42.6 | 35.4 | 51.1 |
| Banas Kantha | 96.5 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 67.1 | 72.3 | 54.5 | 27.2 | 28.7 | 55.2 |
| Bharuch | 87.6 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 86.6 | 84.8 | 53.6 | 44.9 | 35.9 | 58.0 |
| Bhavnagar | 76.0 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 66.8 | 64.8 | 52.0 | 27.6 | 46.9 | 55.4 |
| Dahod | 77.0 | 5.9 | 8.3 | 70.6 | 65.8 | 62.1 | 44.8 | 55.2 | 64.3 |
| Gandhinagar | 79.3 | 2.1 | 19.8 | 92.2 | 89.4 | 77.1 | 62.8 | 40.8 | 55.3 |
| Jamnagar | 87.4 | 3.2 | 16.7 | 88.3 | 86.8 | 67.0 | 41.5 | 48.2 | 67.9 |
| Junagadh | 91.6 | 1.4 | 13.8 | 69.0 | 67.3 | 56.2 | 34.1 | 41.7 | 67.7 |
| Kachchh | 78.4 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 63.5 | 65.2 | 48.9 | 35.2 | 39.7 | 56.0 |
| Kheda | 83.5 | 2.5 | 14.9 | 74.7 | 80.0 | 59.7 | 33.1 | 13.9 | 65.5 |
| Mahesana | 78.2 | 0.8 | 8.7 | 85.4 | 82.6 | 82.9 | 77.5 | 67.8 | 78.4 |
| Narmada | 98.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 50.7 | 54.1 | 35.6 | 16.5 | 31.5 | 59.2 |
| Navsari | 94.0 | 3.7 | 5.1 | 96.7 | 98.9 | 67.1 | 66.2 | 49.1 | 75.6 |
| Panch Mahal | 98.4 | 3.1 | 4.7 | 82.1 | 81.1 | 54.0 | 34.5 | 39.8 | 51.8 |
| Patan | 95.4 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 97.6 | 89.1 | 85.2 | 69.9 | 58.0 | 62.5 |
| Porbandar | 95.2 | 3.6 | 12.8 | 82.7 | 83.7 | 56.5 | 32.2 | 28.8 | 50.6 |
| Rajkot | 78.7 | 4.8 | 9.7 | 67.6 | 67.9 | 55.1 | 31.8 | 45.0 | 58.4 |
| Sabar Kantha | 77.3 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 49.1 | 53.5 | 50.5 | 57.3 | 47.8 | 78.2 |
| Surat | 91.1 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 80.2 | 73.0 | 79.8 | 53.0 | 51.6 | 70.1 |
| Surendranagar | 82.0 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 82.9 | 77.0 | 66.8 | 52.0 | 40.0 | 67.1 |
| Tapi | 82.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 59.3 | 66.8 | 69.7 | 54.1 | 64.2 | 68.1 |
| TheDangs | 95.6 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 75.2 | 78.7 | 42.6 | 22.9 | 19.3 | 46.8 |
| Vadodara | 56.6 | 12.4 | 11.3 | 58.7 | 57.0 | 43.6 | 30.0 | 14.7 | 37.6 |
| Valsad | 75.5 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 87.4 | 89.6 | 52.1 | 25.1 | 7.3 | 48.4 |
| Total | 83.6 | 4.2 | 8.2 | 72.3 | 72.3 | 59.6 | 43.1 | 40.6 | 61.2 |



As of January 1, 2009 data was available for 25 out of 26 districts in Gujarat. Data for remaning 1 district will be included in the final report.

Haryana<br>HimachalPradesh<br>JAMmU\&KASHMIR<br>JHARKHAND<br>Karnataka<br>Kerala



## HARYANA runal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 20 OUT OF 20 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 56.4 | 40.3 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 56.3 | 39.0 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 55.0 | 42.6 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 51.6 | 47.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 59.5 | 37.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 59.1 | 36.9 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 55.3 | 42.2 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 64.2 | 30.5 | 0.3 | 5.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 52.7 | 33.9 | 0.6 | 12.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 50.8 | 38.0 | 0.6 | 10.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 55.0 | 29.0 | 0.5 | 15.6 | 100 |


note: 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 32.5 | 41.1 | 16.4 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 5.3 | 21.3 | 32.8 | 28.3 | 6.7 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 5 | . 1 | 15.2 | 39.5 | 23.7 | 10.1 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 5.7 |  |  | 17.3 | 28.0 | 32.8 | 7.7 |  | 8.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 6.3 |  |  |  | 12.5 | 39.9 | 21.6 | 13.4 | 6.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 4.4 |  |  |  |  | 16.2 | 28.7 | 34.0 | 10.7 | 6.1 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1 | 36.7 | 26.6 | 12.5 | 5.8 |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.9 | 31.4 | 29.3 | 10.9 | 3.2 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $73.5 \%(39.5+23.7+10.1)$ children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were 11.2\% children in Std III in the ASER sample.

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 84.2 |  |  |  | 15.8 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 84.8 |  |  |  | 15.2 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 21.1 | 32.7 | 40.6 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 3.9 | 49.2 | 42.6 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 100 |

## Children in Pre-school 2008

In Haryana, ASER 2005 covered 19 districts. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 20 districts.

## HARYANA rual

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 33.6 | 41.1 | 15.1 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 100 |  |
| II | 10.8 | 29.8 | 28.8 | 15.8 | 14.7 | 100 |  |
| III | 3.8 | 14.2 | 25.0 | 26.3 | 30.6 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.0 | 7.9 | 14.3 | 24.5 | 51.3 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.0 | 3.9 | 7.7 | 20.1 | 67.3 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.5 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 13.8 | 80.2 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.8 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 9.2 | 86.7 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 8.7 | 88.5 | 100 |  |
| Total | 7.3 | 13.6 | 13.0 | 15.6 | 50.5 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | Sil $1 / \mathrm{mal}$ |  |
| तणगा समझवत नड़की थी। सगे घसका घोटा गड्ड अमन बहुत नहत्यट था प़क घिन योरों जालाए में घूम रहे जें। समन मे शास्ते में पवर्ने नैके। उसे पकीहे | चीचा नला मी तो गाम को घ\% अभाश | जावी है। <br> जानी है। <br> पस वाती है। <br> गा खाते है। |
| पकाड़ बनाती थी। नगना मे कहा यह प्योटे नीखों होगे सभा अगन नर्मी नान्। अमन नै पकौके खाये और जसकी औँखी से गारू निकालने जये। | $\begin{aligned} & \text { न } ₹ \text { स } \\ & \text { व त } \\ & \text { न त त } \\ & \text { न य } \end{aligned}$ |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## HARYANA ruval

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 31.6 | 40.8 | 19.6 | 4.9 | 3.1 | 100 |
| II | 10.4 | 34.6 | 30.2 | 17.1 | 7.7 | 100 |
| III | 4.2 | 18.2 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 19.7 | 100 |
| IV | 1.6 | 11.0 | 18.9 | 29.0 | 39.5 | 100 |
| v | 1.0 | 5.0 | 13.9 | 26.7 | 53.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 2.2 | 9.1 | 20.3 | 67.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 0.8 | 5.8 | 16.6 | 76.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 13.1 | 80.3 | 100 |
| Total | 7.0 | 15.3 | 17.1 | 19.6 | 41.0 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: <br> CLASSES CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 8.1 | 21.4 |
| II | 17.1 | 40.5 |
| III | 32.6 | 58.2 |
| IV | 49.4 | 72.5 |
| V | 65.1 | 81.7 |
| VI | 75.6 | 89.1 |
| VII | 83.1 | 91.4 |
| VIII | 88.0 | 95.0 |
| Total | 50.1 | 66.9 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | PRIVATE SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Ambala | 85.2 | 1.4 | 29.9 | 81.2 | 89.0 | 67.8 | 57.7 | 46.2 | 75.3 |
| Bhiwani | 94.1 | 0.3 | 47.3 | 90.0 | 85.7 | 88.2 | 81.7 | 64.3 | 63.1 |
| Faridabad | 73.2 | 4.0 | 50.7 | 74.7 | 73.6 | 74.2 | 63.3 | 56.6 | 74.4 |
| Fatehabad | 63.4 | 5.9 | 35.0 | 72.9 | 81.2 | 75.8 | 69.1 | 46.8 | 78.1 |
| Gurgaon | 92.3 | 2.5 | 43.4 | 71.1 | 74.9 | 78.9 | 71.8 | 58.3 | 70.5 |
| Hisar | 87.5 | 1.7 | 53.2 | 77.3 | 79.6 | 80.1 | 76.4 | 43.8 | 79.4 |
| Jhajjar | 95.7 | 1.1 | 62.3 | 86.7 | 85.2 | 87.9 | 84.0 | 62.9 | 86.7 |
| Jind | 84.2 | 1.5 | 42.7 | 81.9 | 80.7 | 72.0 | 69.0 | 61.0 | 66.8 |
| Kaithal | 93.8 | 1.8 | 38.6 | 75.5 | 77.7 | 77.3 | 72.2 | 51.7 | 73.2 |
| Karnal | 95.5 | 1.8 | 26.4 | 78.4 | 77.1 | 73.6 | 69.6 | 46.2 | 63.1 |
| Kurukshetra | 72.9 | 1.5 | 37.4 | 68.9 | 70.1 | 54.2 | 46.8 | 44.4 | 61.8 |
| Mahendragarh | 89.0 | 1.0 | 48.6 | 80.9 | 82.2 | 77.7 | 66.4 | 43.1 | 73.7 |
| Mewat | 60.6 | 16.1 | 18.2 | 62.3 | 66.7 | 62.9 | 48.4 | 47.3 | 75.2 |
| Panchkula | 88.2 | 2.0 | 24.3 | 84.1 | 84.7 | 76.6 | 73.5 | 59.0 | 86.9 |
| Panipat | 97.8 | 1.2 | 31.8 | 80.5 | 82.4 | 71.9 | 63.5 | 46.3 | 75.9 |
| Rewari | 92.2 | 0.7 | 44.1 | 76.3 | 78.1 | 70.8 | 61.5 | 35.7 | 80.7 |
| Rohtak | 94.9 | 0.8 | 54.5 | 91.8 | 94.1 | 83.4 | 79.6 | 42.0 | 67.5 |
| Sirsa | 72.5 | 2.7 | 30.4 | 66.1 | 62.2 | 59.5 | 49.3 | 39.6 | 57.6 |
| Sonipat | 98.6 | 1.1 | 45.1 | 83.1 | 81.5 | 67.8 | 62.5 | 49.7 | 62.1 |
| Yamunanagar | 91.5 | 2.0 | 39.1 | 79.1 | 81.6 | 66.9 | 48.3 | 29.5 | 60.5 |
| Total | 84.5 | 2.9 | 40.3 | 77.2 | 78.5 | 73.3 | 65.7 | 49.0 | 70.7 |



# HIMACHAL PRADESH rural 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 12 OUT OF 12 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total | Chart 1: TRENDS OVER TIME <br> \% Children out of school by age group and gender |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 75.1 | 24.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 76.8 | 21.8 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 74.2 | 25.5 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 69.9 | 29.9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 78.8 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 78.6 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 100 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 75.9 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 81.4 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 0 | 2006 |  |  | 2008 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 80.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 77.0 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 100 |  | $\sim$ | 7-10 boys | - | 11-14 boys |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 82.9 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 100 |  |  | 7-10 girls | $\longrightarrow$ | 11-14 girls |

NOTE : 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 35.5 | 54.5 | 8.2 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 5.1 | 16.9 | 55.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | . 0 | 14.5 | 60.0 | 18.9 |  |  |  | 5.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | 4.2 |  | 17.0 | 51.8 | 21.8 |  |  |  | . 1 |  |  | 100 |
| Std V |  | 3 | 4 |  | 14.4 | 54.3 | 20.4 |  |  | 7.6 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI |  |  | 1.2 |  |  | 11.2 | 49.1 | 28.1 |  | 10 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 | 51.4 | 27.1 | 10.0 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.9 | 42.0 | 29.7 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $93.4 \%(14.5+60.0+18.9)$ children are in age range 7 to 9 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 91.2 |  |  |  | 8.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 92.7 |  |  |  | 7.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 24.7 | 35.2 | 37.4 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 1.0 | 62.9 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.0 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Himachal Pradesh, ASER 2005 covered 5 districts. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 12 districts.

## HIMACHAL PRADESH ruval

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 16.4 | 54.6 | 22.2 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 3.7 | 21.8 | 33.6 | 27.2 | 13.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.9 | 7.9 | 20.3 | 37.6 | 33.3 | 100 |
| IV | 0.5 | 4.6 | 7.0 | 29.9 | 58.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 18.2 | 75.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 10.4 | 85.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 92.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 95.2 | 100 |
| Total | 2.9 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 17.5 | 56.3 | 100 |

nотe : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008


Chart 7: Reading levels of BOYS AND GIRLS IN STd III



## HIMACHAL PRADESH ruval

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 13.6 | 45.5 | 35.4 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 100 |  |
| II | 2.8 | 19.6 | 47.8 | 24.5 | 5.3 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.8 | 10.6 | 26.9 | 44.9 | 16.9 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.5 | 4.5 | 12.8 | 41.9 | 40.4 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.5 | 2.1 | 9.0 | 28.2 | 60.2 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.2 | 2.0 | 7.2 | 21.1 | 69.6 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 13.6 | 80.9 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 12.2 | 84.2 | 100 |  |
| TOTAL | 2.4 | 10.9 | 18.6 | 24.3 | 43.9 | 100 |  |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

| CHART 8: \% CHILDREN WHO CAN DO DIVISION |
| :--- |
| (in govt schools in Std III - VIII) 2006-2008 |
| 100 |

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: <br> CLASSES CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 5.1 | 22.4 |
| II | 19.6 | 50.2 |
| III | 39.5 | 65.5 |
| IV | 58.0 | 83.1 |
| V | 69.1 | 88.4 |
| VI | 78.8 | 93.4 |
| VII | 87.1 | 95.0 |
| VIII | 92.5 | 96.9 |
| Total | 55.5 | 73.9 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


HIMACHAL PRADESH ruaal

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | PRIVATE SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : LeARNING LeVELS |  |  | Std 3-5 : LeArNing Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bilaspur | 93.1 | 0.0 | 24.8 | 96.3 | 97.6 | 87.4 | 86.7 | 59.3 | 76.8 |
| Chamba | 85.0 | 2.3 | 7.8 | 79.7 | 84.8 | 73.2 | 62.7 | 49.1 | 69.1 |
| Hamirpur | 93.5 | 0.2 | 35.1 | 92.8 | 91.0 | 83.3 | 83.8 | 55.0 | 69.4 |
| Kangra | 91.9 | 0.4 | 37.6 | 88.8 | 91.6 | 87.6 | 78.0 | 55.6 | 82.3 |
| Kinnaur | 90.5 | 0.4 | 20.0 | 94.5 | 94.0 | 92.6 | 87.0 | 71.8 | 93.0 |
| Kullu | 95.1 | 0.1 | 18.8 | 95.4 | 97.7 | 81.9 | 77.4 | 60.3 | 92.3 |
| Lahaul and Spiti | 93.2 | 0.5 | 19.7 | 92.3 | 93.9 | 89.0 | 90.8 | 69.3 | 73.0 |
| Mandi | 92.3 | 0.8 | 20.3 | 91.2 | 94.6 | 86.2 | 83.9 | 61.0 | 83.2 |
| Shimla | 85.7 | 0.4 | 19.1 | 98.1 | 97.2 | 91.1 | 86.6 | 62.7 | 79.0 |
| Sirmaur | 92.1 | 0.7 | 21.8 | 87.5 | 87.0 | 75.5 | 62.4 | 41.4 | 71.7 |
| Solan | 96.8 | 0.8 | 16.2 | 77.0 | 82.1 | 76.6 | 61.3 | 44.1 | 74.2 |
| Una | 95.9 | 0.6 | 21.7 | 88.3 | 89.3 | 86.3 | 82.8 | 57.6 | 78.0 |
| Total | 91.9 | 0.6 | 24.3 | 89.7 | 91.6 | 84.3 | 77.6 | 55.7 | 79.1 |



# JAMMU AND KASHMIR ruval 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 14 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS
Enrollment
School enrollment and out of school children 2008


NOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## Age-wise and class-wise distribution of children in sample

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 26.1 | 40.7 | 23.5 | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 4.1 | 15.4 | 29.3 | 39.9 | 7.6 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | 3.5 | 9.8 | 33.8 | 38.4 | 10.2 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 3.7 |  |  | 11.9 | 23.1 | 47.2 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 4.1 |  |  |  | 8.0 | 33.9 | 37.9 | 10.8 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 3.6 |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | 22.2 | 48.7 | 9.7 | 5.9 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 | 31.1 | 41.0 | 12.6 | 4.7 |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 | 24.0 | 47.5 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 82.3\% (33.6+38.4+10.2) children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

Children in Pre-school 2008

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 56.4 |  |  |  | 43.6 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 65.7 |  |  |  | 34.3 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 12.8 | 38.9 | 38.4 | 1.2 | 8.7 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 5.3 | 50.5 | 39.4 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $10.5 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Jammu and Kashmir, ASER 2005 covered 8 districts. ASER 2006 covered 13 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 14 districts.

## JAMMU AND KASHMIR rubal

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 14.8 | 49.9 | 28.3 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 100 |  |
| II | 6.5 | 29.7 | 41.4 | 17.3 | 5.2 | 100 |  |
| III | 2.8 | 18.3 | 37.5 | 27.6 | 13.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 1.9 | 13.7 | 30.6 | 33.8 | 20.1 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.4 | 7.2 | 22.1 | 36.4 | 33.0 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.6 | 4.7 | 15.3 | 35.3 | 44.2 | 100 |  |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.4 | 9.4 | 30.0 | 56.2 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.5 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 25.2 | 66.7 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 4.0 | 17.2 | 24.4 | 25.9 | 28.6 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can
 read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters (in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


COMPARISION OF READING LEVELS 2008




## JAMMU AND KASHMIR ruval

## Arithmetic LeVEL

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 12.8 | 43.3 | 36.7 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 100 |
| II | 6.3 | 23.3 | 48.3 | 19.2 | 2.9 | 100 |
| III | 2.5 | 13.6 | 42.9 | 32.6 | 8.4 | 100 |
| IV | 1.8 | 6.9 | 37.4 | 39.0 | 14.9 | 100 |
| V | 1.7 | 4.2 | 26.9 | 42.3 | 24.9 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 3.1 | 21.1 | 42.5 | 32.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.7 | 2.0 | 11.6 | 42.2 | 42.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.0 | 1.1 | 9.4 | 36.2 | 52.2 | 100 |
| Total | 3.9 | 13.2 | 30.0 | 31.8 | 21.2 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.


## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 6.3 | 25.9 |
| II | 18.2 | 46.5 |
| III | 35.3 | 63.8 |
| IV | 51.7 | 73.8 |
| V | 65.5 | 84.5 |
| VI | 75.2 | 86.7 |
| VII | 82.5 | 89.4 |
| VIII | 86.5 | 91.9 |
| TOTAL | 50.7 | 68.8 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


Chart 10: ARITHMETIC LeVEls of boys and girls in Std III



Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  |  | Std 3-5 : LeArNing Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in <br> Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Anantnag | 44.6 | 2.6 | 39.7 | 91.2 | 85.8 | 50.9 | 54.6 | 42.6 | 76.7 |
| Budgam | 58.8 | 4.9 | 28.4 | 85.7 | 94.5 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 43.7 | 70.2 |
| Baramulla | 61.9 | 1.6 | 38.8 | 94.0 | 91.4 | 56.2 | 48.9 | 49.3 | 56.5 |
| Doda | 77.9 | 7.4 | 29.8 | 98.8 | 98.6 | 70.9 | 83.6 | 72.7 | 88.4 |
| Jammu | 80.4 | 0.8 | 57.4 | 79.3 | 81.9 | 53.9 | 50.5 | 51.5 | 75.1 |
| Kargil | 50.0 | 0.2 | 38.6 | 99.3 | 97.9 | 71.4 | 53.4 | 39.7 | 84.8 |
| Kathua | 78.8 | 1.4 | 41.9 | 86.0 | 88.9 | 64.2 | 67.9 | 63.7 | 76.1 |
| Kupwara | 69.1 | 3.0 | 31.5 | 87.0 | 89.0 | 44.5 | 48.5 | 42.1 | 66.2 |
| Leh(Ladakh) | 95.7 | 0.2 | 32.0 | 95.9 | 96.4 | 68.8 | 70.5 | 38.5 | 69.0 |
| Pulwama | 69.2 | 2.2 | 54.1 | 94.0 | 98.0 | 67.6 | 57.2 | 63.2 | 91.2 |
| Poonch* |  | 0.1 | 36.7 | 98.4 | 96.2 | 66.7 | 58.9 | 58.0 | 73.5 |
| Rajauri | 34.1 | 3.8 | 35.9 | 84.4 | 86.1 | 42.7 | 39.4 | 33.2 | 70.0 |
| Srinagar | 17.8 | 2.7 | 41.5 | 90.9 | 95.9 | 51.0 | 45.8 | 46.4 | 80.3 |
| Udhampur | 38.1 | 3.2 | 10.4 | 78.0 | 86.0 | 38.5 | 35.9 | 44.8 | 74.5 |
| Total | 61.5 | 2.7 | 37.5 | 89.0 | 90.2 | 55.0 | 54.2 | 50.9 | 74.0 |



* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 17 OUT OF 22 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 82.2 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 80.5 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 83.8 | 9.9 | 2.2 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 83.2 | 10.6 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 84.3 | 9.1 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 80.6 | 9.4 | 1.3 | 8.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 80.5 | 10.6 | 1.1 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 80.7 | 7.6 | 1.5 | 10.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 65.1 | 12.4 | 1.3 | 21.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 66.8 | 11.0 | 1.3 | 20.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 63.7 | 13.4 | 1.5 | 21.4 | 100 |



NOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 25.2 | 45.3 | 15.3 | 8.9 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 4.1 | 16.7 | 29.4 | 33.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | 5.6 | 10.7 | 36.8 | 21.1 | 16.3 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 2.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | 4.9 |  | 15.7 | 21.3 | 34.0 | 9.3 | 10.3 | 4.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V |  | 2.7 |  | 5.4 | 7.6 | 31.9 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 6.3 |  | 7.0 |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 5.7 |  |  |  |  | 13.5 | 16.9 | 38.9 | 12.5 | 7.9 | 4.6 |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 | 35.9 | 25.6 | 15.6 | 6.6 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.1 | 28.5 | 32.5 | 13.6 | 6.0 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $74.2 \%(36.8+21.1+16.3)$ children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $13.7 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 66.0 |  |  |  | 34.0 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 72.8 |  |  |  | 27.2 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 28.7 | 47.9 | 7.3 | 1.4 | 14.6 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 5.6 | 75.3 | 10.8 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 100 |

Children in Pre-school 2008

In Jharkhand, ASER 2005 covered 20 districts. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 22 districts.

# JHARKHAND ruval 

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% Children who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 44.2 | 38.2 | 11.2 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 16.3 | 36.0 | 27.9 | 13.2 | 6.6 | 100 |
| III | 6.7 | 22.8 | 29.1 | 25.3 | 16.2 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 11.8 | 20.5 | 29.5 | 36.0 | 100 |
| V | 1.7 | 5.8 | 10.9 | 26.8 | 54.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 21.9 | 67.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 13.8 | 80.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 10.5 | 86.2 | 100 |
| Total | 11.9 | 18.3 | 15.7 | 18.1 | 36.0 | 100 |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| पन्न क जntus |  |  |
| 5月, IIEMI <br> जलत दिनो को जनिण से रही यो। गीन में समी जगए गंदा पानीी मर गया ला। क्रसी वर्यिए की रालनै खी राह यंज्ञा रहे चे। अवानक़ एक दिन बतरिया रक मी। चूरण विफल ज्ञाया ( थक तोग चुरा हो गये। ज्वासमान में विड्रियी उदने जगीं ज लोग अपने सपडे रुखाने लबे। तहा यो पर्षा हो बाएर निकलसर चेलने लगे। | गा $\overline{\text { ने }}$ छल वह बद्धुत वसे सोनी खाने के बाद |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


COMPARISION OF READING LEVELS 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: Class-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 46.1 | 38.9 | 10.5 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 15.9 | 42.3 | 27.9 | 10.8 | 3.2 | 100 |  |
| III | 6.8 | 26.5 | 35.5 | 22.8 | 8.5 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.0 | 14.7 | 29.8 | 34.3 | 19.3 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.5 | 7.8 | 23.1 | 33.2 | 34.4 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.3 | 15.2 | 31.1 | 48.1 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.3 | 7.9 | 27.1 | 62.2 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.7 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 21.2 | 71.4 | 100 |  |
| Total | 12.1 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 21.6 | 24.6 | 100 |  |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 5.7 | 20.4 |
| II | 13.0 | 39.0 |
| III | 28.4 | 56.7 |
| IV | 44.9 | 71.9 |
| V | 61.0 | 81.6 |
| VI | 73.4 | 86.0 |
| VII | 83.5 | 90.4 |
| VIII | 86.9 | 92.2 |
| Total | 42.4 | 61.7 |
|  |  |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




JHARKHAND ruval

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning levels |  | Std 3-5 : LeARNING Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more |  | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Chatra | 57.5 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 56.6 | 54.5 | 57.8 | 54.7 | 39.8 | 73.2 |
| Dhanbad | 79.2 | 4.8 | 14.8 | 83.3 | 79.6 | 78.0 | 69.9 | 41.5 | 82.7 |
| Dumka | 89.1 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 69.5 | 67.0 | 59.4 | 41.5 | 41.5 | 60.2 |
| Garhwa | 59.5 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 68.7 | 65.7 | 75.2 | 56.4 | 45.3 | 56.4 |
| Giridih | 43.7 | 5.0 | 14.0 | 70.9 | 76.7 | 64.0 | 52.3 | 47.6 | 81.2 |
| Godda | 85.0 | 6.2 | 13.0 | 72.3 | 68.6 | 70.3 | 69.5 | 62.8 | 86.7 |
| Gumla | 71.0 | 3.7 | 11.2 | 51.3 | 50.8 | 56.2 | 44.3 | 49.0 | 67.4 |
| Hazaribagh | 92.7 | 1.8 | 17.1 | 80.2 | 79.4 | 65.4 | 54.8 | 41.5 | 68.9 |
| Jamtara | 81.9 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 72.9 | 74.5 | 50.9 | 41.3 | 40.6 | 76.9 |
| Kodarma* |  | 0.4 | 5.3 | 71.9 | 69.2 | 87.2 | 67.3 | 77.6 | 86.6 |
| Lohardaga | 90.3 | 5.3 | 14.9 | 76.9 | 77.9 | 65.4 | 55.8 | 62.2 | 81.3 |
| Pakaur | 78.6 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 65.1 | 67.6 | 54.5 | 39.5 | 31.3 | 73.0 |
| Palamu | 50.7 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 52.1 | 49.5 | 59.7 | 49.5 | 38.2 | 69.0 |
| Purbi Singhbhum | 78.1 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 74.4 | 78.7 | 63.1 | 55.6 | 63.6 | 61.9 |
| Ranchi | 85.5 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 70.2 | 74.0 | 63.8 | 41.5 | 41.9 | 87.1 |
| Sahibganj | 80.2 | 13.9 | 9.7 | 69.5 | 61.2 | 61.3 | 58.2 | 57.6 | 70.4 |
| Simdega | 83.2 | 4.6 | 33.2 | 71.5 | 69.9 | 71.1 | 48.5 | 44.1 | 79.5 |
| Total | 69.4 | 5.9 | 9.9 | 68.8 | 68.1 | 61.9 | 49.9 | 44.0 | 69.5 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 27 OUT OF 27 DISTRICTS
facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 78.0 | 18.1 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 75.7 | 18.4 | 0.3 | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 78.7 | 19.1 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 77.4 | 20.6 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 80.1 | 17.4 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 77.9 | 16.4 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 76.7 | 17.9 | 0.2 | 5.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 78.9 | 14.9 | 0.2 | 5.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 60.8 | 22.9 | 0.1 | 16.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 61.4 | 22.4 | 0.1 | 16.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 60.3 | 23.4 | 0.2 | 16.2 | 100 |



NOTE : 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $90.1 \%(32.9+57.2)$ children are in age range 8 to 9.


How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $10.1 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## Young Children

Children in Pre-school 2008

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 85.2 |  |  |  | 14.8 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 93.2 |  |  |  | 6.8 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 84.4 | 8.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 17.3 | 61.6 | 19.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 100 |

## Children not in pre-school over the years

CHART 3: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children (AGE 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other)


## KARNATAKA ruval

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 24.7 | 47.9 | 20.7 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 100 |  |
| II | 8.6 | 30.9 | 35.9 | 15.4 | 9.2 | 100 |  |
| III | 5.4 | 16.7 | 33.2 | 25.0 | 19.7 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.5 | 10.0 | 24.1 | 28.3 | 34.1 | 100 |  |
| V | 2.2 | 6.6 | 17.0 | 28.6 | 45.7 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.3 | 4.3 | 11.6 | 24.9 | 57.9 | 100 |  |
| VII | 1.5 | 3.2 | 7.2 | 19.1 | 69.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 1.0 | 2.8 | 6.1 | 16.7 | 73.5 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 5.9 | 15.1 | 19.5 | 20.5 | 39.0 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




KARNATAKA rural

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 25.7 | 47.8 | 23.9 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 100 |
| II | 8.4 | 31.8 | 48.6 | 10.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| III | 4.7 | 18.7 | 49.1 | 24.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.7 | 10.9 | 45.3 | 32.6 | 8.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 8.2 | 36.0 | 37.5 | 16.9 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 5.0 | 30.4 | 36.6 | 27.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.0 | 3.0 | 24.5 | 35.8 | 35.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 2.6 | 22.8 | 33.7 | 39.8 | 100 |
| Total | 5.7 | 15.8 | 35.1 | 26.8 | 16.6 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |


| Testing Tool |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \#therde | arest |
|  | 4 4 | 52 83 | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ -29 \\ -\quad-39 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\longdiv { 8 7 9 }$ |
| Currency Tasks | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 7 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $37 \quad 27$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47 \\ \hline 28 \\ +\quad-17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $6) 824$ |
|  | $69$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline 55 & 28 \\ \hline 91 & 65 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \\ 92 \\ -76 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $8 \longdiv { 9 8 5 }$ |
| $3$ | $52$ | $\text { 36) } 43$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5268 \\ -14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4) 517 C |
|  | $-1 \pi \cos$ | $+\cdots \operatorname{la}^{2}$ | $1 \%=0$ | $x=0 x+x$ |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008

## Chart 9: Arithmetic levels in govt and pVt schools IN DIFFERENT CLASSES



## Chart 10: Arithmetic levels

of boys and girls in Std III



KARNATAKA rural

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | PRIVATE SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bagalkot | 83.5 | 5.2 | 11.3 | 83.7 | 82.7 | 49.8 | 36.3 | 44.6 | 70.3 |
| Bangalore | 89.5 | 1.1 | 47.1 | 88.8 | 90.1 | 67.5 | 57.7 | 46.7 | 82.8 |
| Bangalore Rural | 96.1 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 97.2 | 95.1 | 72.2 | 56.1 | 55.2 | 89.6 |
| Belgaum | 90.0 | 2.1 | 17.9 | 76.9 | 81.0 | 56.8 | 31.1 | 28.6 | 67.5 |
| Bellary | 89.1 | 14.1 | 13.1 | 89.1 | 88.6 | 54.2 | 25.8 | 28.8 | 82.5 |
| Bidar | 97.4 | 3.7 | 24.9 | 65.6 | 72.1 | 44.0 | 28.5 | 31.2 | 74.4 |
| Bijapur | 91.3 | 4.5 | 15.4 | 75.7 | 72.0 | 54.7 | 39.9 | 52.2 | 86.3 |
| Chamaraj Nagar | 95.2 | 2.1 | 14.3 | 81.6 | 76.8 | 55.9 | 33.8 | 32.7 | 67.8 |
| Chikmagalur | 91.8 | 0.4 | 20.9 | 93.8 | 90.7 | 71.9 | 46.1 | 51.9 | 82.4 |
| Chitradurga | 94.5 | 1.3 | 13.9 | 90.7 | 89.5 | 69.8 | 58.9 | 61.3 | 77.0 |
| Dakshin Kannada | 81.5 | 0.8 | 33.6 | 94.5 | 91.5 | 79.6 | 58.2 | 57.2 | 72.5 |
| Davanagere | 96.9 | 2.3 | 22.4 | 78.7 | 71.3 | 58.1 | 26.6 | 38.8 | 68.9 |
| Dharwad | 86.9 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 71.2 | 79.8 | 48.2 | 24.6 | 20.7 | 68.4 |
| Gadag | 97.0 | 2.6 | 10.1 | 85.9 | 85.9 | 60.3 | 38.8 | 38.0 | 77.7 |
| Gulbarga | 73.7 | 13.6 | 8.2 | 78.9 | 78.9 | 46.8 | 22.9 | 26.9 | 81.3 |
| Hassan | 98.0 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 84.6 | 76.1 | 65.2 | 40.2 | 38.5 | 80.3 |
| Haveri | 94.0 | 2.3 | 12.3 | 84.0 | 81.9 | 59.0 | 50.2 | 42.4 | 74.9 |
| Kodagu | 89.9 | 1.7 | 23.8 | 89.7 | 89.7 | 77.0 | 53.1 | 48.1 | 86.7 |
| Kolar | 94.8 | 0.7 | 22.8 | 84.3 | 88.4 | 62.0 | 55.7 | 44.5 | 80.1 |
| Koppal | 93.0 | 3.4 | 13.4 | 63.8 | 69.3 | 46.9 | 15.9 | 17.2 | 67.8 |
| Mandya | 88.9 | 0.4 | 27.8 | 91.8 | 83.7 | 62.2 | 41.2 | 39.7 | 83.5 |
| Mysore | 88.0 | 3.9 | 19.6 | 86.5 | 86.5 | 53.9 | 32.5 | 22.7 | 83.1 |
| Raichur | 81.2 | 12.4 | 8.8 | 78.9 | 79.4 | 53.2 | 31.1 | 47.2 | 66.4 |
| Shimoga | 94.4 | 1.1 | 16.3 | 92.9 | 94.3 | 73.9 | 53.5 | 47.8 | 74.7 |
| Tumkur | 93.9 | 1.3 | 13.2 | 89.5 | 83.9 | 55.5 | 44.8 | 33.3 | 68.6 |
| Udupi | 89.7 | 0.7 | 36.7 | 93.8 | 94.6 | 87.6 | 66.7 | 49.6 | 80.5 |
| Uttar Kannada | 87.1 | 0.7 | 5.5 | 97.6 | 96.8 | 84.2 | 76.1 | 59.6 | 88.8 |
| Total | 89.9 | 3.6 | 18.1 | 83.4 | 83.0 | 60.6 | 41.1 | 39.8 | 76.6 |



## KERALA rubal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 12 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 50.3 | 49.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 51.4 | 47.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 ALL | 48.3 | 51.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 47.2 | 52.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 48.9 | 50.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 53.3 | 46.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 52.6 | 46.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 53.2 | 46.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 54.9 | 43.0 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 54.4 | 43.5 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 55.0 | 43.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 100 |



NOTE: 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот ім sChоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $95.4 \%(12.8+63.4+19.2)$ children are in age range 7 to 9 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 79.6 |  |  |  | 20.5 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 92.4 |  |  |  | 7.6 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 50.4 | 19.5 | 27.7 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 10.7 | 39.6 | 48.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 100 |

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

## Children not in pre-school over the years

Chart 3: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children (AGE 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other)



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $9.5 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Kerala, ASER 2005 covered all 14 districts. ASER 2006 covered all 14 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 14 districts.

## Reading Level

| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 2.5 | 32.5 | 52.2 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 100 |
| II | 0.5 | 12.9 | 39.6 | 26.3 | 20.6 | 100 |
| III | 0.4 | 5.0 | 19.3 | 33.8 | 41.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.2 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 24.3 | 64.4 | 100 |
| v | 0.5 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 18.2 | 75.5 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 14.9 | 79.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 11.4 | 85.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 9.0 | 89.1 | 100 |
| Total | 0.6 | 6.6 | 15.6 | 18.4 | 58.9 | 100 |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3.7 | 31.3 | 58.2 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 0.5 | 13.3 | 53.1 | 29.9 | 3.2 | 100 |
| III | 0.7 | 4.5 | 33.4 | 52.3 | 9.1 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 2.0 | 18.1 | 56.8 | 22.8 | 100 |
| v | 0.7 | 1.1 | 11.9 | 42.6 | 43.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.5 | 0.9 | 10.1 | 30.7 | 57.9 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.8 | 10.1 | 25.2 | 63.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 19.9 | 74.3 | 100 |
| Total | 0.8 | 6.2 | 24.1 | 33.7 | 35.3 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


Chart 10: Arithmetic levels of boys and girls in Std III



Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI or Balwadi | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Alappuzha* |  | 0.1 | 56.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 90.3 | 85.8 | 72.4 | 89.4 |
| Ernakulam | 96.0 | 0.4 | 81.6 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 88.8 | 78.0 | 69.5 | 86.4 |
| Kannur | 89.4 | 0.1 | 57.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 87.1 | 78.8 | 98.4 | 98.8 |
| Kasaragod | 85.9 | 0.7 | 31.6 | 93.9 | 90.7 | 84.8 | 77.1 | 71.3 | 90.1 |
| Kollam* |  | 0.2 | 43.3 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 91.9 | 83.3 | 75.4 | 86.6 |
| Kozhikode | 85.0 | 0.1 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 92.4 | 69.6 | 63.0 | 87.1 |
| Malappuram | 68.2 | 0.0 | 41.9 | 97.2 | 97.7 | 76.4 | 64.9 | 54.8 | 87.2 |
| Palakkad | 93.3 | 0.1 | 40.7 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 80.2 | 73.0 | 65.2 | 79.1 |
| Pathanamthitta | 91.2 | 0.0 | 53.9 | 100.0 | 99.1 | 89.2 | 83.3 | 81.2 | 91.3 |
| Thiruvananthapuram | 93.1 | 0.1 | 37.6 | 98.6 | 99.3 | 88.8 | 77.9 | 66.8 | 79.7 |
| Thrissur | 93.8 | 0.4 | 49.9 | 98.5 | 93.5 | 89.0 | 78.6 | 98.7 | 98.3 |
| Wayanad | 82.7 | 0.3 | 34.7 | 95.2 | 95.1 | 74.6 | 61.5 | 50.4 | 82.5 |
| Total | 88.3 | 0.2 | 49.1 | 98.6 | 97.8 | 85.9 | 75.8 | 72.1 | 87.6 |



As of January 1, 2009 data was available for 12 out of 14 districts in Kerala. Data for remaning 2 districts will be included in the final report.

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## MADHYAPRADESH

MaHARASHTRA
Manipur
Meghalaya
NagALAND
ORISSA


# MADHYA PRADESH ruaal 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 45 OUT OF 45 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 81.1 | 16.2 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 80.3 | 15.4 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 81.1 | 16.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 79.1 | 18.7 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 83.6 | 14.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 81.9 | 14.5 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 79.8 | 16.9 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 84.7 | 11.5 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 72.2 | 13.4 | 0.1 | 14.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 71.4 | 14.9 | 0.1 | 13.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 73.5 | 11.3 | 0.2 | 15.1 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, 86.2\% (45.5+33.6+7.1) children are in age range 8 to 10

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 90.3 |  |  |  | 9.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 91.9 |  |  |  | 8.2 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 32.3 | 46.6 | 17.4 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 4.4 | 74.3 | 19.2 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $13.1 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Madhya Pradesh, ASER 2005 covered 40 districts. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 45 districts.

## MADHYA PRADESH ruaal

## Reading LeVEL

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 6.0 | 61.3 | 27.2 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 0.6 | 15.7 | 49.6 | 28.5 | 5.6 | 100 |
| III | 0.2 | 2.8 | 14.7 | 51.8 | 30.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 29.1 | 65.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 11.0 | 87.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 4.1 | 95.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 97.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 98.5 | 100 |
| TotaL | 1.0 | 11.6 | 13.4 | 18.2 | 55.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| करो - कात (\%) |  |  |
| तगमा समझवा नंजी थी। सगे जसका घोटा गएबं अमन गहुत लहत्ये का प्रा घिन योर्नां स्ताजाए में धूर रहे जे। समतन मे रास्ते में पक्नेंटे बैंतो। उसे पकौडे | रत का रीक्ता हत अनाएथ मे चौह वी | वय का <br> क्रुे यी। <br> तारे बे। <br> रहा का |
| पफोड़े बनाती थी। नगुना ने कहा यह प्योते मीवों होगे। समा अगन नर्धी काना। अगन नै पकौके खाये सीत उसकी औध्यो से गौरू निकालने जये। | $\begin{aligned} & \text { द का च } \\ & \text { ब न } \\ & \text { क ह त } \\ & \text { ह च व } \end{aligned}$ |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008



## MADHYA PRADESH ruaal

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 7.4 | 64.2 | 25.1 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 100 |
| II | 1.0 | 21.0 | 53.5 | 21.0 | 3.5 | 100 |
| III | 0.2 | 4.5 | 23.1 | 49.9 | 22.3 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 1.8 | 8.0 | 36.7 | 53.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 18.1 | 78.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 9.6 | 88.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 6.4 | 92.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 3.5 | 96.0 | 100 |
| Total | 1.3 | 13.1 | 15.9 | 19.9 | 49.9 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


MADHYA PRADESH ruaal

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Balaghat | 94.4 | 0.8 | 25.1 | 96.8 | 97.2 | 75.9 | 54.9 | 43.0 | 75.5 |
| Barwani | 93.1 | 2.2 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.1 | 92.8 | 86.9 | 85.7 |
| Betul | 100.0 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 97.2 | 95.6 | 97.1 | 95.0 | 98.2 | 97.1 |
| Bhind | 95.2 | 0.5 | 10.9 | 97.7 | 96.7 | 85.9 | 86.1 | 95.9 | 97.9 |
| Bhopal | 91.7 | 2.5 | 25.3 | 98.5 | 98.8 | 97.8 | 96.5 | 38.7 | 59.8 |
| Chhatarpur | 98.9 | 1.4 | 9.6 | 96.7 | 95.1 | 95.0 | 86.4 | 83.3 | 94.0 |
| Chhindwara | 99.1 | 2.8 | 13.4 | 93.7 | 92.7 | 82.3 | 76.1 | 43.5 | 69.3 |
| Damoh | 90.5 | 0.4 | 7.9 | 90.7 | 90.7 | 96.1 | 85.6 | 44.4 | 96.5 |
| Datia | 98.0 | 0.5 | 21.1 | 94.5 | 91.7 | 74.8 | 48.7 | 43.8 | 77.5 |
| Dewas | 90.4 | 1.0 | 39.3 | 98.0 | 97.4 | 98.3 | 92.7 | 63.7 | 94.1 |
| Dhar | 84.4 | 2.0 | 19.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.3 | 98.6 | 32.4 | 94.1 |
| Dindori | 100.0 | 2.8 | 10.9 | 93.1 | 92.7 | 86.3 | 70.7 | 60.6 | 84.0 |
| East Nimar | 89.8 | 1.9 | 16.1 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 99.4 | 98.0 | 79.9 | 95.4 |
| Guna | 98.8 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 97.9 | 97.3 | 99.6 | 99.3 | 92.9 | 97.8 |
| Gwalior | 93.2 | 2.2 | 13.6 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 80.9 | 66.7 | 72.4 | 84.0 |
| Harda | 83.5 | 3.2 | 17.7 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 93.4 | 85.1 | 85.4 | 92.0 |
| Hoshangabad | 86.8 | 0.8 | 25.2 | 95.8 | 94.5 | 91.3 | 85.2 | 69.7 | 86.1 |
| Indore | 92.7 | 0.3 | 33.8 | 100.0 | 99.3 | 97.1 | 91.2 | 84.3 | 96.4 |
| Jabalpur | 89.0 | 2.6 | 18.0 | 94.7 | 93.8 | 91.6 | 79.0 | 73.7 | 84.8 |
| Jhabua | 86.2 | 6.8 | 3.5 | 97.0 | 95.0 | 95.8 | 94.3 | 72.6 | 93.6 |
| Katni | 72.8 | 1.6 | 9.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 98.3 | 96.8 | 20.5 | 83.3 |
| Mandla | 93.1 | 2.8 | 13.7 | 98.5 | 96.5 | 82.0 | 70.8 | 41.5 | 66.0 |
| Mandsaur | 80.5 | 2.7 | 42.1 | 97.8 | 97.3 | 99.3 | 99.6 | 75.7 | 99.3 |
| Morena | 98.0 | 1.5 | 9.2 | 98.9 | 99.3 | 95.2 | 92.3 | 86.0 | 96.7 |
| Narsinhpur | 81.8 | 0.2 | 20.2 | 96.0 | 92.8 | 94.2 | 86.4 | 79.3 | 80.3 |
| Neemuch | 96.3 | 0.4 | 21.1 | 97.6 | 94.8 | 96.9 | 88.4 | 89.7 | 83.2 |
| Panna | 89.7 | 1.5 | 33.3 | 94.9 | 95.7 | 89.9 | 85.1 | 62.5 | 77.0 |
| Raisen | 90.5 | 0.2 | 10.6 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 36.7 | 50.9 |
| Rajgarh | 84.5 | 3.6 | 17.8 | 99.0 | 98.3 | 95.6 | 88.3 | 87.4 | 88.0 |
| Ratlam | 100.0 | 0.8 | 17.3 | 97.4 | 97.4 | 90.5 | 88.3 | 98.4 | 97.8 |
| Rewa* |  | 1.1 | 25.4 | 97.7 | 95.4 | 96.2 | 92.6 | 70.3 | 91.3 |
| Sagar | 100.0 | 0.7 | 9.8 | 96.2 | 93.7 | 87.9 | 79.0 | 73.1 | 74.4 |
| Satna | 95.4 | 1.3 | 19.1 | 95.4 | 95.4 | 93.8 | 87.0 | 63.5 | 89.5 |
| Sehore | 100.0 | 0.6 | 29.2 | 96.7 | 95.7 | 93.8 | 80.2 | 76.0 | 82.3 |
| Seoni | 90.4 | 1.8 | 13.5 | 97.8 | 96.3 | 70.0 | 57.1 | 51.1 | 63.1 |
| Shahdol | 85.8 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 93.8 | 92.5 | 78.6 | 72.0 | 85.2 | 94.2 |
| Shajapur | 70.9 | 4.2 | 28.5 | 94.1 | 93.3 | 90.2 | 81.1 | 68.4 | 91.3 |
| Sheopur | 84.9 | 5.9 | 13.0 | 96.1 | 95.8 | 76.2 | 65.0 | 34.7 | 69.7 |
| Shivpuri | 95.3 | 2.8 | 5.7 | 94.4 | 91.6 | 90.3 | 88.1 | 90.9 | 89.2 |
| Sidhi | 86.3 | 2.3 | 13.1 | 93.1 | 92.4 | 94.0 | 88.5 | 76.1 | 83.3 |
| Tikamgarh | 70.7 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 93.3 | 90.5 | 88.5 | 84.7 | 89.3 | 93.9 |
| Ujjain | 92.1 | 2.0 | 37.4 | 97.5 | 97.1 | 99.7 | 99.4 | 24.3 | 99.7 |
| Umaria | 100.0 | 2.4 | 5.7 | 95.5 | 95.5 | 94.4 | 91.5 | 89.1 | 81.7 |
| Vidisha | 99.3 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 95.8 | 95.2 | 89.6 | 84.7 | 87.1 | 86.0 |
| West Nimar | 88.7 | 3.6 | 21.0 | 97.2 | 98.0 | 97.3 | 97.6 | 97.1 | 98.3 |
| Total | 91.1 | 1.9 | 16.2 | 96.6 | 95.7 | 91.7 | 85.9 | 70.5 | 87.2 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 72.1 | 25.9 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 64.2 | 32.7 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 88.8 | 10.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 88.2 | 10.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 89.4 | 9.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 52.4 | 44.8 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 52.6 | 44.9 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 52.1 | 44.9 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 26.2 | 64.1 | 0.4 | 9.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 27.1 | 64.4 | 0.3 | 8.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 25.2 | 63.9 | 0.5 | 10.5 | 100 |



NOTE: 'оTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $89.4 \%(32.1+57.3)$ children are in age range 8 to 9 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | 끙 |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 89.6 |  |  |  | 10.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 95.8 |  |  |  | 4.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 83.0 | 11.4 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 11.1 | 78.7 | 8.4 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.4 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Maharashtra, ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 33 districts.

## MAHARASHTRA ruaal

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 14.5 | 53.9 | 24.6 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 100 |  |
| II | 3.0 | 18.8 | 44.0 | 25.0 | 9.3 | 100 |  |
| III | 1.6 | 4.7 | 19.0 | 46.1 | 28.7 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.7 | 2.7 | 9.8 | 34.0 | 52.8 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.4 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 19.6 | 75.0 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.1 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 13.8 | 82.7 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 9.6 | 87.5 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 6.7 | 91.4 | 100 |  |
| Total | 2.8 | 11.0 | 13.9 | 20.5 | 51.8 | 100 |  |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: Class-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 16.1 | 65.8 | 13.9 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 100 |  |
| II | 3.4 | 34.3 | 46.2 | 14.3 | 1.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 1.8 | 11.3 | 37.8 | 40.3 | 8.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.9 | 6.1 | 25.0 | 40.5 | 27.5 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.4 | 2.9 | 14.2 | 35.4 | 47.1 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.3 | 1.9 | 12.5 | 27.6 | 57.7 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.4 | 1.7 | 10.0 | 21.2 | 66.9 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 1.0 | 8.1 | 18.5 | 72.2 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 3.1 | 16.4 | 21.5 | 25.3 | 33.6 | 100 |  |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 7.3 | 16.6 |
| II | 19.7 | 40.1 |
| III | 44.4 | 67.6 |
| IV | 61.5 | 82.4 |
| V | 77.1 | 91.2 |
| VI | 81.3 | 93.2 |
| VII | 87.5 | 94.6 |
| VIII | 90.7 | 96.1 |
| TOTAL | 57.1 | 71.5 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std $3-5$ ) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Ahmednagar | 95.7 | 0.9 | 35.3 | 83.2 | 82.1 | 92.4 | 82.2 | 61.0 | 83.0 |
| Akola | 84.5 | 2.5 | 35.0 | 81.1 | 78.6 | 71.0 | 46.2 | 44.5 | 72.5 |
| Amravati | 95.3 | 0.3 | 38.0 | 77.6 | 75.4 | 69.2 | 32.6 | 29.4 | 51.3 |
| Aurangabad | 96.5 | 1.3 | 18.3 | 95.6 | 87.8 | 77.4 | 48.5 | 59.1 | 79.2 |
| Bhandara | 90.0 | 0.5 | 32.5 | 89.4 | 89.4 | 94.3 | 73.6 | 70.2 | 90.7 |
| Beed | 89.1 | 0.8 | 28.7 | 97.1 | 98.1 | 91.7 | 84.4 | 89.4 | 90.0 |
| Buldana | 98.8 | 0.7 | 29.3 | 99.4 | 98.3 | 98.3 | 97.2 | 94.4 | 97.2 |
| Chandrapur | 96.0 | 1.6 | 17.2 | 86.1 | 87.8 | 72.8 | 49.8 | 47.3 | 70.8 |
| Dhule | 91.0 | 1.4 | 33.0 | 98.1 | 94.8 | 70.7 | 37.1 | 50.1 | 69.5 |
| Gadchiroli | 89.0 | 8.1 | 22.8 | 79.9 | 78.5 | 68.1 | 39.8 | 41.3 | 72.5 |
| Gondia | 97.7 | 0.2 | 22.1 | 95.1 | 95.8 | 91.3 | 54.4 | 43.2 | 66.5 |
| Hingoli | 96.4 | 2.5 | 16.8 | 91.1 | 91.9 | 84.8 | 59.3 | 69.9 | 81.1 |
| Jalgaon | 99.3 | 1.2 | 16.9 | 99.4 | 98.7 | 94.7 | 49.8 | 79.5 | 82.0 |
| Jalna | 91.6 | 0.8 | 21.7 | 94.7 | 93.9 | 96.0 | 95.3 | 94.6 | 97.7 |
| Kolhapur | 87.1 | 1.4 | 26.7 | 91.6 | 90.9 | 82.6 | 62.3 | 57.5 | 71.4 |
| Latur | 96.1 | 2.6 | 29.6 | 89.5 | 89.9 | 78.5 | 65.5 | 57.3 | 71.5 |
| Nagpur | 95.4 | 1.0 | 49.3 | 86.4 | 86.4 | 79.9 | 58.9 | 38.8 | 75.6 |
| Nanded | 95.2 | 1.6 | 20.0 | 83.2 | 84.3 | 78.2 | 54.9 | 48.4 | 79.9 |
| Nandurbar | 97.9 | 7.9 | 25.2 | 82.1 | 83.4 | 70.4 | 50.9 | 47.6 | 66.8 |
| Nashik | 93.9 | 1.9 | 14.3 | 82.4 | 81.5 | 79.7 | 55.2 | 45.8 | 79.1 |
| Osmanabad | 98.5 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 91.0 | 92.3 | 93.9 | 69.1 | 65.2 | 80.3 |
| Parbhani | 84.8 | 4.7 | 22.7 | 93.3 | 91.4 | 79.4 | 60.7 | 63.4 | 80.7 |
| Pune | 89.3 | 0.9 | 16.8 | 95.5 | 94.4 | 89.0 | 66.2 | 55.3 | 82.0 |
| Raigad | 95.8 | 0.1 | 32.1 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 93.7 | 96.7 | 94.9 | 94.3 |
| Ratnagiri | 94.8 | 0.4 | 8.2 | 94.7 | 94.1 | 85.6 | 83.2 | 70.1 | 82.0 |
| Sangli | 85.7 | 0.4 | 39.6 | 99.4 | 96.6 | 87.2 | 66.1 | 56.6 | 85.0 |
| Satara | 86.2 | 1.0 | 33.7 | 99.1 | 98.1 | 95.2 | 85.5 | 58.0 | 88.4 |
| Sindhudurg | 85.0 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 97.8 | 97.8 | 98.8 | 88.2 | 77.3 | 84.7 |
| Solapur | 95.8 | 0.8 | 32.1 | 95.1 | 94.4 | 90.8 | 66.3 | 46.5 | 81.2 |
| Thane | 98.6 | 2.8 | 23.1 | 98.3 | 93.8 | 92.5 | 87.5 | 82.4 | 84.2 |
| Wardha | 95.1 | 0.0 | 36.8 | 89.6 | 91.2 | 69.8 | 41.2 | 50.3 | 67.6 |
| Washim | 85.8 | 1.5 | 30.4 | 83.3 | 85.9 | 77.6 | 42.8 | 41.9 | 71.0 |
| Yavatmal | 90.0 | 3.7 | 20.2 | 77.4 | 75.9 | 73.7 | 56.1 | 42.9 | 79.2 |
| Total | 93.6 | 1.5 | 25.9 | 91.1 | 90.1 | 85.3 | 66.4 | 60.9 | 80.3 |

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 33.2 | 63.7 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 32.9 | 62.5 | 0.4 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 34.0 | 63.7 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 33.8 | 63.5 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 34.4 | 63.6 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 32.4 | 63.6 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 29.4 | 67.3 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 35.5 | 59.6 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 30.9 | 54.9 | 0.4 | 13.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 28.1 | 58.2 | 0.8 | 12.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 33.9 | 52.0 | 0.1 | 14.0 | 100 |



NOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

| TABLE 2: \% CHILDREN IN EACH CLASS BY AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 13 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 15 | 16 | Total |
| Std I | 8.3 | 31.5 | 30.2 | 16.8 | 5.5 |  |  |  | 7.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 1.5 | 9.9 | 18.6 | 36.9 | 15.0 | 10.9 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 100 |  |
| Std III | 3.9 | 8.8 | 22.4 | 22.8 | 23.3 | 7.9 | 6.6 |  |  | 4.4 |  | 100 |  |
| Std IV |  | 4.2 |  | 8.1 | 13.7 | 32.9 | 17.2 | 11.9 | 8.0 |  | 4.2 | 100 |  |
| Std V |  | 1.4 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 25.4 | 20.6 | 18.4 | 11.2 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 100 |  |  |
| Std VI |  | 1.5 |  | 3.2 | 11.9 | 17.2 | 28.9 | 19.9 | 10.3 | 7.1 | 100 |  |  |
| Std VII |  |  | 2.6 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 28.3 | 28.0 | 16.6 | 10.4 | 3.5 | 100 |  |  |
| Std VIII |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  | 14.1 | 26.5 | 30.1 | 15.9 | 8.5 | 100 |  |

How to read the table: In Std III, 68.5\% (22.4+22.8+23.3) children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

| TABLE 3: \% CHILDREN WHO ATtEND |
| :--- |
| DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $12.7 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Manipur, ASER 2005 covered 3 districts. ASER 2006 covered 8 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 9 districts.

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 5.4 | 36.9 | 40.3 | 15.2 | 2.2 | 100 |  |
| II | 1.1 | 17.1 | 32.9 | 35.2 | 13.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.3 | 10.2 | 18.7 | 37.6 | 33.2 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.4 | 5.3 | 12.0 | 28.2 | 54.1 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.2 | 3.0 | 8.1 | 19.3 | 69.5 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 16.3 | 78.7 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.5 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 12.6 | 82.2 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 8.1 | 90.0 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 1.3 | 11.8 | 18.3 | 23.3 | 45.5 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008




RURAL

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: Class-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 3.2 | 21.9 | 64.4 | 9.6 | 0.9 | 100 |  |
| II | 0.8 | 9.0 | 49.4 | 35.7 | 5.1 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.1 | 4.7 | 27.6 | 50.1 | 17.5 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 2.4 | 14.4 | 41.5 | 41.7 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.2 | 1.5 | 7.4 | 31.1 | 59.7 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 24.1 | 71.5 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.5 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 16.9 | 79.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 9.8 | 89.4 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 0.8 | 6.5 | 26.3 | 28.8 | 37.6 | 100 |  |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 8.0 | 41.3 |
| II | 28.5 | 69.1 |
| III | 46.1 | 84.8 |
| IV | 67.3 | 94.5 |
| V | 78.3 | 95.3 |
| VI | 83.3 | 97.6 |
| VII | 90.6 | 98.8 |
| VIII | 94.2 | 99.2 |
| Total | 55.2 | 81.2 |


| TESTING Tool |
| :---: |
|  |
| $1{ }^{(1+6)}$ |
| Currency Tasks |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


RURAL

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bishnupur | 63.3 | 3.7 | 71.4 | 93.8 | 95.4 | 77.6 | 77.5 | 50.7 | 91.2 |
| Chandel | 43.4 | 4.1 | 63.3 | 98.6 | 99.1 | 88.9 | 81.8 | 69.0 | 92.9 |
| Churachandpur | 37.7 | 4.1 | 80.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 92.2 | 93.5 | 69.0 | 91.8 |
| Imphal East | 63.1 | 1.2 | 63.5 | 93.0 | 94.8 | 73.5 | 68.1 | 69.3 | 93.7 |
| Imphal West | 97.5 | 0.7 | 73.5 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 91.5 | 91.9 | 66.3 | 95.0 |
| Senapati | 45.4 | 6.2 | 47.8 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 90.6 | 84.9 | 77.4 | 90.2 |
| Tamenglong | 53.4 | 4.7 | 65.5 | 97.0 | 97.2 | 68.0 | 63.9 | 46.4 | 86.5 |
| Thoubal | 69.4 | 0.5 | 49.4 | 91.8 | 98.2 | 60.9 | 69.6 | 49.8 | 84.3 |
| Ukhrul | 89.6 | 1.3 | 59.9 | 99.4 | 99.7 | 84.2 | 88.1 | 66.7 | 96.3 |
| Total | 59.7 | 2.6 | 63.7 | 96.7 | 98.0 | 80.3 | 80.2 | 63.3 | 91.3 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 7 OUT OF 7 DISTRICTS
facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 51.2 | 45.6 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 48.1 | 47.5 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 55.3 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 55.6 | 40.6 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 55.5 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 45.2 | 51.2 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 45.1 | 50.4 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 45.8 | 51.5 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 36.3 | 52.3 | 0.1 | 11.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 33.7 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 39.5 | 49.8 | 0.2 | 10.5 | 100 |


| CHART 1: TRENDS OVER TIME |
| :--- |
| \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER |
| 25 |
| \% |

nOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 8.1 | 22.1 | 19.4 | 21.4 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 3.1 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 1.9 | 6.4 | 13.6 | 23.8 | 14.1 | 19.6 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 7.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | . 4 | 3.6 | 13.2 | 10.5 | 25.3 | 14.0 | 17.2 | 8.1 | 6.7 |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | 2.6 |  | 5.2 | 7.7 | 18.4 | 13.4 | 21.3 | 14.4 | 11.0 | 6. | 1 | 100 |
| Std V | 4.1 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 | 10.4 | 21.1 | 20.9 | 15.9 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 100 |
| Std VI | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 10.6 | 19.5 | 17.0 | 27.5 | 13.7 | 6.8 | 100 |
| Std VII | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.6 | 17.8 | 20.2 | 27.1 | 18.2 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.2 | 25.4 | 26.4 | 33.0 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $49 \%(13.2+10.5+25.3)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 65.5 |  |  |  | 34.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 86.5 |  |  |  | 13.5 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 55.3 | 22.5 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 33.7 | 38.6 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $16.3 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Meghalaya, ASER 2005 covered 2 districts. ASER 2006 covered 5 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 7 districts.

## MEGHALAYA <br> RURAL

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 15.2 | 45.8 | 30.9 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 100 |  |
| II | 4.3 | 28.3 | 42.2 | 19.8 | 5.4 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.9 | 11.9 | 34.9 | 29.5 | 22.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.5 | 7.2 | 22.5 | 27.6 | 42.2 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.0 | 3.5 | 11.6 | 27.4 | 57.6 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.4 | 2.6 | 8.9 | 16.3 | 71.8 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 13.9 | 81.6 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 17.6 | 79.0 | 100 |  |
| Total | 3.9 | 17.7 | 25.4 | 20.1 | 32.8 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| READING Tool |
| :--- |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008


Chart 7: Reading levels of BOYS AND GIRLS IN STd III



## Arithmetic Level

 division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: <br> CLASSES WHO CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 3.8 | 19.2 |
| II | 14.1 | 39.8 |
| III | 43.0 | 70.4 |
| IV | 55.8 | 77.9 |
| V | 71.1 | 85.6 |
| VI | 78.8 | 86.0 |
| VII | 87.5 | 91.5 |
| VIII | 85.6 | 88.1 |
| TOTAL | 43.1 | 61.3 |
|  |  |  |



Comparision of arithmetic levels 2008




MEGHALAYA
RURAL

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| East Garo Hill | 58.3 | 6.3 | 29.0 | 99.5 | 99.1 | 62.3 | 60.1 | 48.2 | 74.3 |
| East Khasi Hill | 83.6 | 2.4 | 68.9 | 86.7 | 90.9 | 83.3 | 62.8 | 49.8 | 81.4 |
| Jaintia Hill | 100.0 | 0.2 | 41.1 | 92.1 | 95.1 | 62.7 | 75.1 | 58.0 | 69.4 |
| Ri Bhoi | 83.8 | 5.3 | 40.7 | 69.6 | 74.9 | 68.6 | 64.7 | 49.8 | 75.9 |
| South Garo Hill | 69.8 | 2.9 | 41.1 | 95.7 | 95.4 | 61.8 | 58.1 | 57.8 | 79.7 |
| West Garo Hill | 62.8 | 8.1 | 42.7 | 86.1 | 89.9 | 56.8 | 57.5 | 48.6 | 82.5 |
| West Khasi Hill | 97.8 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 99.5 | 98.3 | 68.9 | 62.5 | 62.9 | 78.0 |
| Total | 77.2 | 3.1 | 45.6 | 90.3 | 92.7 | 66.6 | 64.5 | 54.7 | 76.9 |



## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 53.7 | 41.6 | 0.1 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 52.6 | 40.3 | 0.1 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 54.3 | 42.8 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 52.0 | 45.0 | 0.1 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 56.9 | 40.3 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 53.6 | 39.1 | 0.1 | 7.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 51.8 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 55.7 | 38.1 | 0.1 | 6.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 43.9 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 41.1 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 23.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 47.2 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 100 |



NOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 8.0 | 38.9 | 31.0 | 12.1 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 0.6 | 8.8 | 30.4 | 26.6 | 17.1 | 8.9 | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III |  | 0 | 8.1 | 27.6 | 24.1 | 17.5 | 9.5 | 6.6 | 5.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 1.6 |  |  | 9.1 | 20.8 | 26.5 | 14.3 | 13.9 | 7.1 | 6.6 |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 1.9 |  |  |  | 7.0 | 25.1 | 24.1 | 20.2 | 11.0 | 5.6 | 5.1 |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 7.3 | 22.8 | 28.7 | 20.5 | 12.3 | 6.6 |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.6 | 32.3 | 22.8 | 11.0 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.4 | 39.5 | 19.0 | 12.5 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $69.2 \%(27.6+24.1+17.5)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were 14.3\% children in Std III in the ASER sample.

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\pi}{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 57.0 |  |  |  | 43.0 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 81.9 |  |  |  | 18.1 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 77.3 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 34.6 | 32.0 | 30.4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 100 |

In Nagaland, ASER 2005 covered 2 districts. ASER 2006 covered 10 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 11 districts.

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% ChiLdren who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 5.6 | 50.4 | 34.8 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 100 |  |
| II | 1.8 | 22.5 | 44.6 | 23.0 | 8.2 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.3 | 9.7 | 33.8 | 31.2 | 25.0 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.1 | 3.3 | 20.4 | 30.4 | 45.9 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.1 | 2.5 | 11.6 | 26.3 | 59.5 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.2 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 20.1 | 72.2 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 15.5 | 81.5 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 5.7 | 92.9 | 100 |  |
| TOTAL | 1.3 | 14.4 | 23.6 | 21.2 | 39.6 | 100 |  |

nоte : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing |  | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I |  | 5.3 | 33.5 | 53.2 | 7.6 | 0.5 | 100 |
| II |  | 2.0 | 12.5 | 56.3 | 26.6 | 2.6 | 100 |
| III |  | 0.5 | 4.1 | 41.8 | 38.7 | 15.0 | 100 |
| IV |  | 0.1 | 1.7 | 24.3 | 41.8 | 32.1 | 100 |
| V |  | 0.1 | 1.4 | 17.5 | 37.2 | 43.9 | 100 |
| VI |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 31.0 | 57.4 | 100 |
| VII |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 23.7 | 71.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 20.1 | 3.1 | 10.6 | 86.0 | 100 |  |
| Total |  | 1.3 | 8.6 | 31.8 | 28.0 | 30.3 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


Chart 10: Arithmetic levels of boys and girls in Std III



Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : LeARNING Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Dimapur | 89.8 | 1.4 | 62.1 | 99.5 | 96.2 | 79.7 | 78.7 | 66.8 | 91.0 |
| Kiphire | 40.0 | 3.6 | 23.2 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 82.1 | 72.6 | 63.7 | 84.3 |
| Logleng | 90.4 | 19.4 | 25.2 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 25.9 | 24.8 | 54.2 | 49.7 |
| Mokokchung | 21.4 | 5.6 | 22.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 65.9 | 78.0 | 82.4 | 84.1 |
| Mon | 52.9 | 6.2 | 42.1 | 89.6 | 90.8 | 73.8 | 74.2 | 82.7 | 90.0 |
| Peren | 78.3 | 2.7 | 52.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 89.9 | 86.4 | 93.2 | 96.7 |
| Phek | 46.7 | 2.3 | 47.6 | 90.6 | 92.6 | 66.7 | 77.2 | 69.8 | 90.7 |
| Tuensang | 85.3 | 6.6 | 30.6 | 97.6 | 96.5 | 61.0 | 46.5 | 71.9 | 85.3 |
| Wokha | 77.9 | 3.8 | 31.4 | 97.7 | 98.8 | 82.1 | 56.2 | 52.7 | 66.5 |
| Zunheboto | 100.0 | 2.6 | 23.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 53.1 | 43.2 | 47.2 | 83.4 |
| Total | 70.5 | 4.5 | 41.6 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 71.7 | 68.6 | 70.4 | 86.0 |



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 30 OUT OF 30 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 88.1 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 7.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 84.0 | 4.7 | 0.3 | 11.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 90.6 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 90.8 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 90.8 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 4.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 84.8 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 10.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 86.3 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 9.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 83.1 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 12.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 59.1 | 7.5 | 0.1 | 33.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 62.4 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 31.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 55.5 | 9.1 | 0.1 | 35.3 | 100 |



NOTE : 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. ' $о$ от IN SCноог' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $78.5 \%(62.1+12.2+4.2)$ children are in age range 8 to 10

## Young Children

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\pi}{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 73.7 |  |  |  | 26.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 79.2 |  |  |  | 20.9 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 23.8 | 60.4 | 5.6 | 0.4 | 9.8 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 4.7 | 84.2 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 4.9 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.2 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## ORISSA rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 32.9 | 41.0 | 15.7 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 100 |  |
| II | 9.4 | 30.4 | 25.0 | 12.7 | 22.5 | 100 |  |
| III | 5.1 | 15.6 | 24.8 | 22.7 | 31.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.2 | 8.4 | 16.7 | 26.2 | 45.5 | 100 |  |
| V | 2.0 | 6.0 | 10.8 | 21.4 | 59.8 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.1 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 15.5 | 73.8 | 100 |  |
| VII | 1.1 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 12.4 | 78.7 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 7.6 | 87.9 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 8.2 | 15.5 | 14.1 | 15.2 | 47.0 | 100 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| घฺุ้จ\| มต๒| 훙 ( |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| อ¢a a flal |  धब9 §प लार f1ब I <br>  <br>  |  |
| 960 $169016 \square 9$ 9g\% 6ale |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | - a | 20 50] |
|  | - | -1 |
|  | - a | see de |
|  | - | sume |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 35.3 | 40.3 | 17.8 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 11.2 | 32.2 | 28.3 | 15.9 | 12.5 | 100 |
| III | 4.6 | 21.4 | 30.2 | 29.2 | 14.7 | 100 |
| IV | 3.3 | 12.4 | 26.1 | 34.2 | 24.1 | 100 |
| V | 2.4 | 9.1 | 19.4 | 33.0 | 36.2 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 5.2 | 14.2 | 32.0 | 47.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 3.4 | 11.3 | 29.4 | 54.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 2.4 | 7.7 | 22.1 | 67.5 | 100 |
| Total | 8.8 | 17.6 | 20.0 | 24.1 | 29.5 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : LeARNING Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std $3-5$ ) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Anugul | 72.9 | 11.2 | 5.7 | 77.2 | 80.2 | 65.4 | 56.5 | 63.1 | 84.3 |
| Balangir | 76.8 | 9.5 | 4.8 | 64.7 | 58.9 | 62.2 | 39.1 | 46.4 | 71.4 |
| Baleshwar | 74.7 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 88.9 | 82.3 | 75.5 | 64.6 | 73.0 | 88.8 |
| Bargarh | 94.6 | 8.8 | 4.2 | 89.8 | 89.8 | 74.4 | 64.7 | 58.0 | 73.9 |
| Boudh | 80.9 | 7.0 | 2.7 | 67.9 | 64.2 | 62.4 | 36.1 | 39.0 | 67.3 |
| Bhadrak | 95.0 | 0.6 | 4.5 | 96.2 | 93.5 | 79.4 | 69.4 | 52.6 | 81.1 |
| Cuttack | 71.3 | 3.9 | 6.3 | 91.6 | 88.7 | 80.8 | 66.3 | 55.9 | 77.8 |
| Deogarh | 78.6 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 73.5 | 71.9 | 60.5 | 43.9 | 38.4 | 74.9 |
| Dhenkanal | 84.4 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 78.8 | 81.2 | 61.8 | 40.5 | 48.3 | 75.3 |
| Gajapati | 85.4 | 11.0 | 9.3 | 72.7 | 70.4 | 63.1 | 58.7 | 65.5 | 72.0 |
| Ganjam | 54.2 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 72.7 | 75.0 | 66.6 | 58.1 | 49.2 | 70.0 |
| Jagatsinghapur | 81.7 | 2.6 | 6.5 | 90.9 | 87.6 | 80.6 | 66.7 | 47.3 | 73.3 |
| Jajapur | 63.5 | 2.0 | 8.2 | 87.6 | 86.6 | 79.4 | 76.7 | 62.2 | 85.3 |
| Jharsuguda | 94.3 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 65.8 | 63.9 | 63.7 | 49.8 | 46.1 | 69.5 |
| Kalahandi | 70.9 | 4.3 | 2.6 | 75.6 | 71.5 | 67.5 | 54.4 | 49.8 | 80.7 |
| Kandhamal | 63.0 | 9.1 | 1.9 | 62.8 | 64.2 | 60.9 | 50.3 | 39.8 | 64.1 |
| Kendrapara | 67.7 | 3.0 | 6.1 | 74.4 | 71.7 | 76.0 | 62.2 | 52.1 | 68.6 |
| Kendujhar | 68.1 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 52.9 | 50.7 | 54.6 | 43.5 | 30.1 | 44.0 |
| Khordha | 89.2 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 92.7 | 90.7 | 78.8 | 74.1 | 68.1 | 80.8 |
| Koraput | 43.1 | 17.0 | 3.4 | 77.2 | 73.6 | 58.5 | 53.2 | 56.3 | 58.3 |
| Malkangiri | 65.0 | 21.9 | 2.6 | 83.0 | 76.8 | 61.0 | 66.2 | 65.8 | 69.3 |
| Mayurbhanj | 83.9 | 14.9 | 2.3 | 73.8 | 74.8 | 68.5 | 52.9 | 55.9 | 72.7 |
| Nabarangapur | 92.6 | 16.3 | 2.1 | 73.6 | 70.6 | 67.0 | 46.7 | 64.1 | 78.9 |
| Nayagarh | 89.3 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 79.3 | 78.1 | 78.3 | 70.2 | 48.9 | 70.0 |
| Nuapada | 74.1 | 8.0 | 2.3 | 58.2 | 54.5 | 47.8 | 31.9 | 46.4 | 69.6 |
| Puri | 87.9 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 85.1 | 80.2 | 84.3 | 75.7 | 67.9 | 82.1 |
| Rayagada | 51.7 | 17.7 | 2.5 | 65.4 | 58.3 | 50.6 | 29.7 | 61.1 | 67.4 |
| Sambalpur | 83.5 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 70.1 | 66.0 | 54.9 | 40.6 | 47.3 | 74.6 |
| Sonapur | 82.8 | 7.5 | 2.6 | 83.6 | 81.3 | 56.4 | 41.1 | 47.5 | 72.7 |
| Sundargarh* |  | 4.8 | 9.7 | 86.8 | 84.1 | 69.8 | 47.3 | 43.1 | 63.9 |
| Total | 76.5 | 7.2 | 4.5 | 78.1 | 76.0 | 69.4 | 57.4 | 54.3 | 74.2 |

[^9]
## Punjab

## RAJASTHAN

 SiккimTamilNadu

TRIPURA
Uttar Pradesh


ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 19 OUT OF 19 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 55.3 | 41.7 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 56.3 | 38.9 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 52.2 | 46.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 49.1 | 48.8 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 55.1 | 43.5 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 61.0 | 34.6 | 0.3 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 58.7 | 37.1 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 63.0 | 31.8 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 54.9 | 31.9 | 0.3 | 12.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 52.2 | 34.3 | 0.5 | 13.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 56.8 | 29.1 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 100 |



NOTE: 'оTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in Sснооц’ = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $76.8 \%(33.4+26.7+16.7)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 77.9 |  |  |  | 22.1 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 82.1 |  |  |  | 17.9 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 23.3 | 24.6 | 47.7 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 7.0 | 38.9 | 51.6 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were 11.1\% children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Punjab, ASER 2005 covered 17 districts. ASER 2006 covered 18 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 19 districts.

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4：CLASS－WISE \％CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std． | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> （Std 1 Text） | Level 2 <br> （Std 2 Text） | Total |  |
| I | 19.5 | 54.3 | 18.5 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 6.5 | 31.6 | 35.0 | 14.9 | 12.1 | 100 |  |
| III | 2.8 | 17.9 | 30.4 | 27.1 | 21.9 | 100 |  |
| IV | 1.1 | 9.3 | 17.7 | 33.3 | 38.7 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.7 | 3.6 | 7.8 | 24.8 | 63.1 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.6 | 2.5 | 5.2 | 19.2 | 72.6 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.6 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 13.4 | 81.1 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.2 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 12.0 | 84.8 | 100 |  |
| Total | 4.2 | 15.7 | 15.0 | 18.5 | 46.6 | 100 |  |

nOTE ：Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child．Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters，words，and Std 1 level text．

| Reading Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  उप्जी मेल सेंकटा वै। मर्ते <br>  <br>  वै । मषे प्रेश हात मैं है <br>  रिंत fिंदि के छंतजे ढूँ उपीक <br>  <br>  <br>  रा लाहंट भालदे पठ 1 | 析物 पे flar जै। <br>  <br>  <br>  कर <br> he as री है की उल it 1 攺 |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4：\％Children who Cannot even identify letters
（in govt schools in Std I IV）2006－2008


Chart 5：\％Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT （in govt schools in Std III－VI）2006－2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 22.2 | 48.1 | 22.8 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 100 |
| II | 7.0 | 36.8 | 32.5 | 19.0 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 2.8 | 21.6 | 32.5 | 32.7 | 10.4 | 100 |
| IV | 1.2 | 11.1 | 20.7 | 41.7 | 25.2 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 4.4 | 12.5 | 38.7 | 43.5 | 100 |
| VI | 0.8 | 4.1 | 10.8 | 31.2 | 53.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.5 | 7.0 | 27.7 | 62.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 21.9 | 72.0 | 100 |
| Total | 4.7 | 16.6 | 17.9 | 27.0 | 33.8 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


Chart 10: ARITHMETIC Levels OF BOYS AND GIRLS IN STD III



PUNJAB rural

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more |  | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Amritsar* |  | 2.1 | 48.7 | 91.4 | 87.5 | 65.6 | 57.5 | 45.0 | 66.2 |
| Bhatinda | 71.4 | 2.5 | 39.3 | 94.4 | 89.3 | 69.3 | 72.6 | 61.5 | 85.0 |
| Faridkot | 94.6 | 3.2 | 47.1 | 91.6 | 86.8 | 72.8 | 67.4 | 43.1 | 69.2 |
| Fatehgarh Sahib | 87.8 | 2.4 | 27.7 | 86.7 | 87.7 | 75.2 | 67.6 | 42.0 | 74.0 |
| Firozpur | 73.3 | 4.8 | 39.4 | 84.3 | 83.3 | 68.4 | 60.6 | 53.5 | 60.5 |
| Gurdaspur | 79.7 | 1.4 | 56.6 | 94.6 | 91.2 | 74.9 | 75.4 | 70.1 | 75.6 |
| Hoshiarpur | 89.7 | 1.1 | 42.7 | 88.5 | 90.8 | 82.4 | 79.8 | 49.8 | 72.9 |
| Jalandhar | 80.4 | 2.2 | 39.0 | 78.7 | 77.7 | 66.5 | 50.2 | 38.7 | 62.0 |
| Kapurthala | 71.2 | 7.1 | 36.3 | 86.5 | 82.6 | 73.0 | 66.7 | 47.4 | 66.4 |
| Ludhiana | 64.3 | 0.9 | 38.7 | 80.5 | 78.5 | 72.0 | 68.0 | 49.1 | 82.9 |
| Mansa | 66.0 | 3.6 | 37.6 | 84.3 | 83.5 | 68.2 | 59.8 | 44.9 | 62.0 |
| Moga | 73.2 | 3.9 | 39.5 | 78.5 | 74.5 | 65.0 | 62.4 | 50.7 | 69.5 |
| Muktsar | 77.8 | 7.1 | 27.6 | 83.5 | 78.0 | 62.4 | 60.9 | 50.3 | 64.0 |
| Nawashehar( SBS Nagar) | 98.1 | 1.5 | 29.3 | 68.6 | 73.8 | 64.7 | 63.0 | 41.8 | 75.3 |
| Patiala | 91.1 | 2.0 | 48.8 | 88.9 | 88.4 | 62.5 | 49.3 | 41.9 | 67.1 |
| Rupnagar | 87.4 | 1.9 | 36.8 | 88.6 | 83.2 | 75.4 | 78.2 | 62.4 | 79.0 |
| Sangrur* |  | 2.0 | 45.6 | 88.1 | 86.0 | 69.0 | 56.7 | 41.8 | 58.3 |
| SAS Nagar | 78.9 | 1.6 | 39.3 | 87.8 | 89.2 | 80.5 | 76.4 | 48.9 | 64.9 |
| TarnTaran* |  | 5.2 | 30.8 | 88.3 | 91.0 | 53.1 | 51.0 | 71.7 | 84.4 |
| Total | 80.1 | 2.7 | 41.7 | 86.2 | 84.6 | 69.7 | 64.2 | 50.9 | 70.2 |



* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 32 OUT OF 32 DISTRICTS

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 59.7 | 32.7 | 0.5 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 58.5 | 31.2 | 0.4 | 9.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 59.6 | 34.6 | 0.5 | 5.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 57.9 | 38.3 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 61.7 | 30.3 | 0.6 | 7.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 60.0 | 29.7 | 0.4 | 10.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 59.9 | 33.2 | 0.3 | 6.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 59.7 | 25.0 | 0.5 | 14.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 51.1 | 24.6 | 0.2 | 24.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 54.8 | 25.4 | 0.2 | 19.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 45.1 | 22.5 | 0.3 | 32.2 | 100 |



NOTE: 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 41.0 | 31.6 | 14.2 | 9.1 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 11.0 | 22.1 | 30.8 | 22.9 | 5.4 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 2.9 | 7.4 | 17.1 | 37.1 | 13.8 | 14.0 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV |  | . 7 | 6.9 | 23.0 | 23.7 | 26.4 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 3.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 3.7 |  |  | 9.9 | 14.4 | 37.1 | 14.6 | 12.4 | 3.7 | 4.1 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 4.6 |  |  |  | 5.4 | 23.1 | 21.7 | 29.3 | 8.8 | 5.2 | 2.0 |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 9.3 | 12.8 | 38.4 | 20.7 | 10.1 | 5.7 |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.1 | 29.1 | 22.6 | 13.5 | 5.8 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 64.9\% (37.1+13.8+14.0) children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | 끈 |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 58.8 |  |  |  | 41.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 66.5 |  |  |  | 33.6 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 11.7 | 44.2 | 31.8 | 0.8 | 11.5 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 5.0 | 54.8 | 33.2 | 0.6 | 6.4 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.7 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Rajasthan, ASER 2005 covered all 32 districts. ASER 2006 covered 31 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 32 districts.

## RAJASTHAN ${ }_{\text {ruaal }}$

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

READING

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 50.0 | 37.7 | 8.1 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 100 |  |
| II | 17.5 | 41.0 | 25.3 | 10.6 | 5.6 | 100 |  |
| III | 6.4 | 23.7 | 28.5 | 22.5 | 18.9 | 100 |  |
| IV | 3.0 | 11.1 | 20.5 | 30.7 | 34.8 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.5 | 6.4 | 12.4 | 27.7 | 52.1 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.8 | 3.2 | 6.0 | 18.7 | 71.3 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.2 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 84.3 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 91.0 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 11.1 | 17.1 | 13.8 | 16.4 | 41.6 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008

## Chart 6: Reading levels in govt and pvt schools in different classes



Chart 7: Reading levels of boys and girls in Std III



## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 48.7 | 40.6 | 8.6 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 100 |  |
| II | 17.4 | 46.6 | 26.4 | 7.3 | 2.4 | 100 |  |
| III | 7.1 | 30.0 | 34.6 | 19.0 | 9.4 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.8 | 16.7 | 30.8 | 29.5 | 20.4 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.4 | 9.2 | 24.1 | 32.2 | 33.1 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.8 | 5.4 | 14.4 | 29.1 | 50.4 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.5 | 2.4 | 9.2 | 23.9 | 64.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 1.1 | 4.8 | 18.3 | 75.5 | 100 |  |
| Total | 11.0 | 20.5 | 19.7 | 19.5 | 29.3 | 100 |  |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 4.8 | 16.7 |
| II | 13.6 | 34.1 |
| III | 30.5 | 54.1 |
| IV | 48.8 | 69.9 |
| V | 61.9 | 79.3 |
| VI | 75.5 | 88.9 |
| VII | 83.1 | 92.6 |
| VIII | 90.3 | 95.2 |
| TOTAL | 48.4 | 64.0 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




RAJASTHAN ${ }_{\text {ruaal }}$

Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out <br> of <br> School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) <br> or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Ajmer | 60.2 | 6.1 | 32.1 | 64.9 | 67.7 | 47.8 | 33.2 | 32.0 | 64.2 |
| Alwar | 59.7 | 4.9 | 51.2 | 51.3 | 64.4 | 62.9 | 47.2 | 30.2 | 71.2 |
| Banswara | 79.1 | 11.3 | 14.0 | 60.7 | 56.2 | 49.4 | 24.1 | 43.4 | 57.5 |
| Baran | 79.8 | 9.0 | 21.9 | 60.9 | 65.4 | 58.6 | 49.6 | 61.9 | 79.5 |
| Barmer | 38.8 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 69.0 | 69.3 | 68.4 | 53.3 | 65.9 | 74.5 |
| Bharatpur | 69.1 | 8.2 | 53.8 | 71.0 | 67.1 | 62.1 | 57.5 | 48.8 | 68.3 |
| Bhilwara | 61.3 | 7.2 | 16.2 | 60.1 | 64.1 | 56.9 | 35.7 | 42.2 | 79.2 |
| Bikaner | 62.7 | 8.9 | 24.9 | 72.3 | 67.5 | 77.8 | 63.5 | 58.0 | 72.2 |
| Bundi | 80.3 | 6.4 | 28.5 | 71.9 | 81.9 | 66.9 | 52.1 | 54.2 | 77.3 |
| Chittaurgarh | 96.3 | 11.8 | 10.3 | 56.5 | 58.4 | 52.6 | 37.2 | 49.2 | 69.9 |
| Churu | 53.6 | 6.8 | 35.9 | 62.6 | 59.1 | 67.3 | 50.7 | 57.1 | 69.4 |
| Dausa | 72.1 | 4.4 | 42.0 | 79.1 | 75.1 | 69.8 | 52.1 | 33.8 | 62.2 |
| Dhaulpur | 37.7 | 4.6 | 37.4 | 48.3 | 54.4 | 47.4 | 38.2 | 35.5 | 74.0 |
| Dungarpur | 23.0 | 3.9 | 14.4 | 60.3 | 58.7 | 58.0 | 37.6 | 41.1 | 57.2 |
| Ganganagar* |  | 4.5 | 51.6 | 68.7 | 71.7 | 79.3 | 71.0 | 51.0 | 69.4 |
| Hanumangarh | 69.3 | 3.3 | 59.3 | 81.6 | 81.4 | 82.4 | 74.9 | 59.3 | 82.4 |
| Jaipur | 76.8 | 1.6 | 56.6 | 80.8 | 79.8 | 73.5 | 59.3 | 37.0 | 70.8 |
| Jaisalmer | 60.5 | 15.0 | 12.4 | 60.0 | 62.6 | 60.7 | 54.8 | 53.2 | 67.2 |
| Jalor | 55.0 | 14.5 | 15.8 | 83.3 | 81.2 | 60.3 | 55.3 | 59.9 | 63.2 |
| Jhalawar | 65.9 | 10.1 | 24.7 | 53.9 | 54.3 | 44.2 | 28.4 | 23.4 | 48.5 |
| Jhunjhunu | 57.8 | 1.0 | 42.4 | 77.7 | 74.3 | 66.0 | 56.2 | 52.3 | 67.1 |
| Jodhpur | 48.6 | 12.1 | 31.2 | 65.4 | 69.1 | 59.7 | 40.9 | 52.9 | 69.6 |
| Karauli | 58.8 | 13.0 | 35.4 | 62.3 | 63.9 | 63.6 | 53.9 | 50.5 | 68.0 |
| Kota | 41.2 | 4.4 | 52.6 | 77.3 | 78.6 | 66.5 | 50.8 | 36.5 | 74.4 |
| Nagaur | 57.6 | 3.0 | 47.8 | 80.2 | 77.4 | 63.4 | 47.4 | 39.5 | 60.3 |
| Pali | 62.1 | 7.4 | 19.5 | 47.3 | 55.8 | 47.5 | 33.2 | 39.3 | 56.8 |
| Rajsamand | 86.3 | 4.8 | 13.9 | 57.7 | 60.9 | 54.6 | 32.4 | 41.6 | 72.5 |
| Sawai Madhopur | 91.9 | 5.3 | 31.1 | 75.6 | 74.5 | 72.1 | 59.7 | 69.9 | 70.6 |
| Sikar | 53.3 | 1.7 | 56.2 | 68.4 | 60.7 | 59.3 | 50.0 | 31.2 | 55.7 |
| Sirohi | 74.1 | 10.5 | 4.3 | 56.2 | 60.4 | 47.1 | 47.5 | 57.2 | 57.8 |
| Tonk | 44.6 | 9.4 | 40.3 | 84.3 | 80.3 | 77.2 | 61.4 | 43.8 | 69.9 |
| Udaipur | 63.5 | 10.0 | 11.2 | 60.2 | 55.3 | 58.6 | 36.2 | 56.4 | 71.3 |
| Total | 62.4 | 7.1 | 32.7 | 66.0 | 66.8 | 62.0 | 47.6 | 47.0 | 67.6 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

School enrollment and out of school children 2008

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 72.0 | 24.2 | 0.6 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 73.4 | 21.0 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 66.7 | 30.6 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 62.8 | 34.5 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 70.8 | 26.8 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 78.2 | 16.8 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 76.5 | 18.2 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 79.5 | 15.7 | 0.1 | 4.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 76.1 | 9.2 | 0.8 | 14.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 73.8 | 10.1 | 1.5 | 14.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 78.4 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 100 |

nоte : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

Age-wise and class-wise distribution in sample

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 15.3 | 25.3 | 26.3 | 16.1 | 7.3 |  |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 2.4 | 7.5 | 19.9 | 28.4 | 19.5 | 11.4 | 4.8 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 3 | . 0 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 23.1 | 21.0 | 12.3 | 9.0 | 6.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 0.6 |  |  | 7.5 | 10.4 | 23.5 | 18.8 | 21.0 | 9.3 | 9.0 |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 2.6 |  |  |  | 3.8 | 14.8 | 15.7 | 22.1 | 14.6 | 15.1 | 7.4 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Std VI | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 5.5 | 11.1 | 23.4 | 24.5 | 17.8 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 100 |
| Std VII | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 | 25.1 | 25.7 | 14.2 | 18.2 | 100 |
| Std VIII | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.5 | 35.1 | 24.8 | 15.3 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $60.8 \%(16.7+23.1+21.0)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

Sikkim was not covered in ASER 2005 and ASER 2006. ASER
2007 covered 1 district.

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | 뀽 |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 60.8 |  |  |  | 39.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 82.0 |  |  |  | 18.0 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 40.5 | 32.3 | 20.2 | 0.7 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 29.3 | 41.7 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $14.0 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## Reading and Arithmetic Level

## Reading And Arithmetic

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 5.5 | 41.1 | 34.2 | 12.8 | 6.4 | 100 |  |
| II | 1.7 | 20.8 | 41.2 | 22.0 | 14.3 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.5 | 6.4 | 29.2 | 43.4 | 20.5 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 3.0 | 22.2 | 37.9 | 37.0 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.0 | 0.6 | 11.0 | 27.2 | 61.1 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.6 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 18.6 | 76.8 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 9.7 | 90.0 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 92.5 | 100 |  |
| Total | 1.1 | 9.9 | 20.3 | 24.4 | 44.2 | 100 |  |


| TABLE 5: Class-wise \% CHILDREN WHo CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | 5.7 | 34.4 | 42.4 | 13.0 | 4.6 | 100 |  |
| II | 1.5 | 9.6 | 55.0 | 23.8 | 10.2 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.6 | 1.7 | 31.6 | 47.5 | 18.7 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.9 | 1.9 | 21.3 | 46.3 | 29.6 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.4 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 38.2 | 50.3 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.6 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 29.2 | 65.1 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 10.8 | 88.1 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 87.2 | 100 |  |
| TOTAL | 1.3 | 6.6 | 23.6 | 30.0 | 38.5 | 100 |  |

NOTE: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can

TESTING TOOL FOR READING


## COMPARISION OF READING AND ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008

## Chart 6: Reading levels in govt and pVt

 SCHOOLS IN DIFFERENT CLASSES



| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES WHO CAN |  |

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY



## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) <br> who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| East | 65.4 | 3.0 | 29.6 | 94.7 | 94.0 | 78.8 | 79.5 | 55.5 | 75.2 |
| North | 93.7 | 1.7 | 27.0 | 98.9 | 100.0 | 61.4 | 72.4 | 53.8 | 89.7 |
| South | 100.0 | 1.1 | 17.6 | 97.2 | 97.8 | 77.0 | 74.5 | 77.9 | 93.6 |
| West | 45.6 | 6.8 | 20.5 | 97.2 | 97.2 | 74.7 | 76.8 | 67.9 | 82.1 |
| Total | 70.4 | 3.3 | 24.2 | 96.5 | 96.5 | 75.8 | 76.8 | 64.7 | 83.4 |

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 29 OUT OF 29 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 78.5 | 20.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 78.4 | 19.1 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 76.9 | 22.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 75.9 | 23.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 77.9 | 21.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 81.4 | 17.3 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 81.0 | 17.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 81.7 | 16.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 74.9 | 15.7 | 0.3 | 9.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 73.2 | 17.4 | 0.4 | 9.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 76.4 | 14.1 | 0.2 | 9.3 | 100 |



NOTE : 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $90.4 \%(16.2+74.2)$ children are in age range 7 to 8 .


How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $9.1 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## Young Children

Children in Pre-school 2008

| TABLE 3: \% CHILDREN WHO ATtEND |
| :--- |
| DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |

Children not in pre-school over the years
CHART 3: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children (AGE 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other)


In Tamil Nadu, ASER 2005 covered 28 districts. ASER 2006 covered all 29 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 29 districts.

# TAMIL NADU ruval 

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN who CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 63.9 | 25.9 | 7.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 100 |  |
| II | 27.2 | 38.6 | 27.4 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 100 |  |
| III | 12.8 | 26.1 | 37.3 | 17.0 | 6.9 | 100 |  |
| IV | 5.1 | 14.6 | 35.5 | 29.0 | 15.8 | 100 |  |
| V | 3.2 | 7.7 | 25.1 | 35.6 | 28.4 | 100 |  |
| VI | 2.7 | 4.8 | 18.1 | 33.5 | 40.8 | 100 |  |
| VII | 1.6 | 2.5 | 11.9 | 29.5 | 54.5 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.8 | 1.9 | 7.6 | 23.7 | 66.0 | 100 |  |
| Total | 13.2 | 14.3 | 21.3 | 22.8 | 28.3 | 100 |  |

nотe : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## READING TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008




## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 53.8 | 31.1 | 13.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 100 |
| II | 21.5 | 34.1 | 38.6 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| III | 9.4 | 20.7 | 52.1 | 15.4 | 2.5 | 100 |
| IV | 3.5 | 11.4 | 52.5 | 27.0 | 5.6 | 100 |
| V | 2.3 | 5.3 | 38.1 | 42.1 | 12.2 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 3.2 | 28.8 | 43.7 | 22.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 2.5 | 21.6 | 41.9 | 33.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 1.1 | 17.2 | 39.5 | 41.8 | 100 |
| Total | 10.5 | 12.7 | 32.8 | 28.3 | 15.8 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


TAMIL NADU ruval

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  |  | Std 3-5 : LeArning Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Ariyalur | 90.7 | 0.1 | 14.9 | 54.5 | 69.7 | 31.2 | 26.5 | 21.5 | 61.7 |
| Coimbatore | 83.6 | 0.9 | 19.6 | 49.1 | 58.5 | 50.2 | 40.0 | 32.1 | 61.1 |
| Cuddalore | 88.9 | 0.8 | 34.3 | 51.9 | 57.3 | 47.8 | 40.7 | 41.3 | 60.1 |
| Dharmapuri | 76.5 | 0.3 | 12.2 | 48.9 | 55.0 | 46.9 | 50.0 | 47.4 | 67.5 |
| Dindigul | 91.7 | 1.2 | 12.5 | 52.9 | 63.9 | 25.3 | 20.3 | 25.8 | 64.7 |
| Erode* |  | 0.6 | 14.0 | 55.3 | 67.0 | 40.9 | 34.0 | 29.5 | 36.3 |
| Kancheepuram | 95.2 | 0.1 | 21.3 | 49.4 | 58.0 | 44.4 | 30.1 | 32.3 | 48.1 |
| Kanniyakumari | 100.0 | 0.1 | 43.0 | 47.5 | 57.0 | 41.5 | 42.0 | 36.6 | 34.1 |
| Karur | 89.8 | 1.5 | 27.2 | 58.8 | 68.7 | 53.3 | 39.6 | 23.0 | 58.9 |
| Madurai | 97.0 | 1.3 | 15.4 | 54.1 | 59.9 | 33.9 | 31.8 | 33.0 | 71.1 |
| Nagapattinam | 93.2 | 0.4 | 17.1 | 38.6 | 53.1 | 32.7 | 27.5 | 31.4 | 65.7 |
| Namakkal | 88.1 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 65.1 | 68.6 | 48.7 | 49.0 | 39.3 | 60.0 |
| Perambalur | 85.0 | 1.6 | 27.5 | 57.9 | 76.8 | 35.2 | 23.3 | 27.5 | 69.1 |
| Pudukkottai | 96.5 | 1.3 | 10.8 | 46.8 | 50.5 | 41.8 | 25.8 | 28.0 | 75.7 |
| Ramanathapuram | 93.6 | 0.4 | 22.2 | 60.4 | 63.5 | 49.5 | 46.0 | 39.9 | 69.7 |
| Salem* |  | 1.2 | 26.8 | 50.0 | 47.2 | 31.3 | 38.0 | 15.3 | 18.3 |
| Sivaganga | 89.3 | 0.7 | 12.8 | 56.5 | 59.7 | 63.9 | 58.6 | 65.6 | 78.2 |
| Thanjavur | 90.8 | 1.0 | 21.4 | 43.0 | 63.0 | 37.1 | 17.9 | 24.0 | 63.3 |
| The Nilgiris | 68.9 | 0.2 | 57.6 | 48.5 | 52.6 | 56.6 | 58.5 | 76.9 | 74.4 |
| Theni | 88.2 | 0.5 | 17.9 | 41.2 | 50.0 | 38.7 | 32.2 | 39.3 | 56.9 |
| Thiruvallur | 91.8 | 0.0 | 31.1 | 61.3 | 74.3 | 48.5 | 34.7 | 42.8 | 76.8 |
| Thiruvarur | 86.8 | 0.4 | 16.1 | 57.1 | 67.7 | 32.8 | 30.5 | 32.3 | 62.6 |
| Thoothukkudi | 85.7 | 0.6 | 36.5 | 57.1 | 61.1 | 67.8 | 47.5 | 58.9 | 78.6 |
| Tiruchirappalli | 89.8 | 0.4 | 22.5 | 81.8 | 88.9 | 74.0 | 60.4 | 57.0 | 73.9 |
| Tirunelveli | 91.0 | 0.8 | 32.7 | 71.5 | 72.4 | 65.7 | 45.3 | 51.6 | 57.0 |
| Tiruvannamalai | 87.2 | 0.7 | 14.4 | 54.5 | 65.9 | 52.3 | 26.6 | 26.4 | 70.4 |
| Vellore | 95.9 | 0.3 | 18.3 | 51.1 | 67.9 | 48.3 | 35.1 | 29.2 | 82.0 |
| Viluppuram | 96.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 58.1 | 60.8 | 25.9 | 14.9 | 24.2 | 68.1 |
| Virudhnagar | 92.3 | 1.7 | 25.8 | 63.0 | 67.9 | 56.4 | 47.0 | 46.4 | 71.4 |
| Total | 89.4 | 0.6 | 20.6 | 54.7 | 62.6 | 45.7 | 36.3 | 35.8 | 63.2 |

[^10]

# TRIPURA ruRal 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 93.1 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 93.0 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 5.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 93.4 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 94.4 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 93.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 94.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 93.3 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 5.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 94.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 88.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 85.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 91.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 100 |


nоte : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 1.5 | 42.9 | 45.6 | 6.8 | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II |  | . 6 | 32.4 | 55.2 | 6.3 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 1.5 |  |  | 24.9 | 58.0 | 9.2 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 4.6 |  |  |  | 17.9 | 61.2 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 2.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V | 3.2 |  |  |  |  | 20.0 | 58.8 | 12.1 | 5.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.7 | 60.4 | 18.7 | 7.2 |  |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.6 | 62.3 | 13.6 | 9.2 |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 72.2 | 13.3 | 4.0 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $92.0 \%(24.9+58.0+9.2)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were 12.1\% children in Std III in the ASER sample.

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

| TABLE 3: \% CHILDREN WHO ATTEND |
| :--- |
| DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |

In Tripura, ASER 2005 covered 1 district. ASER 2006 covered 2 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 4 districts.

## TRIPURA <br> RURAL

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 32.1 | 25.8 | 28.4 | 12.3 | 1.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 11.4 | 20.6 | 35.3 | 24.3 | 8.4 | 100 |  |
| III | 3.9 | 14.2 | 35.5 | 35.3 | 11.1 | 100 |  |
| IV | 7.6 | 10.9 | 24.9 | 33.7 | 23.0 | 100 |  |
| V | 5.2 | 6.7 | 20.8 | 32.6 | 34.7 | 100 |  |
| VI | 2.2 | 5.4 | 12.4 | 33.4 | 46.7 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.5 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 30.0 | 58.8 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 19.5 | 75.8 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 7.3 | 10.6 | 20.8 | 28.2 | 33.2 | 100 |  |

note : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Sed 1 Level | 514 Itewel |  |
| \& \% wit : <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  कानच। क्बा दूखर योम चर्चा, लब्ता <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |  <br> इनलण? <br> हि खाशय। <br> s लीएनाई। <br>  |
|  |  |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


COMPARISION OF READING AMD ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008



Chart 10: Arithmetic levels of boys and girls in Std III


## TRIPURA rural

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |
|  | $1-9$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |
| I | 33.6 | 31.8 | 25.9 | 7.1 | 1.7 | 100 |
| II | 10.1 | 20.8 | 44.3 | 20.2 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 3.0 | 22.3 | 42.7 | 29.0 | 3.0 | 100 |
| IV | 3.7 | 17.9 | 30.9 | 35.6 | 11.8 | 100 |
| V | 2.7 | 10.7 | 25.2 | 41.9 | 19.6 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 4.6 | 20.3 | 41.2 | 33.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 2.9 | 18.2 | 35.6 | 43.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 1.0 | 7.5 | 22.7 | 68.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 6.0 | 13.5 | 26.8 | 30.0 | 23.7 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: <br> CLASS CHILDREN <br> CHO CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 9.0 | 30.0 |
| II | 19.1 | 54.5 |
| III | 27.8 | 69.7 |
| IV | 41.5 | 80.8 |
| V | 53.9 | 85.9 |
| VI | 71.2 | 92.3 |
| VII | 78.0 | 94.6 |
| VIII | 86.2 | 97.7 |
| Total | 49.5 | 77.1 |
|  |  |  |



Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children (Age: 6-14) Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) <br> who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Dhalai | 80.9 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 82.1 | 79.3 | 58.4 | 51.5 | 33.7 | 73.0 |
| North | 83.2 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 78.1 | 75.9 | 39.4 | 44.9 | 33.8 | 73.3 |
| South | 93.1 | 13.3 | 1.3 | 92.2 | 93.7 | 75.8 | 41.2 | 45.5 | 65.3 |
| West | 96.7 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 74.3 | 75.7 | 58.9 | 48.4 | 43.8 | 84.7 |
| Total | 90.1 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 78.9 | 78.8 | 56.7 | 47.0 | 40.8 | 78.6 |



## UTTAR PRADESH rubal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 69 OUT OF 69 DISTRICTS
facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 56.4 | 35.9 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 54.0 | 36.2 | 1.9 | 8.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 59.5 | 34.7 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 55.9 | 38.7 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 63.9 | 29.8 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 51.9 | 38.2 | 1.6 | 8.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 50.1 | 41.7 | 1.4 | 6.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 54.2 | 33.8 | 1.8 | 10.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 40.2 | 36.0 | 1.0 | 22.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 43.1 | 36.3 | 0.8 | 19.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 36.5 | 35.7 | 1.2 | 26.6 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 24.3 | 41.7 | 17.6 | 9.9 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std II | 3.4 | 14.0 | 31.2 | 30.7 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std III | 4 | . 5 | 10.6 | 36.6 | 21.6 | 15.3 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std IV | 1 | . 7 | 3.7 | 15.8 | 24.5 | 32.2 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| Std V |  | 1.9 |  | 6.1 | 8.3 | 35.5 | 20.0 | 17.2 | 4.9 |  | 6.1 |  | 100 |
| Std VI | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 14.8 | 24.0 | 34.4 | 11.2 | 6.7 | 3.5 |  | 100 |
| Std VII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 8.3 | 37.1 | 27.7 | 12.2 | 6.7 |  | 100 |
| Std VIII | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.3 | 31.5 | 28.9 | 12.1 | 5.2 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $73.5 \%(36.6+21.6+15.3)$ children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $12.9 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 56.6 |  |  |  | 43.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 66.8 |  |  |  | 33.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 24.1 | 35.8 | 23.0 | 2.0 | 15.2 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 4.4 | 55.1 | 31.3 | 2.5 | 6.6 | 100 |

Children in Pre-school 2008
TABLE 3: \% Children who Attend
DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL

In Uttar Pradesh, ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all 69 districts.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children (AGE 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR other)


# UTTAR PRADESH rural 

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading LeVEL

Reading

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 50.1 | 37.2 | 8.2 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 22.8 | 41.1 | 19.4 | 9.4 | 7.4 | 100 |
| III | 12.2 | 30.1 | 22.4 | 18.3 | 17.1 | 100 |
| IV | 8.0 | 20.9 | 17.6 | 23.0 | 30.5 | 100 |
| V | 4.9 | 15.1 | 14.0 | 22.5 | 43.5 | 100 |
| VI | 2.5 | 9.1 | 9.6 | 18.9 | 59.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.9 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 16.4 | 69.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 12.5 | 78.5 | 100 |
| TotAL | 16.9 | 24.0 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 31.2 | 100 |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [पनक कात्यक] |  |  |
| विनला और अजख मेला दंखने गये। उन्हें मेले मैं वरह वरह की डुखाने विखों। मैले में बहुत हूने थे। उही गरम परच हलळा और जलेबियो की बिक रह्री र्था। णलेबी देखकर दोनों के पु हैं पामी आये लगा। उए्यों जलेपी खाने का मन करने लगा। चिमलः ने जलैबी खती़ी। दोनाँ से मिलवार जलेयों खाईं। ग्राम की बौनों घर लॉट असे। |  उसरका रो प्रे हरी वह बहु $\square$ <br> द. $\square$ <br> 数 त य है त्र न स | थाव है। <br> फेंद है। <br> साती है। <br> देती है। $\qquad$ <br>  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008

## Chart 6: Reading levels in govt and pVt schools in different classes



## Chart 7: Reading levels of

 BOYS AND GIRLS IN STd III


## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 51.5 | 36.5 | 9.3 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 100 |
| II | 23.4 | 44.2 | 22.0 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 100 |
| III | 11.7 | 35.7 | 30.1 | 15.1 | 7.4 | 100 |
| IV | 7.3 | 26.8 | 29.0 | 21.4 | 15.5 | 100 |
| V | 4.6 | 19.6 | 27.3 | 25.1 | 23.6 | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 | 12.9 | 22.0 | 26.6 | 36.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 9.7 | 19.2 | 26.9 | 42.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 5.6 | 15.0 | 23.9 | 54.7 | 100 |
| Total | 17.0 | 27.2 | 21.4 | 16.2 | 18.2 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9 .

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


Chart 10: Arithmetic levels of boys and girls in Std III



## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | StD 1-2 : Lea | ING LEVELS | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Agra | 49.6 | 8.5 | 43.7 | 56.2 | 58.2 | 45.6 | 35.5 | 37.9 | 65.2 |
| Aligarh | 72.5 | 3.8 | 39.2 | 55.2 | 53.5 | 66.3 | 48.9 | 50.2 | 69.7 |
| Allahabad | 57.0 | 3.9 | 39.8 | 52.0 | 56.6 | 44.0 | 28.8 | 17.1 | 50.8 |
| AmbedkarNagar | 55.7 | 3.8 | 43.8 | 56.6 | 62.8 | 50.4 | 31.5 | 30.8 | 68.1 |
| Auraiya | 68.1 | 3.5 | 31.4 | 56.3 | 53.4 | 39.8 | 21.0 | 27.8 | 54.3 |
| Azamgarh | 55.0 | 5.0 | 45.4 | 61.8 | 59.6 | 50.0 | 34.8 | 19.1 | 62.0 |
| Baghpat | 72.5 | 2.6 | 39.3 | 74.2 | 76.2 | 76.3 | 66.5 | 55.8 | 74.5 |
| Bahraich | 43.2 | 16.5 | 19.4 | 47.6 | 49.1 | 35.4 | 17.4 | 29.9 | 62.6 |
| Ballia | 72.6 | 3.5 | 37.2 | 71.0 | 67.8 | 65.9 | 59.2 | 52.0 | 76.9 |
| Balrampur | 77.3 | 8.7 | 25.1 | 59.3 | 56.4 | 27.6 | 21.7 | 46.7 | 60.0 |
| Banda | 63.0 | 3.2 | 12.1 | 69.1 | 64.1 | 53.5 | 36.8 | 47.9 | 70.7 |
| Barabanki | 52.9 | 10.3 | 33.6 | 45.0 | 49.8 | 39.5 | 21.3 | 23.9 | 56.0 |
| Bareilly | 76.5 | 5.1 | 27.5 | 61.9 | 62.8 | 57.2 | 41.8 | 52.1 | 74.9 |
| Basti | 53.9 | 2.9 | 31.3 | 53.7 | 55.8 | 50.4 | 34.0 | 28.2 | 63.0 |
| Bijnor | 90.7 | 3.6 | 52.5 | 77.5 | 75.9 | 62.5 | 46.9 | 39.8 | 71.0 |
| Budaun* |  | 6.9 | 27.4 | 67.6 | 64.6 | 46.1 | 25.2 | 54.4 | 82.0 |
| Bulandshahar | 45.7 | 1.9 | 35.9 | 82.4 | 76.1 | 67.8 | 50.2 | 42.7 | 59.1 |
| Chandauli | 54.4 | 6.0 | 28.8 | 58.1 | 53.0 | 45.3 | 28.4 | 16.9 | 50.1 |
| Chitrakoot | 92.3 | 5.9 | 21.9 | 60.4 | 60.4 | 35.6 | 23.5 | 32.7 | 59.2 |
| Deoria | 77.6 | 3.1 | 48.0 | 66.5 | 63.8 | 53.7 | 35.8 | 27.6 | 67.2 |
| Etah | 67.0 | 6.3 | 39.9 | 46.9 | 45.8 | 39.2 | 28.4 | 32.9 | 49.9 |
| Etawah | 76.9 | 3.1 | 28.3 | 76.5 | 71.7 | 53.2 | 33.4 | 33.9 | 71.2 |
| Faizabad | 86.2 | 2.9 | 40.9 | 61.6 | 66.1 | 54.5 | 42.7 | 32.0 | 66.5 |
| Farukkhabad | 67.0 | 6.5 | 32.6 | 54.5 | 53.7 | 36.8 | 27.5 | 28.1 | 51.2 |
| Fatehpur | 62.1 | 8.9 | 29.7 | 60.2 | 52.1 | 51.3 | 33.6 | 37.4 | 57.6 |
| Firozabad | 61.0 | 4.9 | 39.0 | 65.3 | 63.9 | 50.1 | 34.7 | 32.8 | 55.9 |
| Gautam Buddha Nagar | 58.4 | 4.3 | 65.6 | 69.3 | 71.0 | 71.9 | 53.0 | 35.1 | 75.6 |
| Ghaziabad | 43.4 | 2.6 | 58.6 | 78.7 | 83.2 | 75.5 | 60.6 | 50.4 | 75.4 |
| Ghazipur | 91.6 | 0.3 | 49.5 | 70.0 | 66.9 | 70.7 | 53.7 | 51.7 | 85.5 |
| Gonda | 74.4 | 3.0 | 32.3 | 65.7 | 67.4 | 61.2 | 41.6 | 44.8 | 60.4 |
| Gorakhpur | 67.0 | 5.9 | 42.5 | 60.2 | 58.7 | 42.1 | 22.9 | 29.8 | 61.8 |
| Hamirpur | 50.6 | 4.6 | 30.6 | 67.0 | 68.1 | 43.2 | 36.3 | 33.6 | 58.3 |
| Hardoi | 51.3 | 7.7 | 27.7 | 45.1 | 47.6 | 35.8 | 18.6 | 22.0 | 58.9 |
| Hathras | 48.7 | 6.5 | 35.0 | 55.4 | 55.2 | 56.5 | 40.7 | 42.4 | 63.2 |
| Jalaun | 97.1 | 1.8 | 34.1 | 67.6 | 68.4 | 51.9 | 41.3 | 30.4 | 70.6 |
| Jaunpur | 70.8 | 2.1 | 38.1 | 71.0 | 65.1 | 52.9 | 41.0 | 42.6 | 66.0 |
| Jhansi | 66.7 | 2.9 | 20.0 | 68.8 | 66.0 | 60.5 | 48.5 | 52.2 | 67.6 |
| JyotibaPhuleNagar | 63.4 | 4.7 | 51.1 | 71.3 | 70.6 | 68.3 | 48.9 | 36.2 | 65.4 |
| Kannauj | 80.0 | 3.6 | 34.3 | 66.6 | 62.3 | 44.6 | 34.7 | 41.3 | 55.4 |
| KanpurDehat | 94.0 | 5.6 | 37.3 | 52.6 | 52.2 | 39.9 | 28.7 | 18.8 | 57.4 |

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : LeArning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Kaushambi | 36.9 | 6.9 | 39.0 | 65.2 | 58.5 | 56.1 | 40.0 | 41.8 | 55.1 |
| Lakhimpur Kheri | 54.7 | 13.5 | 30.6 | 53.4 | 54.1 | 37.0 | 22.8 | 18.2 | 64.0 |
| Kushinagar | 51.2 | 4.3 | 42.6 | 76.1 | 67.6 | 62.5 | 52.3 | 52.9 | 73.2 |
| Lalitpur | 45.5 | 3.9 | 16.3 | 45.4 | 38.7 | 28.4 | 22.2 | 37.7 | 61.9 |
| Lucknow | 81.8 | 9.1 | 40.4 | 62.0 | 64.2 | 44.7 | 23.5 | 26.1 | 70.8 |
| Mahoba | 41.7 | 4.8 | 17.5 | 74.1 | 72.0 | 53.2 | 34.2 | 52.2 | 73.5 |
| Maharajganj | 68.9 | 6.7 | 36.7 | 59.2 | 53.7 | 47.4 | 29.3 | 28.0 | 53.9 |
| Mainpuri | 54.6 | 6.7 | 38.4 | 55.9 | 55.2 | 37.6 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 50.0 |
| Mathura | 41.6 | 3.2 | 57.5 | 67.2 | 63.3 | 59.0 | 43.8 | 42.7 | 64.0 |
| Mau | 28.9 | 1.0 | 29.5 | 70.2 | 69.0 | 56.4 | 38.2 | 33.0 | 77.6 |
| Meerut | 83.9 | 5.4 | 52.3 | 73.2 | 73.7 | 69.3 | 45.1 | 45.2 | 70.5 |
| Mirzapur | 82.2 | 2.5 | 23.3 | 50.0 | 49.9 | 47.0 | 27.8 | 27.5 | 51.0 |
| Moradabad | 69.4 | 7.5 | 44.3 | 66.1 | 68.9 | 55.3 | 37.7 | 50.6 | 78.0 |
| Muzaffarnagar | 53.6 | 7.0 | 38.9 | 79.1 | 79.1 | 77.2 | 70.0 | 65.2 | 85.3 |
| Pilibhit | 67.4 | 7.6 | 27.1 | 54.7 | 54.7 | 38.6 | 31.1 | 39.1 | 60.2 |
| Pratapgarh | 58.1 | 2.4 | 46.4 | 74.6 | 70.8 | 53.4 | 36.0 | 33.9 | 69.8 |
| Rae Bareli | 70.3 | 7.7 | 31.7 | 60.4 | 58.3 | 39.2 | 21.1 | 18.3 | 61.9 |
| Rampur | 70.1 | 9.7 | 25.9 | 73.5 | 72.6 | 46.6 | 22.0 | 54.6 | 64.9 |
| Saharanpur | 72.1 | 5.4 | 46.7 | 72.0 | 75.8 | 67.2 | 44.5 | 42.9 | 70.3 |
| Sant Kabir Nagar | 33.0 | 12.3 | 33.3 | 53.7 | 51.8 | 48.3 | 27.9 | 39.7 | 68.3 |
| Sant Ravidas NagarBh | 53.6 | 2.4 | 42.8 | 60.0 | 58.2 | 56.0 | 44.1 | 46.5 | 63.6 |
| Shahjahanpur | 51.2 | 12.9 | 22.2 | 53.7 | 55.7 | 27.1 | 16.4 | 25.4 | 47.0 |
| Shravasti | 43.3 | 8.5 | 12.9 | 44.0 | 41.8 | 27.0 | 18.1 | 31.0 | 64.8 |
| Siddharth Nagar | 35.9 | 8.5 | 18.3 | 54.6 | 50.9 | 39.5 | 26.2 | 30.6 | 63.7 |
| Sitapur | 65.8 | 10.2 | 24.8 | 48.2 | 49.0 | 30.8 | 16.5 | 14.5 | 56.4 |
| Sonbhadra | 45.4 | 6.5 | 21.7 | 65.9 | 61.9 | 54.3 | 28.3 | 32.1 | 55.6 |
| Sultanpur | 49.7 | 3.3 | 46.0 | 48.7 | 56.4 | 42.6 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 67.3 |
| Unnao | 65.7 | 5.6 | 37.3 | 61.4 | 62.6 | 47.6 | 36.3 | 37.6 | 65.1 |
| Varanasi | 51.7 | 4.0 | 33.6 | 73.1 | 70.0 | 57.8 | 37.4 | 31.4 | 67.8 |
| Total | 62.4 | 5.6 | 35.9 | 62.1 | 61.1 | 50.7 | 35.2 | 36.5 | 64.9 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

UTTARAKHAND<br>West Bengal<br>Dadra and Nagar Haveli<br>Daman and Diu<br>Puducherry

## UTTARAKHAND rupal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 9 OUT OF 13 DISTRICTS

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 70.0 | 27.9 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 71.8 | 25.1 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 69.0 | 29.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 65.6 | 33.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 73.2 | 25.3 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 73.4 | 23.4 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 70.8 | 26.8 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 76.6 | 19.3 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 76.1 | 15.4 | 1.1 | 7.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 73.0 | 19.2 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 79.6 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 8.6 | 100 |



NOTE: 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $72.3 \%(44.6+19.0+8.8)$ children are in age range 8 to 10 .

## Young Children



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were 12.1\% children in Std III in the ASER sample.

CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008

| TABLE 3: \% CHILDREN WHO ATtEND |
| :--- |
| DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |

In Uttarakhand, ASER 2005 covered 11 districts. ASER 2006 covered all 13 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 13 districts.

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

READING

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 29.5 | 44.0 | 15.0 | 8.1 | 3.4 | 100 |  |
| II | 9.4 | 29.1 | 32.3 | 18.4 | 10.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 4.3 | 13.7 | 22.7 | 32.7 | 26.5 | 100 |  |
| IV | 2.0 | 7.5 | 11.2 | 30.6 | 48.7 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.8 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 19.3 | 67.6 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.5 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 13.4 | 80.1 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.1 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 7.5 | 87.4 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 5.1 | 93.3 | 100 |  |
| Total | 6.5 | 14.0 | 13.0 | 17.8 | 48.7 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| विमला और जजात मेजा सर्बने पये। वन्हे बेले में तरह्बरह की दकाने दिखां। मेल गे बहुत्त जूल थ) पही गरम नरम एलया और जिलेखियी मी निक्ष रही जी जरतेवी देखक्न दोगीं के नुपि में पानी आने करण। उन्है जलैयी साने का मन बरने लगा। विमला ने जलेवी ठचयीवी। बोनों 二 नितकरे जलेखी खाई़। 1 m म को दोनीं 炚 जौट आखे। |  |  |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading Levels 2008




UTTARAKHAND ruRal

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 29.5 | 45.7 | 18.0 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 100 |
| II | 10.5 | 37.3 | 33.5 | 15.1 | 3.5 | 100 |
| III | 4.5 | 23.2 | 31.8 | 29.6 | 11.0 | 100 |
| IV | 1.8 | 11.7 | 23.9 | 38.1 | 24.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 5.6 | 17.5 | 33.3 | 42.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.5 | 3.0 | 11.8 | 25.6 | 59.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.3 | 3.5 | 9.4 | 20.8 | 66.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 1.5 | 5.1 | 16.8 | 76.7 | 100 |
| Total | 6.6 | 17.8 | 19.8 | 23.4 | 32.4 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% ChiLDREN IN DIFFERENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLASSES who CAN |  |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008



## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI or Balwadi | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bageshwar | 98.6 | 0.6 | 15.4 | 84.4 | 83.8 | 80.0 | 58.2 | 52.3 | 73.9 |
| Chamoli | 58.6 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 82.4 | 79.6 | 79.1 | 61.2 | 48.7 | 69.7 |
| Champawat | 98.5 | 1.0 | 21.9 | 89.9 | 89.5 | 82.4 | 68.0 | 65.1 | 93.3 |
| Dehradun | 94.3 | 1.2 | 43.3 | 76.8 | 79.3 | 68.2 | 54.1 | 32.3 | 72.0 |
| Haridwar | 90.8 | 0.8 | 39.9 | 75.0 | 75.2 | 68.3 | 56.1 | 57.6 | 81.4 |
| Nainital | 73.9 | 2.3 | 20.2 | 76.0 | 76.4 | 76.1 | 57.3 | 54.4 | 75.6 |
| Pithoragarh | 91.1 | 0.3 | 21.6 | 79.4 | 74.4 | 80.5 | 61.1 | 53.2 | 73.6 |
| Rudraprayag | 95.3 | 0.2 | 19.0 | 77.2 | 75.8 | 76.7 | 61.6 | 53.9 | 69.9 |
| Tehri Garhwal* |  | 0.6 | 22.5 | 80.5 | 78.6 | 76.3 | 55.6 | 32.1 | 69.7 |
| Total | 89.8 | 1.0 | 27.9 | 79.8 | 79.4 | 75.2 | 59.8 | 48.7 | 73.2 |



## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of Schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 86.2 | 5.3 | 2.8 | 5.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 84.2 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 9.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 87.3 | 7.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 85.8 | 8.0 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 88.7 | 6.0 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 86.0 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 84.3 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 10.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 87.7 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 7.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 71.0 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 25.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 69.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 27.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 72.6 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 22.3 | 100 |



NOTE : 'OTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. 'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $74.6 \%(37.9+24.2+12.4)$ children are in age range 8 to 10.

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | 끙 |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | 69.6 |  |  |  | 30.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 81.1 |  |  |  | 18.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 42.6 | 38.2 | 9.0 | 2.5 | 7.7 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 10.3 | 72.9 | 11.8 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $10.7 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In West Bengal, ASER 2005 covered 14 districts. ASER 2006 covered 16 districts. ASER 2007 covered all 17 districts.

## WEST BENGAL rural

## Reading LeVEL

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE $\%$ ChILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 22.7 | 41.0 | 25.6 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 100 |  |
| II | 7.7 | 32.3 | 32.5 | 18.6 | 8.9 | 100 |  |
| III | 3.7 | 17.3 | 29.2 | 31.2 | 18.6 | 100 |  |
| IV | 1.5 | 9.3 | 20.6 | 31.7 | 36.9 | 100 |  |
| V | 1.3 | 4.2 | 13.0 | 37.0 | 44.5 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.8 | 2.5 | 7.5 | 26.8 | 62.4 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.3 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 18.0 | 77.3 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 11.4 | 86.1 | 100 |  |
| ToTAL | 5.7 | 15.2 | 17.8 | 22.8 | 38.5 | 100 |  |

nоte : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008


Chart 7: Reading levels of boys and girls in Std III



## WEST BENGAL rural

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 22.1 | 49.0 | 21.2 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 6.4 | 39.0 | 33.5 | 16.4 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 3.4 | 24.2 | 32.4 | 27.4 | 12.5 | 100 |
| IV | 1.1 | 12.9 | 30.0 | 32.3 | 23.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 6.5 | 24.7 | 38.5 | 29.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 3.3 | 17.5 | 33.6 | 45.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 1.8 | 10.7 | 28.8 | 58.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.6 | 8.7 | 21.4 | 68.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 5.3 | 19.2 | 23.1 | 25.1 | 27.4 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 5.2 | 23.6 |
| II | 10.7 | 44.2 |
| III | 23.1 | 61.8 |
| IV | 34.9 | 75.4 |
| V | 50.1 | 83.3 |
| VI | 65.8 | 90.0 |
| VII | 76.5 | 93.3 |
| VIII | 83.9 | 95.0 |
| Total | 40.1 | 67.8 |


| Testing Tool |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telling Time <br> Currency Tasks |  |  | \% | $\cdots$ |
|  |  | -xtmory |  |  |
|  | e 4 | 97 28 |  | 9) $\mathrm{mar}($ |
|  | 1 B | 22 * | $\begin{array}{r}32 \\ -885 \\ \hline-84 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 8) ec ( |
|  |  | 20.9 |  |  |
|  | ₹ | $09 \text { 有 }$ | $\begin{array}{r}84 \\ -20 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 7) $\mathrm{s} 8 \pm$ ( |
|  |  |  | 80 र¢ |  |
|  | - 2 | ebr 28 | -2\% -29 | 6) $4 \times 2$ ( |
|  | - |  | -maners | -manciver |

COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008




## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI or Balwadi | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more |  | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Bankura | 68.0 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 79.9 | 77.6 | 64.0 | 53.1 | 32.9 | 74.7 |
| Barddhaman | 80.6 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 93.1 | 92.6 | 80.9 | 69.7 | 43.6 | 72.6 |
| Birbhum | 72.5 | 9.7 | 1.4 | 73.7 | 73.1 | 58.4 | 44.3 | 33.5 | 64.7 |
| Dakshin Dinajpur | 87.5 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 82.5 | 84.1 | 65.4 | 60.5 | 43.2 | 68.8 |
| Darjeeling | 72.6 | 2.2 | 29.1 | 95.0 | 97.2 | 73.3 | 64.3 | 58.1 | 87.2 |
| Howrah | 86.3 | 5.4 | 2.9 | 87.2 | 88.0 | 77.8 | 60.1 | 42.6 | 81.8 |
| Hoogli | 84.3 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 91.1 | 93.8 | 68.8 | 56.0 | 36.2 | 72.5 |
| Jalpaiguri | 62.8 | 3.4 | 6.8 | 77.5 | 84.1 | 59.9 | 48.6 | 31.0 | 81.8 |
| Cooch Behar | 59.8 | 1.5 | 6.5 | 88.6 | 88.1 | 67.0 | 52.2 | 33.5 | 70.3 |
| Maldah | 73.2 | 7.4 | 16.0 | 76.6 | 76.6 | 60.3 | 49.0 | 40.1 | 75.7 |
| Medinipur | 79.5 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 86.2 | 87.1 | 82.6 | 75.1 | 42.6 | 74.2 |
| Murshidabad | 79.3 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 85.2 | 87.4 | 58.5 | 47.8 | 40.1 | 64.4 |
| Nadia | 90.1 | 7.7 | 2.3 | 88.2 | 87.6 | 62.6 | 48.0 | 33.0 | 68.8 |
| North 24 -Parganas | 82.6 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 91.4 | 93.8 | 68.6 | 52.3 | 33.7 | 81.4 |
| Puruliya | 61.2 | 11.8 | 8.8 | 73.0 | 73.7 | 53.6 | 54.5 | 35.7 | 70.3 |
| South 24-Parganas | 73.0 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 91.0 | 89.4 | 75.9 | 55.9 | 29.1 | 85.5 |
| Uttar Dinajpur | 63.4 | 9.5 | 4.2 | 66.3 | 68.1 | 51.1 | 33.1 | 23.1 | 72.2 |
| Total | 75.9 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 84.0 | 84.8 | 67.7 | 55.5 | 36.9 | 74.0 |



## DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI rural

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 1 OUT OF 1 DISTRICT
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 87.2 | 10.1 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 86.8 | 9.7 | 0.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 ALL | 86.9 | 11.7 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 87.4 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 86.5 | 12.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 88.5 | 7.3 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 87.8 | 8.7 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 89.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 79.6 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | Insufficient Data |  |  |  |  |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | Insufficient Data |  |  |  |  |


| CHART 1: TRENDS OVER TIME |
| :--- |
| \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER |
| 25 P |

NOTE : 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $94.3 \%(5.7+43.8+44.8)$ children are in age range 7 to 9 .

## Young Children

| CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3: \% Children who attend DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRE-SCHOOL \& SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\Im}{\circ}$ |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| AgE: 3 ALL | Insufficient Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| AgE: 4 ALL | 90.4 |  |  |  | 9.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 5 ALL | 48.3 | 36.2 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 1.2 | 81.9 | 14.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $11.9 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.


In Dadra and Nagar Haveli, ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all districts.

## DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

| Table 4: Class-wise \% Children who Can read |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 10.2 | 62.7 | 18.6 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 100 |  |
| II | 0.0 | 14.6 | 60.9 | 10.9 | 13.6 | 100 |  |
| III | 0.0 | 2.9 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 20.2 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 45.5 | 49.5 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 16.7 | 78.3 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 17.8 | 80.2 | 100 |  |
| VII | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 96.3 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 93.1 | 100 |  |
| Total | 1.6 | 12.3 | 17.0 | 18.0 | 51.1 | 100 |  |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stel 7 Limal |  |  |
|  <br>  <br> onel thy mond enild eftit ers. <br>  4id. <br>  tuil bel ad teanint wist az al. <br>  4nd eel ti. <br> ufip Trala smell seal ath als sedy 1 | 20] पूपu afez aोd silrs allee then <br>  | al. <br> 9naty live. |

## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who Can read at least Std II Level text (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading and arithmetic levels 2008




## DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI rURal

## Arithmetic Level



## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

| TABLE 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT <br> CLASSES who CAN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| I | 4.3 | 5.2 |
| II | 38.2 | 37.3 |
| III | 57.3 | 66.0 |
| IV | 89.9 | 86.9 |
| V | 94.2 | 97.5 |
| VI | 96.0 | 96.0 |
| VII | 100.0 | 97.5 |
| VIII | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 69.6 | 70.5 |
|  |  |  |


| Testing Tool |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | sia when 14 | k!es tilp tref: | cavian | нивมя |
| 8 N | $\text { e } \quad 0$ | us 46 | $\begin{array}{r}48 \\ -45 \\ \hline-38 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | c) $\mathrm{EG3}$ |
| Currency Tasks | $3 \quad 4$ | fe ee | $\begin{array}{rrr} 46 \\ -20 & \text { av } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5) 04c |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 3 \gamma & 99 \\ \gamma 9 & c \gamma \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89 \\ -59 \\ -38 \end{array}$ | $0 \longdiv { 6 9 \pi }$ |
| $11$ | ช 9 | 24.46 | $\begin{array}{r} 35 \quad \$ c \\ -9 c \\ -26 \end{array}$ | 7) wec |
| $(50)$ | aw | 动 |  | ameaterand |

## Performance of districts

|  | Anganwadi OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in <br> Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) <br> who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Dadra \& Nagar | 87.1 | 2.2 | 10.1 | 94.7 | 93.8 | 83.6 | 75.8 | 80.6 | 83.5 |
| Total | 87.1 | 2.2 | 10.1 | 94.7 | 93.8 | 83.6 | 75.8 | 80.6 | 83.5 |

## DAMAN AND DIU rubal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS
Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 71.0 | 27.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 71.6 | 26.3 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 65.9 | 33.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 62.2 | 37.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 69.6 | 29.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 ALL | 76.5 | 21.6 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 72.5 | 24.9 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 80.7 | 18.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 70.5 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 63.4 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 81.6 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отнER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'мот in SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-wISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $92.4 \%(11.5+67.7+13.1)$ children are in age range 7 to 9 .

## Young Children

Children in Pre-school 2008
TABLE 3: \% Children who attend
different types of pre-school \& school

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other <br> School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 85.6 |  |  |  | 14.4 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 90.7 |  |  |  | 9.3 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 48.0 | 29.1 | 17.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 3.6 | 60.4 | 33.6 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 100 |



How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $8.6 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

In Daman and Diu, ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all districts.

## DAMAN AND DIU ruval

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

## Reading

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 11.9 | 51.2 | 22.6 | 6.1 | 8.3 | 100 |  |
| II | 5.0 | 27.4 | 36.6 | 20.3 | 10.7 | 100 |  |
| III | 1.5 | 23.0 | 35.4 | 25.6 | 14.4 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 7.5 | 21.3 | 43.7 | 27.5 | 100 |  |
| V | 0.0 | 3.7 | 18.4 | 35.3 | 42.6 | 100 |  |
| VI | 1.1 | 2.0 | 10.2 | 36.3 | 50.4 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.9 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 29.7 | 63.3 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 15.0 | 84.0 | 100 |  |
| TOTAL | 2.4 | 13.5 | 17.4 | 26.3 | 40.4 | 100 |  |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN ReAD at least Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading and arithmetic levels 2008




Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 17.2 | 50.2 | 25.1 | 3.1 | 4.4 | 100 |
| II | 8.1 | 35.4 | 40.2 | 14.3 | 2.1 | 100 |
| III | 3.9 | 28.8 | 43.4 | 17.4 | 6.6 | 100 |
| IV | 1.7 | 9.5 | 36.9 | 37.9 | 14.0 | 100 |
| v | 1.7 | 10.4 | 19.3 | 46.9 | 21.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 5.1 | 21.0 | 37.4 | 36.4 | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 | 2.0 | 11.7 | 44.8 | 39.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 0.5 | 8.4 | 38.2 | 52.7 | 100 |
| Total | 4.1 | 16.3 | 24.5 | 31.2 | 24.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

Chart 8: \% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std III - VIII) 2006-2008


## TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

Table 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT CLASSES WHO CAN

| Std. | Tell time | Do <br> currency <br> tasks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 14.9 | 34.1 |
| II | 17.1 | 44.5 |
| III | 29.0 | 57.3 |
| IV | 55.0 | 76.8 |
| V | 60.0 | 86.5 |
| VI | 75.0 | 90.3 |
| VII | 87.8 | 97.0 |
| VIII | 97.7 | 97.5 |
| Total | 57.5 | 75.0 |


| TESTING TOOL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ain mime | eber alys. $51-45$ | creses | **ม* |
|  | 30 | 9436 | $\begin{array}{r}44 \\ -34 \\ \hline 86\end{array}$ | $4 \longdiv { 5 1 6 }$ |
| Currency Tasks | $8 \quad 8$ | $\text { ER } 23$ | $\begin{array}{rr} \text { Cy } & \text { bl } \\ -96 & -35 \end{array}$ | $5 \longdiv { 9 5 6 ( }$ |
|  | $c$ $6$ | $86 \quad 62$ $45 \quad 60$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ +30 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | c) 863 |
|  | 4 2 | 26 \$9 | $\begin{array}{rr} 184 \\ -46 & -83 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $y \longdiv { 4 4 3 }$ |
|  | 4/0204mens |  | $\frac{20 m}{2 \pi}+2 \pi=x=0$ | Whatim |

## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | PRIVATE SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : LeArning Levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) <br> who CAN <br> READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Diu | 97.8 | 1.1 | 5.7 | 81.7 | 76.6 | 49.2 | 38.0 | 58.8 | 70.3 |
| Daman | 85.9 | 0.7 | 32.2 | 93.7 | 89.8 | 67.4 | 51.9 | 46.7 | 75.7 |
| Total | 87.9 | 0.7 | 27.5 | 91.5 | 87.4 | 64.3 | 49.6 | 48.8 | 74.8 |

## PUDUCHERRY rưal

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Enrollment

## School enrollment and out of school children 2008

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of Schools |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 74.7 | 24.7 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 76.5 | 22.7 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 71.5 | 27.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 72.2 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 70.9 | 28.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 77.6 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 75.7 | 23.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 79.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 83.2 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 85.6 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 79.5 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'мот in schоol' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Age and Class

## AgE-wISE AND CLASS-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN SAMPLE



How to read the table: In Std III, $95.2 \%(18.1+77.1)$ children are in age range 7 to 8 .


How to read the chart: In 2008 there were $9.8 \%$ children in Std III in the ASER sample.

## Young Children

Children in Pre-school 2008
Table 3: \% Children who attend
different types of pre-school \& school

|  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other School |  |  |
| Age: 3 ALL | 96.7 |  |  |  | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 4 ALL | 96.5 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 5 ALL | 4.3 | 62.5 | 32.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 6 ALL | 0.0 | 74.6 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |

## Children not in pre-school over the years

Chart 3: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children (Age 3-4) not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other)


In Pondicherry, ASER 2005 covered no district. ASER 2006, ASER 2007 covered all districts.

## PUDUCHERRY rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading Level

READING

| TABLE 4: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |  |
| I | 38.3 | 43.5 | 14.9 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 100 |  |
| II | 11.0 | 27.3 | 53.7 | 7.3 | 0.8 | 100 |  |
| III | 4.2 | 12.6 | 61.8 | 16.6 | 4.8 | 100 |  |
| IV | 0.0 | 6.2 | 45.9 | 41.6 |  |  |  |
| V | 0.9 | 3.9 | 23.8 | 46.3 | 6.3 | 100 |  |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.4 | 49.5 | 25.1 | 100 |  |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 27.0 | 41.5 | 100 |  |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 9.5 | 70.2 | 100 |  |
| TotAL | 6.9 | 11.5 | 24.0 | 25.5 | 32.1 | 89.2 |  |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


## Reading trends over time

Chart 4: \% Children who Cannot even identify letters
(in govt schools in Std I IV) 2006-2008


Chart 5: \% Children who CAN READ AT LEAST Std II LEVEL TEXT (in govt schools in Std III - VI) 2006-2008


Comparision of reading levels 2008




## PUDUCHERRY <br> RURAL

## Arithmetic Level

## ARITHMETIC

| TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers | Subtract | Divide | Total |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 - 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 - 9 9}$ |  |  |  |  |
| I | 30.8 | 49.1 | 17.8 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 100 |
| II | 9.7 | 25.2 | 59.1 | 5.5 | 0.4 | 100 |
| III | 3.8 | 14.5 | 71.3 | 8.5 | 1.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 6.3 | 73.1 | 14.3 | 6.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 2.4 | 48.3 | 29.9 | 18.5 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.7 | 29.8 | 49.0 | 20.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 8.9 | 60.2 | 30.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 38.8 | 57.9 | 100 |
| ToTAL | 5.6 | 11.9 | 36.5 | 27.4 | 18.6 | 100 |

Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division can do subtraction, can recognize numbers 10 to 99 and 1 to 9.

TELLING TIME AND TASKS WITH CURRENCY

Table 6: \% Children IN DIFFERENT
CLASSES who CAN

| Std. | Tell time | currency <br> tasks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 10.5 | 18.8 |
| II | 23.9 | 36.2 |
| III | 45.9 | 60.6 |
| IV | 52.7 | 75.3 |
| V | 76.1 | 90.9 |
| VI | 78.2 | 96.4 |
| VII | 92.5 | 98.1 |
| VIII | 95.8 | 99.1 |
| TOTAL | 61.6 | 73.7 |



COMPARISION OF ARITHMETIC LEVELS 2008


## Performance of districts

|  | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Std 1-2 : Learning Levels |  | Std 3-5 : Learning levels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | \% Children (Age 3-4) in Anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> Out of School | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in Private school | \% Children <br> (Std 1-2) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std 1-2) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN TELL TIME of both clocks | \% Children (Std 3-5) who CAN DO CURRENCY TASKS |
| Karaikal | 98.9 | 0.0 | 20.7 | 75.2 | 84.6 | 72.5 | 69.6 | 96.9 | 92.8 |
| Puducherry | 95.9 | 0.8 | 26.0 | 73.1 | 76.6 | 41.8 | 15.2 | 47.8 | 72.0 |
| Total | 96.6 | 0.6 | 24.7 | 73.5 | 78.3 | 49.8 | 29.3 | 60.6 | 77.5 |



## Annexures

| ALİvata |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Tatal |
| Std I | 85.5 | 73.5 | 27.8 | 9.0 | 3.1 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| Stdil | 9.9 | 19.8 | 52.4 | 30.4 | 8.4 | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 2.1 |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| 5edili |  |  | 14.5 | 42.7 | 33.7 | 11.1 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |
| Stalv |  |  |  | 12.4 | 41.5 | 29.2 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 2.4 |  |  | 8.4 | 10.9 |
| Stdy |  |  |  |  | 10.0 | 39.7 | 34.6 | 12.6 | 5.3 | 31 |  |  | 11.4 |
| Stavi |  |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 39.2 | 32.0 | 11.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 9.8 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | 39.0 | 31.2 | 121 | 5.5 |  | 88 |
| 5tavili |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |  | 9.1 | 38.3 | 320 | 12.2 | 7.6 | B,2 |
| Stdix |  |  |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  | 8.3 | 14.9 | 29.5 | 12.1 | 6.2 |
| $58 d x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 8.5 | 41.3 | 46.0 | 5.5 |
| Stdxid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  | 3.7 | 19.3 | 1.1 |
| $5{ }^{50 d} \mathrm{XOI}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 6.6 | 0.4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| Aseam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Tetal |
| Stdi | 87.3 | 73.5 | 30.8 | 11.6 | 4.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.5 |
| Stdil | 9.1 | 20.6 | 46.0 | 29.9 | 112 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| Stdill |  |  | 17.6 | 40.1 | 36.4 | 10.4 |  |  | 10.2 | 4.) | 7.9 |  | 11.7 |
| Stdiv |  |  |  | 12.8 | 32.5 | 34.3 | 10.2 | 6.2 |  |  |  | 8.7 | 10.9 |
| Stdy |  |  |  |  | 10.2 | 33.9 | 38.6 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  | 10.8 |
| Stdyl |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5 | 32.1 | 37.2 | 13.2 | 7.7 |  |  | 9,9 |
| Stavil |  | 60 |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 27.5 | 39.9 | 18.0 | 7.9 |  | 9.4 |
| 514 vili |  |  | 5.7 | 5.7 |  |  |  | 8.0 | 29.5 | 39.4 | 15.6 | 19.5 | 8.0 |
| 5tdIX |  |  |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  | 6.8 | 23.8 | 38.7 | 21.7 | 5.8 |
| $\operatorname{std} \mathrm{X}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 4.7 | 28.0 | 47.0 | 4.0 |
| Stdx IJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | 0.1 | 18 | 7.7 | 0.4 |
| Std XIII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | 18 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Total | 109 | 100 | 100 | 160 | 100 | 100 | 160 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

ANDHRA FRADELSH

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Tctal } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$


DAmen aya Dia


| EaA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | B | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| stal 1 | 100 | 91.8 | 46.1 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 |
| stdil |  | 3.5 | 46.2 | 52.6 |  | 4.0 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 |
| Std III |  |  | 7.7 | 43.5 | 40.8 |  |  |  | 2.1 |  |  |  | 8.9 |
| Staliv |  |  |  |  | 43.2 | 49.7 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  | 5.1 | 10.3 |
| StdY |  |  |  |  | 82 | 39.4 | 46.6 | 1.4 |  |  | 7 | 3.1 | 9.8 |
| Stavl |  |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 39.5 | 48.5 | 10.8 |  |  |  | 10.6 |
| 5tavil | D. 0 | $4{ }^{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 37.2 | 43.8 | 18,6 |  |  | 11.2 |
| Ste VIII |  |  | 0.0 | 2,8 |  |  |  |  | 29.4 | 38.4 |  |  | 8.6 |
| std IX |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 27 | 69 |  | 13.9 | 29.8 | 41.5 | 6.9 | 9.1 |
| stal x . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  | 10.1 | 43.5 | 38.1 | 8.2 |
| StdXI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 7.7 | 39.3 | 1.9 |
| Staxil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ds | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.9 |
| Tctal | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 190 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| Hastama |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16. | Total |
| S(d) | 89.9 | 61.6 | 25,1 | 6.8 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| 5td III | 12.5 | 29.1 | 45.9 | 28.8 | 8.8 |  | 5.6 | 1.4 | 3.2 |  |  |  | 11.1 |
| Sta III |  |  | 21.4 | 40.6 | 31.6 | 9.5 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 44 |  | 11.2 |
| Stdiv |  |  |  | 17.2 | 36.2 | 29.9 | 10.5 | 5.7 |  |  | ar | 5.5 | 10.9 |
| StdV |  |  |  |  | 16.5 | 37.0 | 30.0 | 12.9 | 5.1 |  |  |  | 11.1 |
| 5tavi |  |  |  |  |  | 13.9 | 36.9 | 30.5 | 13.0 | 5.2 |  |  | 10.2 |
| Sta VII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.1 | 27.8 | 27.4 | 12.7 | 58 |  | 8.6 |
| Sta VIII |  |  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  | 16.2 | 34.7 | 32.0 | 14.7 | 6.0 | 9.3 |
| std IX |  |  |  |  | 48 | 5.5 |  |  | 13.5 | 28.1 | 27.2 | 10.5 | 6.4 |
| 5 tax |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.6 |  | 17.3 | 36.9 | 39.8 | 6.3 |
| StdXI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2 | 12 | 9.6 | 23.7 | 2.0 |
| StdXII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14.5 | 0.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 160 | 100 | 100 | 100 |



$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Total } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Tokal } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Tctal } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$


| TKNIE日 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| Stal | 82.0 | 70.9 | 50.8 | 20.9 | 9.3 | 4.9 |  | 49 |  |  |  |  | 14.9 |
| 5tdil | 13.8 | 20.9 | 29.4 | 42.9 | 23.9 | 11.0 |  | 1.9 | 6.2 |  |  |  | 16.0 |
| 5tdill |  |  | 12.7 | 23.2 | 33.0 | 21.5 | 11.8 | 7.6 |  | $\alpha$ | 6.5 | 6.8 | 12.7 |
| Stalv |  |  |  | 8.1 | 19.1 | 29.2 | 24.7 | 13.2 | 10.8 |  |  |  | 12.3 |
| StdV |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 21,1 | 27.8 | 19.0 | 14.2 | 9.6 |  |  | 11.5 |
| stdyl |  |  |  |  |  | 8.4 | 19.5 | 25.3 | 21.3 | 11.8 | 72 | 4.7 | 9.7 |
| Stavil | 4.3 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  | 5.8 | 29.4 | 24.7 | 15.7 | 11.6 | 7.3 | 8.0 |
| StdVIII | 4, 3 |  | 7.1 | 6.4 |  |  |  | 88 | 20.4 | 24.7 | 15.7 | 15.1 | 7.0 |
| Sta IX |  |  |  |  | 5.5 | 3.9 |  |  |  | 27.6 | 1988 | 16.7 | 4.8 |
| 5taX |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 | 0 | 2.4 |  | 38.4 | 39.8 | 4.7 |
| stexI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2.4 | 3.9 |  | 6.9 | 0.3 |
| Std XII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |



| MABALAND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| Std I | 89.6 | 78.8 | 43.4 | 15.9 | 8.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7 |
| StdIII |  | 18.2 | 43.6 | 35.6 | 23.9 | 11.8 | 6.5 |  | 8.2 | 0.7 | 6 |  | 15.1 |
| Stdili |  |  |  | 35.2 | 32.1 | 22.0 | 14.8 | 9.5 |  |  |  |  | 14.9 |
| 5td lv |  |  |  |  | 27.0 | 32.8 | 21.8 | 19.7 | 11.0 |  |  |  | 13,0 |
| stav |  |  |  |  |  | 24.6 | 29.2 | 22.7 | 13.5 | 7.5 | 7.2 |  | 11.1 |
| stivi |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.0 | 23.3 | 18.2 | 11.8 | 5.5 |  | 8.0 |
| Sta VII | 10.4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 18.1 | 28.4 | 21.8 | 14.4 | 6.1 | 8.0 |
| Std viif |  |  |  | 13.4 |  |  |  |  | 18.1 | 31.9 | 21.0 | 16.5 | 6,7 |
| 5 td 1 K |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 | 4.4 |  |  | 16.4 | 27.0 | 21.0 | 4.4 |
| staX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.9 | 2* |  | 17.7 | 40,3 | 3.4 |
| Stax) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.9 |  | 5.3 | 0.9 |
| Staxll |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| Pypuchtery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Tatai |
| 5 tal | 97.2 | 37.5 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.9 |
| Stdill |  | 58.7 | 77.8 | 4.6 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9 |
| Std III |  |  | 21.3 | 78,0 |  |  | 3.7 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |
| Sterv |  |  |  | 13.6 | 88.9 |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 27 |  | 7.2 |
| Stay |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 87-4 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 11.0 |
| Sts Vil |  |  |  |  |  | 7.2 | 94. 3 | 21.3 |  |  |  |  | 10.4 |
| stavil | 2.9 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 72.3 | 13.2 |  |  |  | 8.5 |
| std VIII |  |  | 0.5 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 77.8 | 11.4 |  |  | 10.8 |
| sta IX |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 27 | 2.0 |  |  | 80.4 | 4.9 |  | 8.6 |
| StaX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 5.6 |  | 87.6 | 8. 7 | 11.4 |
| StdXI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.6 | 3.4 |  | 75.9 |  |
| StdxII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5 | . 2 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Total } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array} 100$

| Rainstian |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Tatal |
| Std I | 74.5 | 50.5 | 20.6 | 9.3 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.6 |
| Stall | 19.3 | 33.9 | 43.1 | 22.5 | 8.9 |  | 6.9 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| Std IIII |  | 11.0 | 23.2 | 35.3 | 22.1 | 12.6 |  |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 11.7 |
| Staly |  |  | 8.3 | 19.5 | 33.7 | 21.2 | 10.1 | 6.5 |  |  |  | 7.0 | 10.5 |
| StaV |  |  |  | 9.3 | 22.7 | 32.9 | 25.6 | 12.4 | 5.5 |  |  |  | 11.6 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 7.5 | 17.7 | 33.9 | 25.2 | 11.5 | 7.3 |  |  | 10.0 |
| Sta VII | 6.3 |  |  |  |  | 6.3 | 17.1 | 29.2 | 23.9 | 12.6 | 6.3 |  | 8.8 |
| std VIII |  | 4.6 | 4.7 |  |  |  | 5.8 | 17.1 | 35.8 | 30,2 | 20.3 | 12.1 | 9.6 |
| 5ta ix |  |  |  | 4,0 | 29 |  |  |  | 14.1 | 27.0 | 23.6 | 13.9 | 5.7 |
| StdX |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |  | 14.3 | 34.6 | 37.2 | 5.4 |
| $5 t d \mathrm{XI}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |  | 6.9 | 19.3 | 1.5 |
| StdXII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 10.7 | 0.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 109 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 109 | 100 | 100 |


$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Totel } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Tctal } & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100\end{array}$


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16. | Totial |
| Std) | 86.0 | 73.0 | 32.5 | 12.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.9 |
| Std 11 | 9.7 | 19.7 | 46.0 | 31.6 | 123 | 8.7 | क. | 3 |  |  |  |  | 13.6 |
| Sta ili |  |  | 14.9 | 35.7 | 342 | 15.4 | 71 | 5.3 | S | A. 1 |  |  | 12.9 |
| StdiV |  |  |  | 13.0 | 32.6 | 27.3 | 12.1 | 9.0 |  |  |  | 9.5 | 10.9 |
| stdV |  |  |  |  | 12.0 | 29.9 | 11.9 | 16.5 | 7.3 | 5.5 |  |  | 10.8 |
| 5tdyl |  |  |  |  |  | 10.2 | 31.5 | 27.2 | 13.6 | 8.2 |  |  | 8.9 |
| Stavil |  | 73 |  |  |  |  | 9.1 | 24.5 | 28.1 | 12.5 | 6.4 |  | 7.4 |
| Sta VIII |  |  | 6.7 |  |  |  |  | 10.6 | 31.5 | 293 | 14.5 | 10.2 | 7.3 |
| Stal IX |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |  |  | 9.1 | 27.4 | 25.3 | 12.1 | 5.0 |
| 5tax |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 11.2 | 35.8 | 42.8 | 4.9 |
| StdXI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 |  | 4.7 | 13.6 | 0.9 |
| stdxII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | 23 | 11.9 | 0.6 |
| Total | 100 | 160 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 160 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| OTTAFAKHay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | \$ | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Tolal |
| Sud | 84.8 | 64.5 | 17.2 | 6.3 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.4 |
| Stdil | 10,0 | 27.3 | 59.6 | 21.3 | 68 |  | 5.1 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  | 11.0 |
| Stdill |  | 5.0 | 24.0 | 48.9 | 26.6 | 9.0 |  |  | 3.3 | 28 |  |  | 12.2 |
| 5ta IV |  |  |  | 19.2 | 48.2 | 28.3 | 11.7 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 4.6 | 12.0 |
| StdV |  |  |  |  | 12.7 | 44.3 | 34.7 | 16.7 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 12.2 |
| Stsvi |  |  |  |  |  | 10.5 | 36.9 | 29.3 | 12.6 | 5.0 |  |  | 9.2 |
| StdVil |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.6 | 31.2 | 29.5 | 15.4 | 7.7 |  | 8.6 |
| Std VIII | $3: 1$ | 3.2 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.6 | 41,3 | 35.1 | 15.9 | 9.1 | 5.9 |
| Stdix |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.9 | 340 | 31.3 | 14.7 | 6.4 |
| Std C |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 6.5 | 33.4 | 47.7 | 5.4 |
| Std XI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 1.3 |  | 6.4 | 18.0 | 1.4 |
| 58 dXOI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 6.0 | 0.4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| WIGT Erncal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| Stal | 88.5 | 73.9 | 33.6 | 11.6 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.4 |
| 5t\& \% | 7.4 | 19.9 | 45.6 | 33.3 | 12.5 |  | 7.0 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 5tdill |  |  | 16.3 | 37,2 | 30.9 | 11.7 |  |  |  | 6.3 | 8.0 | 5.6 | 10.7 |
| Sta IV |  |  |  | 13.7 | 36.9 | 31.9 | 12.5 | 78 |  |  | 8. |  | 11.1 |
| staV |  |  |  |  | 12.0 | 40.5 | 41.9 | 20.5 | 9.1 |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| Stdvi |  |  |  |  |  | 6.6 | 11.6 | 38.9 | 20.7 | 11.8 |  |  | 11.4 |
| StdVII | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 22. 3 | 35.9 | 22.4 | 10.2 | 7.7 | 9.5 |
| Std VIII |  |  | A. 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 23.6 | 31.4 | 150 | 9.6 | 7.2 |
| sta IX |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 23.0 | 37.8 | 24.2 | 6.3 |
| StaX |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 6.5 |  | 3.0 | 26.6 | 41.2 | 4.2 |
| stexI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.1 | 23 | 9.7 | 0.6 |
| Stdxil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | 23 | 2.0 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Sample Description






 $\underset{\sim}{n} \stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$








AndhraPradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli
Daman and Diu
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu and Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Madhya Pradesh Madhya Pradesh
 Manipur
Meghalaya Mizoram
 Puducherry . Rajasthan Sikkim Tamil Nadu Tripura
 Uttarakhnad West Bengal

## Village Infrastructure and Household Indicators



## Sample Design of Rural ASER 2008

The purpose of rural ASER 2008 is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading, writing and math ability) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions are added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning in the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2006 and 2007 tested reading comprehension for different kinds of readers. ASER 2008 has for the first time questions on telling time and oral math problems using currency. In addition, this year's ASER survey has incorporated questions on village infrastructure and household assets. Investigators were asked to record whether the village visited had a pucca road leading to it, whether it had a bank, ration shop, etc. In the sampled households information on assets like type of house, phone, television, etc was recorded. This will be able to better establish the links between household affluence and learning.

As compared to previous years, ASER 2008 is fairly lean in the number of variables on which information has been collected. Instead the attempt this year has been to strengthen and streamline the process. Master trainers were appointed in each state. In each district $2-4$ villages were re-visited after the survey in order to check how the survey was conducted.

Since one of the goals of ASER is to generate estimates of change in learning, a panel survey design would provide more efficient estimates of the change. However, given the large sample size of the ASER surveys and cost considerations, we adopted a rotating panel of villages rather than children. In ASER 2007, we retained the 10 villages from 2005 and 2006 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2008 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2005, kept the 10 villages from 2006 and 2007 and added 10 more villages from the census village directory.

The sampling strategy used will generate a representative picture of each district. All rural districts will be surveyed. The estimates obtained will then be aggregated to the state and all-India levels.

Since estimates were to be generated at the district level, the minimum sample size calculations had to start at the district level. The sample size is determined by the following considerations:

- Incidence of what is being measured in the population. Since a survey of learning has never been done in India, the incidence of what we are trying to measure is unknown in the population. ${ }^{1}$
- Confidence level of estimates. The standard used is $95 \%$.
- Precision required on either side of the true value. The standard degree of accuracy most surveys employ is between 5 and 10 per cent. An absolute precision of $5 \%$ along with a $95 \%$ confidence level implies that the estimates generated by the survey will be within 5 percentage points of the true values with a $95 \%$ probability. The precision can also be specified in relative terms - a relative precision of $5 \%$ means that the estimates will be within $5 \%$ of the true value. Relative precision requires higher sample sizes.

Sample size calculations can be done in various ways, depending on what assumptions are made about the underlying population. With a $50 \%$ incidence, $95 \%$ confidence level and $5 \%$ absolute precision, the minimum sample size required in each strata ${ }^{2}$ is $384 .{ }^{3}$ This derivation assumes that the population proportion is normally distributed. On the other hand, a sample size of 384 would imply a relative precision of $10 \%$. If we were to require a $5 \%$ relative precision, the sample size would increase to $1600 .{ }^{4}$ Note that all the sample size calculations require estimating the incidence in the population. In our case, we can get an estimate of the incidence from previous ASER surveys. However, incidence varies

[^11]across different indicators - so incidence of reading ability is different from incidence of dropouts. In addition, we often want to measure things that are not binary for which we need more observations.
Given these considerations, the sample size was decided to be 600 households in each district. ${ }^{5}$ In each district, we have 10 villages from ASER 2006 and ASER 2007 and an additional 10 villages have been added this year to the sample, giving us a total of 30 villages per district. In each village 20 households are surveyed as in ASER 2007, giving a household sample size of 600 per district. National estimates from ASER 2006 put the proportion of children who could subtract or do more at $58 \%$. If we use this as a measure of incidence, then our sample size of 600 would imply a relative precision of about $7 \%$ and an absolute precision of $4 \%$ at the district level to measure the proportion of children who could subtract. Note that at the state level and at the all-India level the survey has many more observations lending estimates at those levels much higher levels of precision.

If we had house lists at the district level, the 600 households could be randomly selected. In the absence of these, a twostage sample design was adopted. In the first stage, 30 villages were randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 census as the sample frame. ${ }^{6}$ In the second stage 20 households were randomly selected in each of the 30 selected villages in the first stage.

Villages were selected using the probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling method. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample. It is most useful when the sampling units vary considerably in size because it assures that those in larger sites have the same probability of getting into the sample as those in smaller sites, and vice verse. ${ }^{7},{ }^{8}$

In the selected villages, 20 households are surveyed. Ideally, a complete houselist of the selected village should have been made and 20 households selected randomly from it. However, given time and resource constraints a procedure for selecting households was adopted that preserved randomness as much as possible. The field investigators were asked to divide the village into four parts. This was done because villages often consist of hamlets and a procedure that randomly selects households from some central location may miss out households on the periphery of the village. In each of the four parts, investigators were asked to start at a central location and pick every $5^{\text {th }}$ household in a circular fashion till 5 households were selected. In each selected household, all children in the age group of 6-14 were tested. ${ }^{9}$

The survey provides estimates at the district, state and national levels. In order to aggregate estimates up from the district level households had to assigned weights - also called inflation factors. The inflation factor corresponding to particular household denotes the number of households that the sampled household represents in the population. Given that 600 households are sampled in each district regardless of the size of the district, a household in a larger district will represent many more households and, therefore, have a larger weight associated with it than one in a sparsely populated district.

The advantage of using PPS sampling is that the sample is self weighting at the district level. In other words, in each district the weight assigned to each of the sampled household turns out to be the same. This is because, the inflation factor associated with a household is simply the inverse of the probability of it being selected into the sample times the number of households in the sample. Since PPS sampling ensures that all households have an equal chance of being

[^12]${ }^{9}$ In larger villages, the investigators increased the interval according to a rough estimate of the number of households in each part. For instance, if a village had 2000 households, each part in the village would have roughly 500 households. Selecting every $5^{\text {th }}$ household would leave out a large chunk of the village un-surveyed. In such situations, investigators were asked to increase the interval between selected households.
selected at the district level, the weights associated with households in the same district are the same. Therefore, weighted estimates are exactly the same as the un-weighted estimates at the district level. However, to get estimates at the state and national levels, weighted estimates are needed since states have a different number of districts and districts vary by population.

Even though the purpose of the survey is to estimate learning levels among children, the household was chosen as the second stage sampling unit. This has a number of advantages. First, children are tested at home rather than in school, allowing all children to be tested rather than just those in school. Further, testing children in school might create a since teachers may encourage testing the brighter children in class. Second, a household sample will generate an age distribution of children which can be cross-checked with other data sources, like the census and the NSS. Third, a household sample makes calculation of the inflation factors easier since the population of children is no longer needed.

Often household surveys are stratified on various parameters of interest. The reason for stratification is to get enough observations on entities that have the characteristic that is being studied. For instance, the NSS uses a two stage stratified sample for their consumption surveys. In the first stage the sample is stratified by population and in the second stage households are stratified on the basis of their affluence. The reason for doing this is that the purpose of the survey is to generate poverty estimates for which a representative sample must include enough non-affluent households. The ASER survey stratifies the sample by population in the first stage. No stratification was done at the second stage. Since the proportion of population in the 6-14 age group is about $22 \%$ and the average household size is about $5,{ }^{10}$ a simple random sample at the second stage would yield enough children in the sample. Finally, if we were to stratify on households with children in the 6-14 age group, we would need the population of such households in the village, which is not possible without a complete house list of the village.
Household format English
ASER 2008 SURVEY - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SHEET

| State | AEVNACHAL PRABESH | Full Name of family head |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Elkamum. | John Jaryem |  |
| Block | Seijora | Name of Surveyors | HHNo. |
| Villoge | NSti Parling. | Salda Jolam |  |
| Date | $17 / 1 / 07$ | Sury Tayem | 9 |

 PI


[^13]Household format Hindi
असर 2008: घर सर्वेक्षण प्रपत्र


## Village information sheet - English

## VILLAGE INFORMATION SHEET

| State Name | ARUNACHAL PRADESH | Block/ Toluk Nome | Seijota |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District Name | Elkameng | villoge Name | Nitic Da |
| Names of ASER Surveyors |  | Sarda Jotham |  |

Ask questlons to the head of panchayat (Sarpanch) or a Panchayat Member.

| Name of Sarpach/Respresentative |  | Tacho Kimo |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position |  | G.B |  |  |  |
| Note: If you do not find the sarpanch then ask any other responsible adult person of the village |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please tick the relevant box |  | Ask The Sarpoanch |  | Did You See |  |
|  | Electricity connection in the villoge? | yes | NO | YES | NO |
|  | Pucca road leading to the villoge? | YES $\swarrow$ | NO | VES $\checkmark$ | NO |
|  | STD Booth? | YES |  | YES | NO $\checkmark$ |
|  | Post office in the village? | YES | NO | YES | NO |
|  | Ration Shop in the village? | Yes $/$ | NO | YES $ل$ | NO |
|  | Bank? | YES |  | YES | NO |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |
| n | Govt Primary School | YES | NO | YES | NO |
|  | Govt Middle School(Std 5 or 6 \& up) | YES | NO | YES $\sqrt{ }$ | NO |
|  | Govt Secondary School(Std 9 \& up) | YES |  | YES | NO |
|  | Private School | YES $V$ | NO | YeS | NO |

## Village information sheet－Hindi

## गाँव की जानकारी

| राज्य का नाम | मटय | बलॉक／तालुका का नाम | मेंहदवाली |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ज़िले के नाम | दिण्डो | गाँव का नाम | खबरी माल |
| असर सवेक्षक का नाम |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { अ-्य क मार मरखी } \\ & \text { मनोन केमारे सारथा } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| पंचायत（सरपंच）के मुखिया या पंचायत के सदस्य से प्रश्न पूछें। |  |  |  |
| सरपच／उत्तर दन वाल का नामस्थान |  | शी ज्ञगत सद परसे |  |
|  |  | अरपच |  |

नोट ：यदि आप सरपंच से नही मिल पाते है तब आप गॉँच किसी जिम्मेदारी व्यक्ति से जानकारी हासित करें।

| उचित खानों में सही का निशान लगायें |  | सरपंच से पूछें |  | आपने देखा |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 粊 } \\ & \text { 要 } \\ & \text { 㬓 } \end{aligned}$ | गाँव में बिजली है？ | हाँ | नहीं | हों $\checkmark$ | नहीं |
|  | गाँव जाने के लिये पक्का रोड है？ | हाँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं | हाँ | नहीं |
|  | STD बूथ | हों $\checkmark$ | नहीं | हॉँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं |
|  | क्या गाँव में डाकघर है？ | हाँ | नहीं | हाँ | नहीं |
|  | क्या गाँव में राशन की दुकान है？ | हॉं | नहीं | हाँ | नहीं |
|  | क्या बैंक है？ | हाँ | नहीं | हॉँ | नहीं $\checkmark$ |
|  | सरकारी प्राइमरी स्कूल | हाँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं | हाँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं |
| E／ | सरकारी मध्यवगी स्कूल（कक्षा 5 या 6 और ऊपर ） | हाँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं | हाँ $\checkmark$ | नहीं |
| 店 | सरकारी संकेन्डरी स्कूल（कक्षा 9 या ऊपर） | हाँ | नही $\sqrt{\text { d }}$ | हॉँ | नहीं $\checkmark$ |
|  | प्राइवेट स्कूल | हाँ | ］नहीं | हाँ | नहीं $\downarrow$ |



| ANDHRA PRADESH | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 570.1 | 727.0 | 1305.2 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 337.6 | 492.2 | 599.4 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 65.0 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 5.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 24 | 24 | 22 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 30.8 | 19.8 | 26.8 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 53.1 | 41.3 | 58.7 |


| AsSAM | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 317.5 | 401.7 | 1042.1 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 224.0 | 227.1 | 439.3 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 38.7 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 7 | 4.4 | 6.9 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 26 | 25 | 25 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 37.5 | 41.3 | 25.9 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 55.4 | 56.4 | 49 |


| BIHAR | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 884.8 | 900.0 | 2414.1 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 341.3 | 218.2 | 802.2 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 36.8 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 13.1 | 12.8 | 6.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 78 | 65 | 64 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 47.8 | 42.5 | 37.3 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 63.2 | 54 | 53.9 |


| CHHATTISGARH | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 394.0 | 550.7 | 821.3 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 295.7 | 424.4 | 653.9 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 85.9 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 4.6 | 7.3 | 4.6 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 37 | 28 | 27 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 33.4 | 33.5 | 32.5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 52.8 | 36.2 | 31.1 |


| DADRA \& NAGAR HAVELI | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 8.8 | 7.3 | 8.3 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 0.1 | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 7.0 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 0.5 | 6.3 | 4.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) |  | 41 | 45 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 64.7 | 24.6 | 16.1 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 18.3 | 44.7 | 54.3 |


| DAMAN AND DIU | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.6 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 0 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 0.4 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 1.1 | 1 | 1.6 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) |  | 34 | 33 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 24.5 | 13.6 | 15.4 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 26.8 | 66.3 | 54.4 |


| GoA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 0 | 12.1 | 21.3 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 0 | 4.9 | 11.1 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 8.0 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) |  | 25 | 24 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 3.2 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 79 | 73.8 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 5}$ |


| HARYANA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 229.2 | 249.1 | 365.0 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 113.6 | 167.9 | 274.8 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 27.8 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 5.1 | 4.9 | 3.6 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 36 | 33 | 32 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 37.5 | 32.4 | 32.5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 56.8 | 61.7 | 54.2 |


| GUJARAT | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 291.8 | 303.3 | 389.4 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 186.3 | 238.3 | 280.3 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 27.1 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 3.4 | 5.6 | 3.7 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 36 | 35 | 35 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 34.9 | 32.9 | 30 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 43.4 | 46.6 | 40.1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | HimACHAL PRADESH | 12005 | 2006 |
|  | 2007 |  |  |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 84.2 | 98.2 | 104.2 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 121.2 |  |  |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 23.9 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 1 | 1.3 | 1 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 21 | 20 | 18 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 19 | 18.7 | 12.9 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 66.5 | 58.6 | 72.7 |

Source: Pupil Teacher Ratio: Dise 2006-07, Flash Statistics.
Allocation, Expenditure data: MHRD
Out of school and learning percentage: ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007

| JAMMU AND KASHMIR | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 207.0 | 283.5 | 354.5 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 81.6 | 136.3 | 198.1 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 29.7 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 2.6 | 4.7 | 3.6 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 19 | 18 | 16 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 13.6 | 18.8 | 11.1 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 49.7 | 37 | 37.9 |


| KARNATAKA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 435.3 | 432.2 | 742.2 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 344.6 | 354.6 | 525.8 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 45.4 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 1.9 | 4.9 | 3.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 35 | 30 | 32 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 46.1 | 29.8 | 23.7 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 39.3 | 38.7 | 37.6 |


| MADHYA PRADESH | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 1250.4 | 1422.8 | 1869.9 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 605.1 | 854.5 | 1345.8 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 62.3 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 4 | 3.8 | 2.2 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 32 | 36 | 38 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 57.1 | 19.4 | 11.3 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 38.4 | 65 | 68.4 |


| MANIPUR | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 46.0 | 50.2 | 62.4 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 13.5 | 12.8 | 21.5 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 5.3 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 7.2 | 5.6 | 4.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) |  | 20 | 20 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 21.3 | 22.9 | 4.5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 62.2 | 51.5 | 66.3 |


| NAGALAND | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 34.4 | 33.9 | 62.0 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 27.5 | 28.8 | 38.4 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 8.6 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 18.8 | 5 | 3.2 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 6.3 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 76 | 48.3 | 54.2 |


| JHARKHAND | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 447.0 | 595.1 | 1042.9 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 292.5 | 203.6 | 504.0 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 45.5 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 9.7 | 8.9 | 5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 54 | 48 | 48 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 42.8 | 41.8 | 33.6 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 54.9 | 49.7 | 42.6 |


| KERALA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 167.9 | 175.4 | 171.5 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 93.8 | 103.0 | 100.0 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 21.2 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 28 | 29 | 27 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 9.1 | 2.2 | 4.4 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 79.1 | 73.9 | 69.6 |


| MAHARASHTRA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 856.0 | 882.2 | 1064.6 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 389.6 | 636.5 | 1026.7 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 62.2 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 2.8 | 3.8 | 1.8 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 28 | 29 | 28 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 29.1 | 19.6 | 12.2 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 65.7 | 66 | 74.8 |


| MEGHALAYA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 54.3 | 34.7 | 91.5 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 21.5 | 20.5 | 49.2 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 13.0 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 8.2 | 6.8 | 7.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 2.2 | 6.9 | 5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 81.2 | 72 | 67.7 |


| ORISSA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 640.0 | 654.4 | 939.6 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 280.6 | 371.7 | 637.5 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 43.0 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 8.8 | 9.1 | 8 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 37 | 35 | 33 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 50.7 | 39.2 | 36.6 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 45.4 | 47.3 | 44.5 |

Source: Pupil Teacher Ratio: Dise 2006-07, Flash Statistics.
Allocation, Expenditure data: MHRD
Out of school and learning percentage: ASER 2005, ASER 2006, ASER 2007

| PUDUCHERRY | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 10.6 | 12.4 | 9.4 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 2.7 | 5.4 | 4.0 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 6.1 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) |  | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 27 | 24 | 24 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) |  | 39.7 | 36.9 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) |  | 24.5 | 27.3 |


| PUNJAB | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 200.3 | 225.8 | 232.8 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 96.4 | 118.4 | 157.7 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 19.6 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 29 | 33 | 32 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 39.7 | 24.5 | 19.9 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 46.1 | 49.5 | 53.8 |


| RAJASTHAN | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 640.9 | 854.2 | 1253.4 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 395.9 | 755.3 | 1057.3 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 69.0 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 10.2 | 10.8 | 6.5 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 34 | 33 | 31 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 58.2 | 66.5 | 45 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 46.7 | 38.4 | 35.8 |


| TRIPURA | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 62.6 | 94.4 | 90.9 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 51.1 | 86.8 | 77.0 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 53.7 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 1.1 | 5.2 | 3.7 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 22 | 23 | 22 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 0.0 | 5.2 | 20.9 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 70.4 | 66 | 51.3 |


| UTTARAKHAND | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 130.4 | 168.5 | 248.2 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 97.0 | 146.4 | 188.9 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 33.3 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 26 | 26 | 26 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 29.3 | 19.6 | 29.5 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 68.9 | 57.6 | 59.2 |


| TAMIL NADU | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 440.5 | 487.8 | 723.2 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 366.4 | 408.0 | 411.2 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 40.9 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 39 | 29 | 27 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 44.9 | 51.1 | 57.8 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 39.5 | 24.9 | 28.4 |


| UTIAR PRAD ESH | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 1604.5 | 2641.9 | 3678.5 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 1251.7 | 2238.2 | 2829.1 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) |  | 90.3 |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 7.2 | 6 | 3.9 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 68 | 57 | 53 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 52 | 55.7 | 45.8 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 39.4 | 31.1 | 32.3 |


| WEST BENGAL | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation (In Rs Crores) | 877.7 | 1059.4 | 1464.9 |
| Expenditure (In Rs Crores) | 509.5 | 488.3 | 932.6 |
| Average Expenditure Per District Over 3 Years(In Rs Crores) | 113.6 |  |  |
| Total out of school children(\%) | 4.2 | 7.8 | 4.8 |
| Pupil Teacher Ratio(\%) | 55 | 54 | 51 |
| Children in Std 1 who could not even read letters(\%) | 16.1 | 13.6 | 19.4 |
| Level 1( Std I Text)+Level 2(Std II Text) at Std 3(\%) | 74.2 | 67.9 | 64.7 |






[^0]:    * Dr. Rukmini Banerji is Director, ASER Centre.
    ${ }^{1}$ For the first time ASER in 2008 collects information on household and village characteristics. These items are not covered in this note. However, the appendix to this report includes tables summarizing the household and village information that was collected.
    ${ }^{2}$ ASER 2005 and 2007 included school observations. ASER 2006 and 2007 looked at reading and comprehension. ASER 2006 assessed the reading levels of the women in the sampled households. ASER 2007 had the first nationwide survey of basic English reading and comprehension across India. In 2006, children were asked to calculate a arithmetic word problem. In 2007, the word problem had do with money.

[^1]:    Director SRF Foundation, New Delhi.
    ${ }^{1}$ Ministry of HRD, Government of India (2007), Selected Education Statistics 2005-06, New Delhi.
    See for instance, Kingdon, Geeta G (1996), "Private Schooling in India: Size, Nature and Equity Effects", Economic and Political Weekly, New Delhi, December
    ${ }^{3}$ Muralidharan, Karthik and Kremer, Michael (2006), "Public and Private Schools in India", Harvard University, Boston.
    ${ }^{4}$ See for example, "Low Turnout, Waning Popularity Push MCD Schools To Brink Of Closure", The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, $26{ }^{\text {th }}$ December, 2006.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ UNICEF (2004), "Communitisation and Resurgence of Naga Social Capital: Impact Assessment of Public Institutions and Services in Nagaland", ODEC, Chennai.
    ${ }^{6}$ Mehta, Arun C (2008), "Elementary Education in India: Progress towards UEE", NUEPA, New Delhi.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Fluent readers are defined as those who can read the Std. 2 level text.
    ${ }^{3}$ In the absence of income, the type of house is a good proxy for affluence.
    ${ }^{4}$ In 2007, ASER collected information on facilities in government primary schools. The survey also identified children who went to the surveyed schools allowing us to investigate the link (if any) between school facilities and learning. However, since only government schools were visited, any analysis exploring the correlation between school infrastructure and learning outcomes could not explore this relationship in private schools.
    ${ }^{5}$ The model was a linear probability model with state fixed effects estimated for the 20 major states. To account for differences in schools across states, state fixed effects were interacted with the school type variable.
    ${ }^{6}$ Type of school was also interacted with the class the child was in to take into account differences in classes across schools.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ In the ASER 2008 sample of over 16,000 villages, only about $39 \%$ had a government secondary school. There was a fair amount of variation in this number across states - only $18 \%$ of UP villages had a government secondary school compared to $85 \%$ of Kerala villages.
    ${ }^{8}$ University of Maryland and NCAER have recently collected information on children's schooling and learning with a nationally representative household sample.

[^5]:    * Dr. Suman Bhattacharjea is Director, ASER Centre.

[^6]:    * Dr. Wilima Wadhwa is Director, ASER Centre.
    ${ }^{1}$ Out of school estimates which use the entire sample fluctuate much less across years at the district level.
    ${ }^{2}$ For more details on why a household based sample was chosen see the note on Sample Design in the Appendix.
    ${ }^{3}$ A complete listing of children in the village would be required to sample a pre-defined distribution of children. See the appendix for more details.

[^7]:    * Arunachal Pradesh data avaliable for 10 out of 13 districts. Gujarat data avaliable for 25 out of 26 districts. Jharkhand data avaliable for 17 out of 22 districts. Kerala data avaliable for 12 out of 14 districts. Nagaland data avaliable for 10 out of 11 districts. Uttrakhand data avaliable for 9 out of 13 districts.
    $\dagger$ Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram state pages not included because of insufficient data at the state level.

[^8]:    *In 2008, ASER was not conducted in Supaul and Madhepura due to the floods.

[^9]:    * Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

[^10]:    * Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

[^11]:    * Dr. Wilima Wadhwa is Director, ASER Centre.
    ${ }^{1}$ For the rural sector we can use the estimates from ASER 2007 to get an idea of the incidence in the population.
    ${ }_{2}$ Stratification is discussed below.
    ${ }^{3}$ The sample size with absolute precision is given by $\frac{z^{2} p q}{d^{2}} \quad$ where $z$ is the standard normal deviate corresponding to $95 \%$ probability ( $=1.96$ ), $p$ is the incidence in the population ( 0.5 ),
    $q=(1-p)$ and $d$ is the degree of precision required ( 0.05 ).
    ${ }^{4}$ The sample size with relative precision is given by $\frac{z^{2} q}{r^{2} p}$ where $z$ is the standard normal deviate corresponding to $95 \%$ probability ( $=1.96$ ), $p$ is the incidence in the population ( 0.5 ),
    $q=(1-p)$ and $r$ is the degree of relative precision required (0.1).

[^12]:    ${ }^{5}$ Sample size calculations assume simple random sampling. However, simple random sampling is unlikely to be the method of choice in an actual field survey. Therefore, often a "design effect" is added to the sample size. A design effect of 2 would double the sample size. At the district level a $7 \%$ precision along with a $95 \%$ confidence level would imply a sample size of 196 , giving us a design effect of approximately two.
    ${ }^{6}$ Of these 30 villages, 10 are from ASER 2006, 10 from ASER 2007 and 10 are newly selected in 2008. They were selected randomly from the same sample frame. The 10 new villages are picked as an independent sample.
    ${ }^{7}$ Probability proportional to size (PPS) is a sampling technique in which the probability of selecting a sampling unit (village, in our case) is proportional to the size of its population. The method works as follows: First, the cumulative population by village calculated. Second, the total household population of the district is divided by the number of sampling units (villages) to get the sampling interval (SI). Third, a random number between 1 and the SI is chosen. This is referred to as the random s
    tart (RS). The RS denotes the site of the first village to be selected from the cumulated population. Fourth, the following series of numbers is formed: RS; RS+SI; RS+2SI; RS+3SI; .... The villages selected are those for which the cumulative population, contains the numbers in the series.
    ${ }^{8}$ Most large household surveys in India, like the National Sample Survey and the National Family Health Survey also use this two stage design and use PPS to select villages in the first stage.

[^13]:    
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