## Chapter- 6

## DISCUSSION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

## 6.1: Perspectives of the Principals:

This part of the study deals with the background and perspective of the principal towards their educational institute, the administrative measures practiced and problems encountered in the school, their achievements and lacunas, and their perspective towards a possible solution. The chapter covers detail in-depth information about the principal in the respective school to understands their perception towards education as an institution as a whole.

For the present study, every principal is interviewed from every six schools. The data is collected from 3 male (50\%) and 3 female principals (50\%).

Table 6.1: Age group of the Respondents:

| The age group of the <br> Respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $40-49$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| $50-59$ | 4 | 66.7 |
| $60-69$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) are from the 55-59 age group followed by 60-69 (26.7\%) and 40-49 age group (20\%).

Hence the majority of the respondents are at the end of their teaching carrier, followed by old faculties ( $16.7 \%$ ) who are in their later age and as many as $16.7 \%$ of the teachers interviewed are in their initial period of teaching carrier as a principal.

Table 6.2: Religion of the respondents

| Religion | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hindu | 5 | 83.3 |
| Christian | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents practice Hindu religion (83.3\%) which is followed by the Christian religion (16.7\%)

Hence the data reveals that the majority of the principals who are interviewed are from the Hindu religion.

Table 6.3: Teaching experience of the Respondents

| ` Teaching experience of the respondents (in years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $11-20$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| $21-30$ | 2 | 33.3 |
| $31-40$ | 3 | 50.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that half of the respondents (50\%) have 31-40 years of experience, followed by the respondents ( $33.3 \%$ ) who have 21-30 years, and the rest ( $16.7 \%$ ) have 1120 years of experience

Hence the respondents are having diverse levels of working experiences, which says that the principals of the schools are a mix blend of young and experienced faculties.

Table 6.4: Relation of teaching experience of respondents with the category of school

| Total-experience in teaching <br> profession of Principals (in years) | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $11-20$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $21-30$ | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| $31-40$ | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: FieldworkThe data shows that most of the respondents who have 31-40 years’ experience are all from government schools.

Hence, the majority of the experienced principals prefer government schools which show that it is more secure than private schools.

The average teaching experience of a private school principal is 23 years and public school is 31 years.

Table 6.5: Working experience of the respondents as principal

| Working experience of the respondents as <br> principal (in years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 4 | 66.7 |
| $6-10$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| $16-20$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) are having 1-5 years' experience followed by 6-10 years, and 16-20 years' experience ( $16.7 \%$ ) respectively.

Hence, we can say that majority of the respondents working as a principal not more than 5 years followed by $16.7 \%$ between the 6 to 10 years and 16 to 20 years of experience as a principal respectively.

The data reveals that all of the principals of different institutions have B.Ed. degree.
Hence all of them are professionally trained to teach the students. Moreover, all of them have also attended leadership development programs.

Table 6.6: Experience in the leadership development program

| Experience in leadership <br> development program (in Years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 4 | 66.6 |
| $3-4$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| $9-10$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the highest number of respondents (66.6\%) have 1-2 years of experience, followed by the respondents ( $16.7 \%$ each) having 3-4 and 9-10 years of experience.

Hence the majority of the respondents are having up to two years of leadership development program experience.

Table 6.7: Number of school management program attended by the respondents

| Number of school management program attended <br> by the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 3 | 50.0 |
| $3-4$ | 2 | 33.3 |
| $7-8$ | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Though the data reveals that all of the principals of different institutions have attended school management programs, but there is significant variance in the data which reveals
that half of them ( $50 \%$ ) have 1-2 years of experience, followed by the respondents $33.3 \%$ have 3-4 years.

Hence the respondents are having a diverse level of school management experiences, which says that the principals of the schools are a mix blend of experience in attending school management programs.

Table 6.8: Number of professional development program attended by the respondents

| No. of professional development program <br> attended by the respondents (in years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 4 | 66.7 |
| above 8 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that all the principals of different institutions have attended a professional development program. The data also reveals that more than half of the respondents (66.7 $\%$ ) have 1-2 years of experience, followed by the respondents (33.3\%) who have above 8 years' experience.

Hence we can conclude that more than half of the principals have only 1-2 years' experience of attending a professional development program.

## The intake capacity of the schools

The data reveals that all the six schools have the intake capacity in every year up to 550 students in the higher secondary level. And the data also reveals that all the six schools use to accept not more than 600 applications every year.

Table 6.9: Criteria used by the schools for the selection of the students

| Criteria of selection of the students | First <br> come <br> First <br> Serve |  | Interview of the students |  | students Living in The Immediate Vicinity |  | The Linguistic Background of the students |  | Caste <br> category of the students |  | Financial Backgrou nd of the students |  | Parents/ Guardians interview |  | The written test of the students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Yes | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 4 | 66.7 |
| No | 4 | 66.7 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 5 | 83.3 | 5 | 83.3 | 5 | 83.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Total | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that the majority of the schools give preference to students living in the immediate vicinity of the school (66.7\%), followed by parents/guardians' interviews to select a student in their school.

Table 6.10: Relation of First cum first serve criterion with the category of school

| First Cum First Serve | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| No | 3 | 1 | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table confirms that first come first serve as a criterion of selection is preferred by government schools. But Rajdhar Borah H.S School is not practicing the method as the principal reported that to maintain the quality of the school minimum level of quality of the students needs to be maintained. Hence, they practice entrance test/ scrutiny of the credentials of the students to finalize the shortlisted students.

Hence, the majority of the government schools are not opting for a difficult and long process in selecting students in their school and practice, the criterion for selection of students are decided by the school management rather than following any uniform
government rule which directs all government school to admit students of any category as emphasized in the right to Education Act.

Table 6.11: Relation of Children living in the immediate vicinity with the category of school

| Children living in the <br> immediate vicinity | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table confirms that children living in the immediate vicinity of the school as a criterion of selection are preferred in both government and private schools.

Table 6.12: Relation of Parent /Guardian interview with the category of school

| Parent/ guardian's interview | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| No | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | 3 | 6 |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table confirms that parents' / guardian's interview as criteria of selection is preferred by private schools.

Hence, private schools are taking more cautions to find out even the background of the parents and guardians which play a significant role in the performance of the students.

Table 6.13: Criteria practiced in the schools for the selection of teachers

| Criteria for selection of teachers | HighEducationalQualification |  | Teaching Experience |  | Religi on |  | Family Status |  | Moral <br> Charac ter |  | Fluency In <br> English |  | Persona lity Factors |  | Profession <br> al <br> Training |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Very imp | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Important | 4 | 66.7 | 4 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Average imp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very little imp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not important | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not applicable | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Total | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data indicates that the majority of the schools give preference to educational qualification ( $66.7 \%$ ) of the teachers, followed by teaching experience ( $66.7 \%$ ), fluency in English (50.0\%), personality factor (50.0\%), in selecting a teacher in their school.

Table 6.14: Relation of the criterion of High Educational qualification with the category of school

| High Educational qualification | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Very important | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Important | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The data shows that educational qualification as a criterion of selection of teachers is preferred by both government and private schools.

Table 6.15: Relation of teaching experience with the category of school

| Teaching experience | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Very important | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Important | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 1 | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that teaching experience as a criterion of selection is preferred by private schools over government schools.

Table 6.16: Relation of fluency in English with the category of school

| Fluency in English | School |  | $*$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Very important | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Important | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that fluency in English as a criterion of selection is preferred by private schools over government schools.

Table 6.17: Relation of personality factors with the category of school

| Personality factors | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Very important | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Important | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that personality factors as criteria of selection are preferred by private schools over government schools.

Table 6.18: Practice of free ship/ concession

| The practice of free ship/ concession | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concession | 4 | 66.7 |
| Both free ship and concession | 2 | 33.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The data reveals that most of the respondents (66.7 \%) have the facility of concession in their school followed by both free ship and concession

Hence the majority of the schools have these provisions of concession and free ship.
Table 6.19: Person deciding for failing students in the school

| The person deciding to fail students in the school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Only by the class teacher | 5 | 83.3 |
| By the class teacher but reviewed by the principal | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $83.3 \% \%$ ) reported that the decision regarding passing or failing the students of the class is taken only by the class teacher followed by the $16.7 \%$ schools where the decision is taken by the class teacher but reviewed by the principal.

Hence in most of the schools, the students' performance evaluation is left to the teachers only.

Table 6.20: Factor considered for reviewing the failure of students by Principal

| Factor considered for reviewing the failure of students by Principal | The Health of the student |  | The Yearround performan ce of the student |  | The Home Circumstan ces of the student |  | Any Other Considerat ion |  | Not applicable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Yes | 4 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 83.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 |
| No | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 100 | 1 | 16.7 | 4 | 66.7 | 6 | 100 |
| Total | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100.0 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table reveals that while reviewing the cases of failure of students in a class principal generally considers the home circumstances of the child (83.3\%) and the health of the child (66.7\%).

Table 6.21: Relation of the home circumstances as a factor considered for reviewing the failure of students with the category of school

| The home circumstances of <br> the child | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| No | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table reveals that the principal generally considers the home circumstances of the child while reviewing the cases of failure of students in a class in both private and government schools.

Table 6.22: Relation of the health of the students as a factor considered for reviewing the failure with the category of school

| The health of the child | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that the principal generally also considers the health of the child while reviewing the cases of failure of students in a class in both private and government schools.

Table 6.23: Instances of large no. of students failing in class

| Instances of large no of students failing in class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| An occasional occurrence in school | 3 | 50.0 |
| Never occurs in your school | 3 | 50.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that a large number of students failing is either never occurred (50.0\%) or occasionally happened (50.0\%) in their school.

Hence failing a large number of students is a rarity in the majority of the schools.
Table 6.24: Responsibility of failure of students

| Responsibility of <br> failure of students | The <br> Capabilit <br> ies of the <br> Child |  | Lack Of <br> Interest <br> On The <br> Part Of <br> Parents | Lack Of <br> Interest <br> On The <br> Part Of <br> Teachers | The poor <br> economic <br> status of <br> the <br> student | Bad Peer <br> Group of <br> The <br> Students |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Strongly agree | 0 | 0 | 4 | 66.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Agree | 6 | 100 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 66.7 |
| Neither agree or <br> disagree | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Strongly disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table reveals that the majority of the principals believe that the responsibility of the failure of the students is mostly because of the lack of interest among the parents
towards their children's education ( $66.7 \%$ who strongly agree with it), followed by the poor level of capabilities of the children ( $100.0 \%$ who agree with it).

Table 6.25: Relation of Lack of interest on the part of parents as the reason for the failure of students with the category of school

| Lack of interest on the part of parents <br> as the reason for the failure of students | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Strongly agree | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Agree | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Neither agree or disagree | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Total | 3 | 3 | 6 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that principals from both the government and private schools mostly believe that a lack of interest in the parents is the reason for the failure of the students.

The data also confirms that all the principals from both the government and private schools believe in the capacities of the child as the reason for the failure of the students.

Table 6.26: Frequency of activities performed in the school

| Frequency of activities performed in the school | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sport } \\ \text { Activit } \\ \text { ies } \end{gathered}$ |  | Elocut <br> ion <br> decla <br> mation <br> Poetry <br> Comp <br> etition <br> s |  | Plays /Skits |  | Music |  | Quizzes |  | Essay <br> Compet <br> itions |  | Writing Compet itions |  | Art / <br> Exhib <br> itions |  | Science <br> Exhibit ions |  | School Schola rship Test |  | Olym piads |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Bi weekly | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weekly | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Monthly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Once a term | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Yearly | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 33.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not at all | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 66.7 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Total | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that according to the respondents in their school sports activities are mostly held ( $66.7 \%$ ) yearly, Elocution declamation poetry competitions mostly held monthly and once a term and yearly ( $33.3 \%$ each), play and skit are mostly held in yearly ( $50 \%$ ) and once a term ( $33.3 \%$ ), music mostly held monthly ( $33.3 \%$ ), quizzes mostly held yearly $(50 \%)$, essay competition mostly held yearly and monthly ( $33.3 \%$ each), writing competition mostly held yearly ( $50.0 \%$ ) and monthly ( $33.3 \%$ ), art/ exhibition mostly held monthly( $33.3 \%$ ), science exhibition mostly held yearly (50.0\%), and Olympiad mostly held yearly (50.0\%) and monthly (33.3\%).

Hence, sports activities, Elocution declamation Poetry Competitions, Plays /Skits, music, quizzes, essay competition, writing competition, art exhibition, science exhibition, school scholarship test, and Olympiad mostly held yearly.

Table 6.27: Level of performance by the students

| Level of performanc e by the students | Studies |  | Sports |  | Plays |  | Elocuti ons |  | Music |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Discipl } \\ \text { ine } \end{gathered}$ |  | Teachi ng staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Excellent | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Good | 4 | 66.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 4 | 66.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 5 | 83.3 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Average | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that all the schools are getting trophies and awards in studies, sports, extra-curricular activities, exemplary conduct, and Olympiads.

The data also shows that majority of the principals believes that their school performing excellently in the quality of teaching staff and music ( $50 \%$ each), followed by good performance in the discipline (83.3\%), studies (66.7\%), plays (66.7\%), sports (50\%).

Table 6.28: Relation of teaching staff between government and private schools

| Teaching staff | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Good | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The above data clearly shows that teaching staff who are performing excellent are all from private schools. And all the principals of government schools are finding their teaching staff only good.

Table 6.29: Relation of music with the category of school

| Music | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Good | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Average | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data clearly shows that in the category of music, students who are performing excellent are mostly from private schools.

And the principals of government schools are finding their performance in music either good or average.

Table 6.30: Relation of discipline with the category of school

| Discipline | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Public |  |
| Excellent | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Good | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data shows that majority of the principals of both private and government schools are satisfied with the status of discipline in their respective schools.

Table 6.31: Relation of studies between government and private schools

| Studies | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Good | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data shows that the majority of the principals of private schools find the performance of the student's studies excellent. And the principals of government schools are finding their performance of students in studies only good

Table 6.32: Relation of sports with the category of school

| Sports | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| No of prizes/awards | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Both | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Not applicable | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data shows that majority of the principals of both private and government schools are satisfied with the performance of students in sports in their respective schools.

Hence, we can comprehend now that the data is collected from 3 male and 3 female principals. All the respondents are having at least a post-graduation degree together with B.Ed. and one of the private English medium school's respondents is having a Ph.D. together with B.Ed. The respondents are having a diverse level of working experience, which says that the principals of the schools are a mix blend of young and experienced faculties. Majority of the respondents working as a principal not more than 5 years followed by $16.7 \%$ who are working between 6 to 10 years and 16 to 20 years of
experience as a principal respectively. The majority of the experience principals prefer government schools which shows that it is more secured than the private school. All of them are professionally trained to teach the students with B.Ed qualification. Moreover, all of them have also attended leadership development programs. The respondents are also having a diverse level of leadership development experiences, which says that the principals of the schools are a mix blend of experience in attending leadership development program. The respondents are having a diverse level of school management experiences, which says that the principals of the schools are a mix amalgam of experience in attending school management programed. Most of the respondents practice Hindu religion (83.3.3 \%), followed by Christianity (16.7\%).

When asked about the infrastructure and the status of education in the school, the respondent's response is recorded which holds that all the six schools have the intake capacity every year up to 500 students in the higher secondary level. The majority of the schools give preference to students living near the school (66.7\%), followed by parents/guardians' interviews to select a student in their school. First come first serve as a criterion of selection is preferred by government schools. Hence, the majority of the government schools are not opting for a difficult and long process in selecting students in their school. Parent /guardians interview as criteria of selection is preferred by private schools. Hence, private schools are taking more caution to find out even the background of the parents and guardians which play a significant role in the performance of the students.

The majority of the schools give preference to educational qualification (66.7\%), teaching experience ( $66.7 \%$ ), fluency in speaking the English language (50.0\%), personality factor $(50.0 \%)$, in selecting a teacher in their school. The data shows that educational qualification as a criterion of selection of teachers is preferred by both government and private schools. The data reveals that teaching experience as a criterion of selection is preferred by private schools over government schools. The data reveals that fluency in

English, personality factors, as criteria of selection are preferred by private schools over government schools. Hence private schools are following more criteria to select a teacher in their school.

The majority of the schools have the provisions of concession and free ship. And in most of the schools, the students' performance evaluation is left to the teachers only, moreover, while reviewing the cases of failure of students in a class the principal generally considers the home circumstances of the child ( $83.3 \%$ ) and the health of the child ( $66.7 \%$ ). Failing of a large number of students is a rarity in the majority of the schools. Principals from both the government and private schools mostly believe that lack of interest of the parents as the reason for the failure of the students.

Analyzing the research findings, it can be understood that students are generally of lower socioeconomic origin and the cause of student failure is generally attributed to the family, student, school, and the education system despite their diversity. According to the students' opinions, prominent causes of failure in the context of the family are students' lack of academic support from their families and lack of an appropriate physical environment for studying. Similarly, teachers also specified causes such as low socioeconomic level of the family, fragmented family structure, and lack of importance attached to education as a part of this failure puzzle. According to field literature, education is a complex process that relies on the mutual interaction of many factors. In this respect, failure in education can be regarded as the common representative of elements that allow the production of education service. However, a family is shown as possibly the most important among these parts. It is stated that the socio-economic level of the family affects student achievement and strengthen the effect of education. It is observed that student's success in tests increases as the socio-economic level of family increases (Davis-Kean, 2005; Gelbal, 2008; Konstantopoulos, 2006; Köse, 2007; PISA 2009).

The data shows that majority of the schools are getting trophies and awards in studies, sports, extra-curricular activities, exemplary conduct, and Olympiads which are held yearly.

The data shows that the majority of the principals believe that their school is performing excellently in the quality of teaching staff and music, followed by good performance in discipline, studies, plays, sports. In the category of music, student's studies, students who are performing excellently are mostly from private schools and in government schools, it is just good or average. The majority of the principals of both private and government schools are satisfied with the status of discipline and performance of students in sports in their respective schools. The data clearly shows that teaching staff that is performing excellent are all from private schools. And all the principals of government schools are finding their teaching staff only good.

The response of the principals on the reasons for the performance in both academics and extracurricular activities in government schools is mostly restricted to the role played by the teachers and the process of teaching that is practiced in the school as far as their performance in extracurricular activities, the principals mostly find the role of sports teacher as the imperative cause behind that. In the case of private schools, the principals give the credit to good administration, robust teaching methods, the role played by teachers and students together with parents. Hence private schools are better understanding the importance of the involvement of different agents for the success of a student.

The government schools highlighted their main objectives to produce an ideal citizen by proper supervision and monitoring involving teachers for their all-round development. But the private schools focus more on equipping the students with human and social values, to master the children in their social, intellectual, moral growth so that they can be socially, physically, professionally, spiritually, and economically fit and strong.

## 6.2: Perspectives of the Teachers:

The present part of the study deals with the background, responsibilities undertaken by them, the perspective of the teacher towards their educational institute, their perspective towards the achievements and lacunas of the institution, and their perspective towards a possible solution. The chapter covers a detailed in-depth study of the role that the teachers are playing in the respective school to understands their perception towards education as an institution as a whole.

For the present study 5 teachers are interviewed from every six schools that are selected by following convenient sampling. The data is collected from 20 females ( $66.7 \%$ ) and 10 male teachers ( $33.3 \%$ ).

Table: 6.33: Age of the respondents

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-34$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| $35-49$ | 16 | 53.3 |
| $50-60$ | 8 | 26.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (53.3\%) are from the 35-49 age group followed by 50-60 (26.7\%) and 25-34 age group (20\%).

Hence more than half of the respondents are in the middle of their teaching carrier, followed by old faculties ( $26.7 \%$ ) who are in their later age and as many as $20 \%$ of the teachers interviewed are young ones in their initial period of teaching carrier.

Table 6.34: Religion of the respondents

| Religion | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hindu | 28 | 93.3 |
| Islam | 1 | 3.3 |
| Jainism | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents practice Hindu religion (93.3 \%) , followed by Islam and Jainism religion (3.3\% each)

Hence though the sample is too small to generalize, the data reveals that an insignificant majority of the school's teachers from Hindu religion are working which may be an indicator of the preference of the employers or the poor status of education of the other religion in the area or the demographic composition of the population.

Table 6.35: Educational qualification of the respondents

| Educational qualification of the Teachers | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduation+ B.Ed. | 1 | 3.3 |
| PG + B.Ed. | 15 | 50.0 |
| PG + B.Ed.+ PhD | 3 | 10.0 |
| Graduation / PG | 11 | 36.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table shows that half of the respondents have both PG and Bed degree, followed by the respondents who have the only graduation.

Hence the data reveals that a significant number of the teachers (36.7\%) are not trained to teach in the schools studied which in an alarming situation.

Table 6.36: Level of Formal teacher training taken by the teachers

| Level of Formal teacher training taken by the teachers | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B.Ed. | 20 | 66.7 |
| M.Ed. | 1 | 3.3 |
| None | 9 | 30.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above-mentioned table reveals that the majority of the respondents have B.Ed. degree (66.7\%).

Thus, it can be observed that though a majority of the teachers are professionally trained to teach the students, yet a significant number (30\%) are still to be trained up professionally which may yield a significant difference in the outcome.

Table 6.37: Relation of the level of formal teacher training with the category of school teachers

| Level of formal teacher <br> training | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| B. Ed | 12 | 8 | 1 |
| M. Ed | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| None | 2 | 7 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |

Source: Fieldwork
The data further reveals that out of the teachers who are not trained the majority of them are working in government schools which also reveals the status of education provided by them in these schools.

Table 6.38: Total teaching experience of the respondents

| Total teaching experience | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $6-10$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| $11-15$ | 8 | 26.7 |
| $16-20$ | 2 | 6.7 |
| $21-25$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $26-30$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $31-35$ | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that more respondents $(26.7 \%)$ are having 11-15 years of experience, followed by the respondents who have 1-5, 16-20, and 26-30 (16.7\% each) years of experience respectively.

Hence the respondents are having a diverse level of working experience, which says that the teachers of the schools are a mix blend of young and experienced faculties.

Table 6.39: Relation of total teaching experience of the respondents with the category of school

| Total teaching experience | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Government |  |
| $1-5$ | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| $6-10$ | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| $11-15$ | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| $16-20$ | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| $21-25$ | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| $26-30$ | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| $31-35$ | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The above data shows that most of the experienced teachers are working in government schools whereas most of the private school's teachers are not experienced. Hence it shows that teachers find the government schools more attractive as it is more secured than the private schools.

Table 6.40: Experience of the respondents in the present school

| Experience of the respondents in <br> the present school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| $6-10$ | 9 | 30.0 |
| $11-15$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $16-20$ | 2 | 6.7 |
| $21-25$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $26-30$ | 2 | 6.7 |
| $31-35$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (30\%) are from 6-10 years' experience group followed by 1-5 ( $20 \%$ ) and, 11-15, and 21-25 years' experience group (16.7\%) respectively.

Hence, again a diverse level of working experiences can be seen, which mean that the teachers of the schools are a mix blend of young and experienced faculties but in government, schools are preferred by the experienced faculties than the private schools which are used by the fresher as a ladder for their growth.

Table 6.41: Nature of the teacher

| Nature of the teacher | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class teacher | 11 | 36.7 |
| Subject teacher | 19 | 63.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (63.3\%) are subject teachers and $36.7 \%$ are class teachers.

Table 6.42: Relation between gender and the number of students in the class

| Number of the students | Boys |  | Girls |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| $1-10$ | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13.3 | 4 | 6.7 |
| $11-20$ | 12 | 40.0 | 13 | 43.4 | 21 | 42 |
| $21-30$ | 9 | 30.0 | 6 | 20.0 | 15 | 25 |
| $31-40$ | 5 | 16.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 6 | 10 |
| $41-50$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 3.3 |
| above 50 | 4 | 13.3 | 4 | 13.3 | 8 | 13 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | 100 |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that the majority of the schools have 11-20 (42\%) and 21-30 (25\%) students in the class and a similar trend is observed in enrollment of students of both the sex.

Table 6.43: Perspective towards the overall quality of the students

| Perspective towards the overall quality of the students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Above average | 6 | 20.0 |
| Average | 24 | 80.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The data reveals that $80 \%$ of the respondents consider their students as average followed by $20 \%$ of the respondents who find their students above average.

When we compare the private and government teachers' perceptions towards their students, it shows that the private teachers are comparatively more satisfied ( $66.7 \%$ ) with their students than the government teachers (46.6\%).

Hence the majority of the teachers are not satisfied with the overall quality of the students in their school.

Table 6.44: System of seating arrangement used for students in the class by the respondents

| System of seating arrangement used for <br> students in the class by the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed s arrangement | 16 | 53.3 |
| Flexible arrangement | 14 | 46.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

## Source: Fieldwork

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (53.3\%) responded that the student's sitting arrangement is fixed whereas the rest $(46.7 \%)$ responded that it is flexible.

Table 6.45: Relation of Criteria of allocating children's place with the category of school

| System of seating arrangement <br> used for students | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Fixed s arrangement | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Flexible arrangement | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the private schools prefer to have a fixed sitting arrangement for the students whereas the majority of the government schools give a flexible choice of sitting arrangement to students.

Table 6.46: Person responsible for the sitting arrangements of students

| The person responsible for the sitting <br> arrangements of students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The children themselves | 7 | 23.3 |
| The teacher | 7 | 23.3 |
| The children decide where to sit subject to <br> the teacher's approval | 2 | 6.7 |
| Not applicable | 14 | 46.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that half of the respondents who are availing flexible sitting arrangements reported that it is executed by the teacher and the children themselves respectively ( $23.3 \%$ each).

Hence though government schools are more following flexible sitting arrangements for the students, it is not always executed by the teachers or management but just a free choice to the students is given where they can sit anywhere, they want which is mutually accepted by the students.

Moreover, the data also shows that the advantage of flexible sitting arrangements which is suggested by many works of literature is also not availed by private schools.

The physical arrangement of the classroom has the potential to impacts on student behavior, their attention to the task at hand and there is evidence to suggest that it impacts on achievement as well (Daniels, 1998; Pace and Price, 2005; Granstrom,1996; Espey; 2008)

Table 6.47: Share of students involved in talking in the class

| Share of students <br> involved in talking <br> in the class | When a teacher is on <br> the blackboard |  | During lesson |  | During class <br> work |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P |
| All of them | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Most of them | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Some of them | 10 | 33.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 11 | 36.7 |
| Very few of them | 15 | 50.0 | 13 | 43.3 | 5 | 16.7 |
| None | 4 | 13.3 | 13 | 43.3 | 11 | 36.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that most of the students are comparatively disciplined in all the schools as the majority of the teachers ( $50 \%$ ) find few of the students speaking when the teacher is on the blackboard and during the lesson (43.3\%). Moreover, some of the students are also noticed by teachers (36.7\%) to be speaking during classwork.

Hence overall the perception of the teachers towards the students' engagement in creating an undisciplined environment in the class by speaking in the class is lesser.

Table 6.48: Number of students who are talkative in the class

| Number of talkative students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 21 | 70.0 |
| $6-10$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| $11-15$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| Most of them | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that in all schools at least 1 to 5 students in a class who are mostly talkative ( $70 \%$ ) followed by 6-10 students who are also talkative ( $20 \%$ ).

Hence the majority of the students are not talkative in the class.

Table 6.49: Academic performance of the talkative students

| Academic performance of the talkative <br> students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Above average | 3 | 10.0 |
| Average | 6 | 20.0 |
| Below average | 21 | 80.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals most of the talkative children are generally the below-average students ( $80 \%$ ) followed by average students.

Table 6.50: Nature of disciplinary problems in the school

| Nature of disciplinary problems in the school | Irregular Attendance |  | Homewo rk not done |  | Forgetting books |  | Use of abusive language |  | Physical violence |  | Lackofcleanliness |  | Theft |  | Cheating |  | Truancy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| All | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Most | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Some | 8 | 26.7 | 18 | 60.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Very few | 20 | 66.7 | 10 | 33.3 | 13 | 43.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 13 | 43.3 | 13 | 43.3 |
| None | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 22 | 73.3 | 21 | 70.0 | 12 | 40.0 | 24 | 80.0 | 14 | 46.7 | 14 | 46.7 |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |

## Source: Fieldwork

The data shows that most of the teachers find incomplete homework, irregular attendance, and forgetting books as the major disciplinary issues the students are suffering from in their class, whereas problems of theft, physical violence use of abusive language, and cheating are very rarely found among the students.

Hence the study confirms that most of the time though there is hardly any problem faced from the students' part, but among the majority of the problem of them are not of much grave nature which demands special attention.

Table 6.51: Disciplinary measures taken for disruptive behavior

| Disciplinary measures are taken for disruptive behavior | Stern look |  | Reasonin g with child |  | Pulling ears/slap ping |  | Kneel down /stand up |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Repeate } \\ \text { dly } \\ \text { writing } \end{gathered}$ |  | Sending out from the room |  | Isolating them |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Send to } \\ \text { the } \\ \text { principal } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Send } \\ \text { notes to } \\ \text { parents } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Most often | 10 | 33.3 | 12 | 40.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 3 | 10.0 |
| Sometimes | 9 | 30.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 2 | 6.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 8 | 26.7 |
| Rarely | 4 | 13.3 | 6 | 20.0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 30.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 8 | 26.7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40.0 | 12 | 40.0 |
| Never | 7 | 23.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 30 | 100.0 | 20 | 66.7 | 20 | 66.7 | 20 | 66.7 | 26 | 86.7 | 8 | 26.7 | 7 | 23.3 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Fieldwork
The table confirms that the majority of the teachers use reasoning and stern look to tackle disruptive behavior. Whereas occasionally teachers also send the students to the principal, send notes to their parents and punish them to kneel down. A significant number of teachers do not use any disciplinary measures for disruptive behavior.

When we look at the private and government school teachers' comparison we can see that there is no significant difference in the way the teachers react to these cases of indiscipline in the class.

Table 6.52: Prevalence of the practice of monitor in the class

| The practice of monitor in the class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 23 | 76.7 |
| No | 7 | 23.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents responded that (76.7\%) schools have class captain or monitor followed by (23.3\%) classes does not have any class captain.

Table 6.53: Relation of the prevalence of the practice of monitor in the class with the category of school

| Prevalence of the practice of <br> monitor in the class | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 14 | 9 | 7 |
| No | 1 | 6 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 23 |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that out of the majority of the schools that are not having monitors in the class are mostly from government schools.

Table 6.54: Mode of selection of class monitors

| Mode of selection of class monitors | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected by the teacher | 15 | 50.0 |
| Nominated and elected by the students themselves | 2 | 6.7 |
| Nominated by the teacher and elected by the students | 8 | 26.7 |
| Not applicable | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table shows that half of the respondents responded that class captains are selected by the teachers, followed by the respondents responded that they are nominated by the teachers and selected by the students.

Table 6.55: Qualities of the students used while selecting leaders by the teachers

| Qualities of the <br> students used <br> while selecting <br> leaders | Bright <br> students |  | Communi <br> cative <br> abilities | Enthusias <br> tic <br> students | Who <br> controls the <br> class | The <br> trouble <br> makers/ <br> bulbul |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Yes | 7 | 23.3 | 21 | 70.0 | 13 | 43.3 | 19 | 63.3 | 4 | 13.3 |
| No | 23 | 76.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 17 | 56.7 | 11 | 36.7 | 26 | 86.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table reveals that the majority of the respondents (70.0\%) preferred communicative ability in students in selecting leaders which are followed by those (63.3\%) who favored students who can control the class and $23.3 \%$ responses are in the favor of bright students.

Hence the majority of the teachers see leaders in students having qualities of communication, controlling abilities, and intellectual capabilities.

Table 6.56: Getting time daily during the working time in school by the respondents

| Getting time daily during the session | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 17 | 56.7 |
| No | 13 | 43.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (56.7\%) responded that they find some time daily during the working time in the school, followed by $43.3 \%$ who responded that they do not get any time.

Table 6.57: Relation of getting time daily during the working time in school by the respondents with the category of school

| Getting time daily during the <br> session | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 5 | 12 | 13 |
| No | 10 | 3 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the private school teachers reported that their working hours in the school are too hectic whereas the majority of the government schools' teachers reported that they get time during their working hours in the school.

Table 6.58: Getting time in the week to spend with students by the respondents

| Getting time in the week to spend with students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 25 | 83.3 |
| No | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents ( $83.3 \%$ ) responded that they used to get some time in the week for the students. And a similar trend can be seen among the teachers of both private and government schools.

Table 6.59: Getting some time for students before school starts

| Getting some time for students before school <br> starts | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 10 | 33.3 |
| No | 20 | 66.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents ( $66.6 \%$ ) responded that they don't get any time to spend with the students before school starts. And the majority of the private school teachers reported that they don't get time with the students before the school starts whereas the majority of the government schools' teachers reported that they get time during this time.

Table 6.60: Getting time to spend with weak students

| Getting time to spend with weak students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 25 | 83.3 |
| No | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents $(83.3 \%)$ responded they try to get some time to spend with the students who are weak in their studies. When we look at the break up between private and government school, we can see that the teacher who could not get time for the weak students are all from private schools.

Table 6.61: Finding time to spend with students individually

| Finding time to spend with students individually | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 12 | 40.0 |
| No | 18 | 60.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (60\%) responded that they don't find time to spend with students individually.

Table 6.62: Reason for not finding time to spend with the students individually

| The response of <br> the respondents | Reason for not finding time to spend with the students <br> individually |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The syllabus to <br> be covered <br> very lengthy | Time interval <br> each period is <br> very short | Too many <br> students in <br> the class | Not applicable |  |  |  |  |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
|  | 14 | 46.7 | 20 | 66.7 | 12 | 40.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
|  | 16 | 53.3 | 10 | 33.3 | 18 | 60.0 | 29 | 96.7 |
|  | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that majority of the respondents held fewer time intervals between each period responsible for not finding time to spend with the students individually, followed by the lengthy nature of the syllabus.

Table 6.63: Relation of lengthy nature of syllabus with the category of school

| Lengthy nature of the syllabus | School |  | (otal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| No | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data shows that majority of the private school teacher finds that syllabus is too lengthy whereas most of the government school teachers find it okay.

Table 6.64: Number of students meeting the teacher when they face difficulties

| Number of students meeting the teacher <br> when they face difficulties | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All of them | 2 | 6.7 |
| Most of them | 12 | 40.0 |
| Some of them | 15 | 50.0 |
| A few of them | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that half of the respondents ( $50 \%$ ) responded that some students come to them when they have difficulties in studies; followed by ( $40 \%$ ) respondent said that most of the students come to them and $6.7 \%$ said that all of the students come to them when they have some difficulties in their studies.

Table 6.65: Coming of students to the teacher with their problem

| Coming of students to the teacher with their <br> problem | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 23 | 76.7 |
| No | 7 | 23.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (76.7\%) responded that students come to them with their problems, followed by $23.3 \%$ who reported that students don't come with such issues to them.

Hence we can say that majority of the students prefer to meet with the teacher to discuss personal issues. Teachers from both private and government institutes are preferred for discussing such issues by the students.

Table 6.66: Time when the students come to the teacher with their problems

| The time when the students come to the teacher with <br> their problems | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| During school hours | 23 | 76.6 |
| Before school starts during the races after school hours | 4 | 13.3 |
| They visit you at home | 2 | 6.7 |
| Not applicable | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (76.6\%) responded that the students visit them with their problem during the school hours, followed by (13.3\%) students come before school starts during the races after school hours.

Hence we can say that majority of the students come to the teacher with their problems during school hours.

Table 6.67: Number of students known by name by the respondent

| Number of students known by name by the <br> respondent | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 16 | 53.3 |
| Most | 10 | 33.3 |
| Some | 3 | 10.0 |
| very few | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (53.3\%) responded that they know all the students by name, followed by ( $33.3 \%$ ) of the respondents who know most of the student's names.

Hence we can say that more than half of the respondents know all the students by name followed by most of the students (33.3\%).

Table 6.68: Number of students known by family background by the teacher

| Number of students known by family <br> background by the teacher | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All of them | 3 | 10.0 |
| Most of them | 7 | 23.3 |
| Some of them | 16 | 53.4 |
| Few of them | 4 | 13.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The above data reveals that ( $53.4 \%$ ) respondents know some of the students family background followed by ( $23.3 \%$ ) most of the students family background, ( $13.3 \%$ ) responded few of the students, and (10\%) respondent said that teacher knows all of the students family backgrounds.

Hence we can conclude that majority of the respondents does not know all the students family background.

Table 6.69: Number of students asking questions during lessons in the class

| Number of <br> students asking <br> questions during <br> lessons in the class | During the class |  | After the <br> class |  | Any time <br> they feel like <br> it |  | Any other <br> time |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| All do | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Most do | 12 | 40.0 | 8 | 26.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Some do | 11 | 36.7 | 16 | 53.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 6 | 20.0 |
| A few do | 4 | 13.3 | 4 | 13.3 | 13 | 43.3 | 12 | 40.0 |
| None do | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 11 | 36.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork

The data reveals that more students ( $40 \%$ ) ask questions during class, some of the students (53\%) ask questions after the class and very few of the students ask questions any time they like it (43\%).

Hence most of the students are asking questions during the class when they get enough insights that stimulate their mind to question, which diminishes after the class is over.

Table 6.70: Perspective on the importance of asking questions by the students in the class

| Perspective on the importance of asking <br> questions by the students in the class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very important | 25 | 83.3 |
| Not important | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $83.3 \%$ ) responded that during the class asking questions by the students are very important for their clarification followed by ( $16.7 \%$ ) respondent said that asking questions during class is not important.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents give importance to asking questions in the class by the students.

Table 6.71: Feasibility of the teacher to allow children to ask question

| Feasibility of the teacher to <br> allow children to ask question | During the lesson |  | After the lesson |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P |
| Yes | 20 | 66.7 | 25 | 83.3 |
| No | 10 | 33.3 | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Fieldwork
The data shows that a significant majority of the respondents (83.3\%) think that it is feasible for the teacher to allow children to ask questions.

Hence the majority of the respondents find the problem of the feasibility of teacher, not an issue in letting students ask questions.

Table 6.72: Mode of recognizing and rewarding children who do good work

| Mode of recognizing and rewarding children who do good work | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Praising the child in the class | 24 | 80.0 |
| Making the class children applaud the students who do well | 6 | 20.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondent $(80.0 \%)$ responded that they recognize and reward students who do good work by praising them in the class followed by ( $20 \%$ ) respondents who reported that they do it by making the class children applaud the students who do well.

Hence we can say that praising the student in the class is the most popular way of recognizing and rewarding students who do good work.

Table 6.73: Measures taken against the poor performance of the child

| Measur es were taken against the poor perform | Persiste ntly coax the child to study |  | Encour age the child to do better |  | Spend some time with the child |  | Find out the negative sanction s |  | Send notes to child parents |  | Send <br> the <br> child <br> to the <br> princip <br> al |  | Write off the child as a potential failure |  | Parentteacher meet |  | Manag ement teache r meet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ance of the child | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Always | 12 | 40.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Someti mes | 6 | 20.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 11 | 36.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 4 | 13.3 | 21 | 70.0 | 11 | 36.7 |
| Rarely | 6 | 20.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 6 | 20.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 11 | 36.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 4 | 13.3 | 7 | 23.3 |
| Never | 6 | 20.0 | 3 | 10.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 19 | 63.3 | 11 | 36.7 | 10 | 33.3 | 23 | 76.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 12 | 40.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |

Source: Field Work

The above table reveals that half of the teachers always prefer to encourage the child to do better $(50 \%)$ and persistently coax the child to study ( $40 \%$ ), followed by sometimes arranging parent-teacher meet to address the problem of the poor performance of the students in the class (70\%).

Table 6.74: Frequency of taking students out of the school

| Frequency of taking students out of the school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekly | 1 | 3.3 |
| Monthly | 3 | 10.0 |
| Once a term | 16 | 53.3 |
| Never | 10 | 33.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $53.3 \%$ of the respondents responded that they take their students out of the school once in a term followed by $33.3 \%$ responded who never do it, and $10 \%$ respondents responded to have it monthly, and a similar trend can be seen in both private and government schools.

Table 6.75: Frequency of giving homework to students

| Frequency of giving homework to students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Every time you have a class with them | 17 | 56.7 |
| Any other arrangement | 13 | 43.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents $56.7 \%$ give their students homework whenever they have class followed by $43.3 \%$ responded to any other arrangement.

Though the majority of the Government schools' teachers prefer to give homework to the students every time, they have a class with them, but the private school teachers opt for both homework and other arrangements for the students of their class.

Table 6.76: Amount of the homework evaluated by the teacher

| Amount of the homework evaluated by the teacher | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All the homework is given to the students | 18 | 60.0 |
| Some of the homework given to the students | 12 | 40.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents $60.0 \%$ evaluate all the homework by themselves, followed by $40.0 \%$ who only check a part of the whole homework.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents themselves correct the homework given to the students. Moreover, most of the teachers (55.6\%) who do all the homework given to the students by themselves are from private schools whereas the government school teachers are mostly doing ( $58.3 \%$ ) some of the homework given to the students.

Table 6.77: Number of students failing in class

| Number of students failing in class | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-5$ | 24 | 80.0 |
| $6-10$ | 4 | 13.3 |
| $11-15$ | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $80 \%$ of the respondents responded that $0-5$ students fail in class every year followed by $13.3 \%$ of respondents who find 6-10 students fail every year.

Hence we can say the majority of the students in most of the respondents' class pass.
Most of the private school respondents have reported that they have no students who fail in their class, whereas though most of the respondents from government schools also reported that they have mostly $0-5$ students who fail in the class but almost all the respondents who reported $6-10$ (3 out of 4 respondents) and 11-15 (2 out of 2 respondents) students failing in their class are from a government school. Hence it speaks about the difference in the performance of the students in the classes of the two categories of schools.

Table 6.78: Number of students in your class taking private tuitions

| Number of students taking private tuitions | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None | 6 | 20.0 |
| Less than 3 | 3 | 10.0 |
| $4-6$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| $7-9$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| $10-12$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| $13-15$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| $16-18$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| More than 18 | 5 | 16.7 |
| I don't know | 4 | 13.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $20 \%$ of the respondents responded that none of the students take any tuition followed by $20 \%$ respondents who reported that $10-12$ students take tuitions, $16.7 \%$ respondent reported that more than 18 students are opting for tuition, $10 \%$ of the respondents find 10-12 students in this category.

Hence the data shows that not many students opted for extra tuitions.

Table 6.79: Relation of taking tuitions with the category of school

| Number of students taking <br> private tuitions | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| None | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| less than 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| $4-6$ | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $7-9$ | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| $10-12$ | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| $13-15$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $16-18$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| More than 18 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| I don't know | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table suggests that more students from private schools are opting for tuitions in comparison to government schools' students.

Table 6.80: Frequency of giving an assignment to children in the class

| Frequency of giving an assignment to children in <br> the class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 15 | 50.0 |
| Sometimes | 13 | 43.3 |
| Rarely | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $50 \%$ of the respondents always give assignments to children in class followed by $43.3 \%$ of respondents who give it sometimes and $6.7 \%$ rarely. And a similar trend is found among both government and private schools.
Hence we can say that class assignment is a popular means of teaching used by the respondents.

Table 6.81: Frequency of the activities performed for the class

| Frequency of the activities performed for the class | Activities performed for the class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sports/ p. t } \\ & \text { etc. } \end{aligned}$ |  | Debate/gro up discussion/ poetry |  | Plays / skits etc. |  | Music |  | Quiz |  |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Daily | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Bi weekly | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Weekly | 10 | 33.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 4 | 13.3 | 4 | 13.3 |
| Monthly | 3 | 10.0 | 6 | 20.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Once a term | 6 | 20.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Yearly | 0 | 0 | 11 | 36.7 | 11 | 36.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 9 | 30.0 |
| Not at all | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 50.0 | 13 | 43.3 | 12 | 40.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Field Work
The data here shows that sports are mostly preferred in the schools after class followed by music and quiz.

Table 6.82: Relation of playing sports activities with the category of school

| Frequency of playing sport activities | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Daily | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Bi-weekly | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Weekly | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| Monthly | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Once a term | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Not at all | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

As the majority of the respondents reported that sports are mostly preferred activity after the class in their school, the above table shows that majority of them are from private schools. Hence sports are more popular in private schools.

Table 6.83: Frequency of parent-teacher meetings in the school

| Frequency of parent-teacher meetings | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Once a month | 5 | 16.7 |
| Six monthly | 16 | 53.3 |
| Once a year | 8 | 26.7 |
| Occasionally | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

## Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (53.3\%) responded that parentteacher meetings are assigned in six monthly followed by $26.7 \%$ viewed once a year.

Hence, we can conclude that more than half of the respondents said that parent-teacher meetings are assigned six monthly.

Table 6.84: Share of parents' attendance during parent-teachers meet

| The response of the respondents | Share of parents' attendance during parent-teachers meet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Most of the parents turn up |  | Some of the parents turn up |  | Very few parents turn up |  | None of the parents turn up |  |
|  | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P |
| Yes | 19 | 63.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| No | 11 | 36.7 | 21 | 70.0 | 21 | 70.0 | 29 | 96.7 |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that according to the respondents most of the parents do attend the parent-teacher meeting. And most of the parents from private schools (63.15\%) take parent-teacher meet seriously in comparison to the government school parents.

Table 6.85: Perception of a parent-teacher meeting

| Perception towards parent-teacher meeting | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Useful | 27 | 90.0 |
| Can't say | 1 | 3.3 |
| Not so useful | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents $(90 \%)$ find the parent-teacher meeting useful followed by $6.7 \%$ of the respondent said that not so useful and $3.3 \%$ said that can't say.

Hence, we can find that majority of the respondent is in the favor of parent-teacher meeting.

Table 6.86: Perception of the number of parents shows interest in their children's studies.

| Perception towards the number of parents' <br> showing interest to their children's studies | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All the parents take an interest in their <br> children studies | 9 | 30.0 |
| Most of the parents take an interest | 12 | 40.0 |
| Some of the parents take an interest | 7 | 23.3 |
| Very few parents take an interest | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (40\%) finds most of the parents take interest in children's studies followed by $30 \%$ of the respondents who viewed that all the parents take interest in their children studies and $23.3 \%$ of the respondents reported that some of the parents take interest in children's studies.

Hence, we can say that there is a not significant difference in parent's interest in children's studies.

Table 6.87: Category wise ranking of the performance of the school compared to other schools at Guwahati

| Ranks | Categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Studies |  | Sports |  | Plays |  | Elocutio n |  | Music |  | Discipli ne |  | Teachin g staff |  |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Excellence | 13 | 43.3 | 10 | 33.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 4 | 13.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 12 | 40.0 |
| Good | 11 | 36.7 | 14 | 46.7 | 16 | 53.3 | 13 | 43.3 | 12 | 40.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 17 | 56.7 |
| Average | 6 | 20.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 7 | 23.3 | 6 | 20.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Poor | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents finds their school performing excellently in studies (43\%), teaching staff (40\%), followed by good in teaching staff (56.7\%), plays (53.3\%), discipline (50\%), sports (46.7\%).

Table 6.88: Relation of ranking in studies by the teacher with the category of school

| Ranking in Studies | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 12 | 1 | 13 |
| Good | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Average | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Source: Field Work |  |  |  |

The data in the above table establish that the private schools are doing much better than the public schools as more than ( $90 \%$ ) of the excellent performers are from private schools.

Table 6.89: Relation of ranking in sports by the teacher with the category of school

| Ranking in Sports | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Good | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Average | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Poor | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data in the above table establish that the private schools are doing much better than the public schools as more than $60 \%$ of the excellent performers are from private schools.

Table 6.90: Relation of ranking in discipline with the category of school

| Ranking in Discipline | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Good | 6 | 9 | 15 |
| Average | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data in the above table establish that the private schools are doing much better than the public schools as more than $80 \%$ of the excellent performers are from private schools.

Table 6.91: Relation of ranking in teaching staff with the category of school

| Ranking in teaching staff | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Excellent | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Good | 5 | 12 | 17 |
| Average | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data in the above table establish that the private schools are doing much better than the public schools as more than $70 \%$ of the excellent teaching staff are from private schools.

Table 6.92: Person responsible for students' failure

| Frequency | The person responsible for students' failure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | On the capacities of <br> the child | Lack of interest on <br> the part of parents | Lack of interest <br> on the part of <br> teachers |  |  |  |
|  | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | P |
|  | 10 | 33.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sometime | 16 | 53.3 | 16 | 53.3 | 5 | 16.7 |
| Rarely | 3 | 10.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 13 | 43.3 |
| Never | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 12 | 40.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Source: Field Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The data shows that most of the respondents find the capacities of the child and lack of interest on the part of parents responsible for students' failure. When we look at the breakup of the data it shows that the private schools' respondents have accused the student more of their failure whereas the government school respondents have blamed their parents more for the same. It is alarming to see that though mostly (43.3\%) occasionally but some respondents find the teachers' lack of interest responsible for the failure of the students. It is all happening in the government schools where there is no mechanism to evaluate the feedback of the students on teachers and hence, they are mostly not answerable. Moreover, unlike private schools, there are no incentives attached to the performance of the teachers in government schools, which is not consistently motivating their teachers to upgrade themselves and evaluate the utility of their teaching methods. Few of the teaching training programs are mostly reduced to rituals as there is no mechanism to evaluate its outcomes.

Table 6.93: Continuation of further study of students

| Continuation of further study of students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 27 | 90.0 |
| No | 3 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents responded that most of their students ( $90 \%$ ) are continuing their study followed by $6.7 \%$ who are not continuing.

Hence there is a significant difference in continuing study in their institutions.
After going through the findings of the teacher's perspectives we can now comprehend that the present study was conducted with 5 teachers who are selected and interviewed from every six schools who are chosen by following convenient sampling. The data is collected from 20 females ( $66.7 \%$ ) and 10 male teachers ( $33.3 \%$ ). More than half of the respondents are in the middle of their teaching carrier, followed by old faculties ( $26.7 \%$ ) who are in their later age and as many as ( $20 \%$ ) of the teachers interviewed are young ones in their initial period of teaching carrier. A significant majority of the school teachers follow the Hindu religion, which may be an indicator of the preference of the employers or the poor status of education of the other religion in the area. As far as the educational qualification of the teacher is concerned half of the respondents have both PG and Bed degree, followed by the respondents who have the only graduation. Hence, though a majority of the teachers are professionally trained to teach the students, yet, a significant number ( $30 \%$ ) are still to be trained up professionally which may yield a significant difference in the outcome. The data further reveals that out of the teachers who are not trained the majority of them are working in government schools which also reveals the status of education provided by them in these schools. The experience of the teachers shows that most of the experienced teachers are working in government schools whereas most of the private schools' teachers are not experienced. Hence it shows that teachers
find the government schools more secure than private schools. The majority of the respondents $(63.3 \%)$ are subject teachers and $(36.7 \%)$ are class teachers.

The data shows that the majority of the schools have 11-20 and 21-30 students in the class and a similar trend is observed in enrollment of students of both the sex. The data shows that government schools are heaving bigger classes than private schools. Though the majority of the teachers are not satisfied with the overall quality of the students in their school, most of the teachers from private schools find their students from average and above-average category and the majority of the students are from the below-average category according to the government school teachers.

The majority of the private schools prefer to have a fixed sitting arrangement for the students whereas the majority of the government schools give a flexible choice of sitting arrangement to students. The data reveals that half of the respondents who are availing flexible sitting arrangements reported that it is executed by the teacher and the children themselves respectively ( $23.3 \%$ each). Hence though government schools are more practicing flexible sitting arrangements for the students, it is not always executed by the teachers or management but just a free choice to the students is given where they can sit anywhere they want which is mutually accepted by the students. Moreover, the data also shows that the advantage of flexible sitting arrangements is also not availed by private schools.

Though overall the perception of the teachers towards the students' engagement in creating an undisciplined environment in the class by speaking in the class is lesser. The data shows that most of the teachers find incomplete homework, irregular attendance, and forgetting books as the major disciplinary issues the students are suffering from in their class, whereas problems of theft, physical violence use of abusive language, and cheating are very rarely found among the students. Hence the study confirms that most of the time though there is hardly any problem faced from the students' part, but among the majority of the problems of them are not of much grave nature which demands special attention.

Under the situation of breaching of discipline, the teachers mostly use reasoning and stern look to tackle disruptive behavior. Whereas occasionally teachers also send the students to the principal, send notes to their parents and punish them to kneel down. When we look at the private and government school teachers' comparison we can see that there is no significant difference in the way the teachers react to these cases of indiscipline in the class.

The data shows that out of the majority of the schools that are not having monitors in the class are mostly government schools. Moreover half of the respondents responded that class captains are selected by the teachers, followed by nominated by the teacher and selected by the student. The majority of the teachers see leaders in students having qualities of communication, controlling abilities, and intellectual capabilities.

The data reveals that the majority of the private school teachers reported that their working hours in the school is too hectic whereas the majority of the government schools' teachers reported that they get time during their working hours in the school, which is hampering particularly the private school teachers to give time for the weak students in their class.

When we look at the student-teacher relationship the study shows that teachers from both private and governments institutes are preferred for discussing academic and personal problems by the students, and the majority of the students from both government and private schools come to the teacher with their problems during school hours, but almost all the teachers who used to receive students after the schools are teaching at private schools. Most of the private schools' teachers either know the students in their class by name in comparison to government school teachers. Though the majority of the respondents does not know all the student's family background but here too private schools teachers are doing better than their government school counterparts.

The data reveals that most of the students from private schools ask questions to their teacher during the lesson and some after the lesson. Moreover, majority of the
respondents finds feasibility of teacher, not an issue in letting students ask questions in both the government and private schools. In the study, it has been established that praising the student in the class is the most popular way of recognizing and rewarding students who do good work. The majority of the respondents take their students out of the school at least once in a term followed by $33.3 \%$ responded who never do it, $20 \%$ respondent do it yearly and a similar trend can be seen in both private and government schools.

Though the majority of the Government schools' teachers prefer to give homework to the students every time, they have a class with them, but the private school teachers opt for both homework and other arrangements for the students of their class. Moreover, the majority of the respondents themselves correct the homework given to the students, but most of the teachers who do all the homework given to the students by themselves are from private schools whereas the government school teachers are mostly doing some of the homework given to the students. Class assignment is also a popular means of teaching used by the respondents in private schools in comparison to the government schools.

Though the majority of the students in most of the respondents' class pass, private schools' students are comparatively more in this category than government schools. The data also shows that most of the respondents find the capacities of the child and lack of interest on the part of parents responsible for students' failure. Similarly, though not many students opted for extra tuitions, from private schools' students are opting for tuitions more in comparison to government schools' students.

In extra-curricular activities, sports are more popular and are more practiced in private schools. It mostly due to the expenses involved in playing sports like cricket, badminton, basketball, etc.

More than half of the respondents said that parent-teacher meetings are assigned in six months and according to the respondents most of the parents do attend the parent-teacher meeting, but most of the parents from private schools take parent-teacher meet seriously in comparison to the government school parents. And the majority of the respondent is in
the favor of parent-teacher meeting. The data also confirms that there is a not significant difference in parent's interest in children's studies.

The above table shows that majority of the respondents finds their school performing excellent in studies (43\%), teaching staff (40\%), followed by good in teaching staff ( $56.7 \%$ ), plays ( $53.3 \%$ ), discipline ( $50 \%$ ), sports $(46.7 \%)$, and the private schools are doing much better than the government schools in all these categories.

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents responded that most of their students ( $90 \%$ ) are continuing their study. The majority of the respondents from private schools reported that most of their students get admission to elite government colleges, followed by elite private college and lesser-known government colleges; whereas most of the government school respondents reported that their students get admission to elite government colleges and lesser-known private and government colleges. Hence we can see the preference for government colleges by the students of both the category of schools.

When asked about the students who discontinued their studies, the teachers from private schools hold that they mostly get private C grade jobs whereas the teachers from government schools reported that these category students are mostly doing government c grade jobs. The main reason was given by the respondents of more government and also of private schools for students not getting admission in the best colleges in the country is the poor intellectual capacity of the students, followed by lack of support from parents and lack of knowledge of current affairs. The main reason was given by the respondents more of government schools and also of private schools for students not getting absorbed by the best employers in the country is the poor intellectual capacity of the students, followed by lack of knowledge of current affairs and lack of support from parents. Those students who get decent jobs are mainly because of their parents and the students themselves according to the private school respondents, whereas most of the government school respondents give the credit to the teachers and the students.

## 6.3: Perspectives of the Students:

The present part of the study deals with the background, the perspective of the students towards their performance, educational institute, their teachers, parents, government, their achievements, expectation, and lacunas, and their perspective towards a possible solution. The chapter covers a detailed interview of the students in the respective school to understands their perception towards education as an institution as a whole.

Table 6.94: Category of school studied by the respondents

| Category of school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private | 170 | 50.0 |
| Govt. | 170 | 50.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
For the present study 170 students are interviewed from 3 private schools and the rest 170 students are interviewed from 3 government schools that are selected based on the highest enrollment. The data is collected from 170 male (50\%) and 170 female students (50\%).

Table 6.95: Age group of the respondents

| Age group (in years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-17$ | 226 | 66.5 |
| $18-20$ | 114 | 33.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (66.5\%) are from the 15-17 age group followed by 18-20 (33.5\%)

Hence more than half of the respondents are in the age group of 15 to 17 years age which is followed by $33.5 \%$ of respondents are from 18 to 20 years of age.

Table 6.96: Employment status of the mother

| Employment status of the mother | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaried employee | 99 | 29.1 |
| Homemaker | 241 | 70.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents' mothers (70.9\%) are engaged as housewives which and the rest (29.1\%) respondents' mothers are working as a salaried employees.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondent's mother is a housewife. Moreover, the above data clearly, established that almost twice the number of private schools students' mothers ( $38.82 \%$ ) are salaried employees in comparison to government schools (19.41), which will have an impact on their economic status.

Table 6.97: Perception towards subject learned this year

| Perception towards subject | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Most subjects are interesting | 99 | 29.1 |
| Some are interesting | 218 | 64.1 |
| None of the subjects are interesting | 23 | 6.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (64.1\%) find that some subjects are interesting followed by respondents ( $29.1 \%$ ) who reported that most of the subjects are interesting. Though the majority of both the category of schools find some subjects interesting, but out of the students who find most subjects interesting are mostly from private school background ( $63 \%$ ), and the students who find none of the subjects interesting ( $51 \%$ ) are mostly from government school background.

Table 6.98: Action is taken when facing a difficult sum in mathematics

| Frequency <br> of action <br> taken | Action is taken when facing a difficult sum in mathematicsLeave it and go <br> on to the next <br> problem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Keep on trying <br> until you solve <br> the problem | Ask the <br> classmate to <br> help you | Ask the <br> teacher to <br> help |  |  |  |  |  |
| Often | 83 | 24.4 | 57 | 16.8 | 114 | 33.5 | 174 | 51.2 |
| Sometime | 183 | 53.8 | 158 | 46.5 | 144 | 42.4 | 106 | 31.2 |
| Not so far | 74 | 21.8 | 125 | 36.8 | 82 | 24.1 | 60 | 17.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that whenever students find it difficult to solve a sum in mathematics they often prefer to asked the teacher to help ( $51.2 \%$ ), followed by the classmates to help (33.3\%).

Table 6.99: Relation of leaving it to go on the next problem as an action taken when facing difficult sum in mathematics with the category of school

| Leave it to go on the next problem as <br> an action taken when facing difficult <br> sum in mathematics | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 29 | 54 | 83 |
| Sometime | 90 | 93 | 183 |
| Not so far | 51 | 23 | 74 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that government school students leave the problem they face in solving sum in mathematics and go on to the next problem more in comparison to private school students.

Table 6.100: Relation of solving mathematical problems by taking help from a classmate with the category of school

| Solving mathematical problems by <br> taking help from a classmate | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 51 | 63 | 114 |
| Sometime | 77 | 67 | 144 |
| Not so far | 42 | 40 | 82 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that government school students take help from their classmates while solving sum in mathematics more in comparison to private school students.

Table 6.101: Relation of solving mathematical problems by taking help from teachers with the category of school

| Solving mathematical problems by <br> taking help from teachers | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 84 | 90 | 174 |
| Sometime | 60 | 46 | 106 |
| Not so far | 26 | 34 | 60 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that government school students take help from their teacher while solving sum in mathematics more in comparison to private school students

Table 6.102: Time spend on doing homework

| Time spend on doing homework | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 246 | 72.4 |
| $3-4$ | 13 | 3.8 |
| None | 81 | 23.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the students (72.4\%) responded that they use to spend 1-2 hours doing their homework which is followed by ( $23.8 \%$ ) students who don't spend time doing homework. Hence, thought the majority of the students have the habit of doing homework, but, all the students from private schools do homework, whereas all the students who don't do homework are from government schools.

Hence, homework is not very popular among government school students.
Table 6.103: Process of doing homework

| Process of doing homework | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self-study | 142 | 41.8 |
| Home guidance | 27 | 7.9 |
| Parents guidance | 8 | 2.4 |
| Tutor guidance | 11 | 3.2 |
| parent/tutor | 71 | 20.9 |
| None | 81 | 24 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the students (41.8\%) responded that they use to do their homework by themselves i.e. self-study, followed by ( $20.9 \%$ ) respondents do that from the help of a parent/tutor, and (7.9\%) take help from home guidance.

Hence, we can say that majority of the students completed their homework themselves in both the category of schools.

Table 6.104: Amount of homework given to the respondents

| Amount of homework given to the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Too much | 88 | 25.9 |
| Just enough | 125 | 36.8 |
| Too little | 73 | 21.5 |
| Do not get homework | 54 | 15.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
|  |  |  |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that ( $36.8 \%$ ) of the respondents reported that homework which they have got is just enough, followed by too much ( $25.9 \%$ ), too little ( $21.5 \%$ ), and $(15.9 \%)$ respondent said that they don't get any homework.

Hence, we can observe a mixed response to the amount of homework given to the respondents. But the picture gets clear when we break up the data into two categories of schools which reveals that most of the students who reported that they either get too little ( $93.15 \%$ ) or no homework at all $(100 \%)$ are from a government school, whereas the majority of students who finds their homework too much (96.59\%) or just enough (64\%) are mostly from private school background.

Table 6.105: Perception towards doing homework for the studies of the respondents

| Perception of doing homework | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 133 | 39.1 |
| Sometimes | 178 | 52.4 |
| Not at all | 29 | 8.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data reveals that almost half of the respondents (52.4\%) reported that sometimes doing homework helps in their studies, followed by the respondents (39.1\%) who reported that homework always helps in their studies. Hence, the majority of the respondents find homework helpful only occasionally. The data further reveals that most of government school students ( $58.23 \%$ ) finds homework helpful only occasionally more in comparison to private school students ( $46.47 \%$ ), whereas more private school students ( $48.82 \%$ ) finds homework always helpful than their government school counterparts(29.41\%).

Table 6.106: Perception of discontinuing school

| Perception towards discontinuing school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Happy | 17 | 5.0 |
| Not Happy | 254 | 74.7 |
| don't know | 69 | 20.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data confirm that $74.7 \%$ of the respondents do not feel happy if they are to stop going to school, followed by the respondents (20.3\%) reported that they don't know.

Hence, we can say that students mostly would not be happy if they could stop going to school. But all the students ( 17 students) reported that they are happy to discontinue their studies are from government schools and more students from private school background ( $81.8 \%$ ) wants to continue their studies in comparison to the government school counterparts ( $67.7 \%$ ).

Table 6.107: Frequency of performing well in Homework /Classwork test

| Frequency of performing well in Homework <br> /Classwork test | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Often | 44 | 12.9 |
| Sometime | 131 | 38.5 |
| Rarely | 70 | 20.6 |
| Not so far | 95 | 27.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that ( $38.5 \%$ ) of the respondents responded that sometimes they have done well either in doing their classwork or homework, followed by the respondents ( $27.9 \%$ ) who have not so far done well, rarely done ( $20.6 \%$ ), and reported that they have often done well ( $12.9 \%$ ).

Hence we can say that majority of the students are not satisfied with their performance in homework or classwork.

Table 6.108: Relation of the frequency of performing well in homework /classwork test with the category of school

| Frequency of performing well in <br> homework /classwork test | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 36 | 8 | 44 |
| Sometime | 64 | 67 | 131 |
| Rarely | 31 | 39 | 70 |
| Not so far | 39 | 56 | 95 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table clearly shows that private school students are far more satisfied with their performance in classwork and homework in comparison to their government school counterparts.

Table 6.109: Number of teacher praise when performed well

| Number of teacher praise when performed well | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Most of your teacher did | 137 | 40.3 |
| Some of your teachers did | 170 | 50.0 |
| None of your teachers did | 33 | 9.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents(50\%) reported that some of the teachers praise them when they have done well, followed by the respondents (40.3\%) who said that most of the teacher praise them and $(9.7 \%)$ students viewed that none of the teachers praise them when they have done well either homework or classwork.

Hence, we can say that majority of the teachers does not have the habit of praising the students when they have done well

Table: 6.110: Relation of number of teacher praise when performed well with the category of school

| Number of teacher praise when <br> performed well | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Most of your teacher did | 80 | 57 | 170 |
| Some of your teachers did | 75 | 95 | 33 |
| None of your teachers did | 15 | 18 | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ |  |

Source: Field Work

The above data reveals that private school students get more praise from their teachers when they successfully do their homework or classwork more than their government school counterparts.

Hence, praising students' good work is more found in private schools.
Table: 6.111: Teachers reaction towards students’ mistake

| Numberteachers | Teachers reaction towards students' mistake |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Shout at you |  | Make fun of you |  | Explain to you nicely your mistakes |  | Punish you |  |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Most of them did | 21 | 6.2 | 7 | 2.1 | 164 | 48.2 | 40 | 11.8 |
| Some of them did | 136 | 40.0 | 98 | 28.8 | 131 | 38.5 | 126 | 37.1 |
| None of them did | 183 | 53.8 | 235 | 69.1 | 45 | 13.2 | 174 | 51.2 |
| Total | 340 | 100.0 | 340 | 100.0 | 340 | 100.0 | 340 | 100 |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the teachers explain to the students their mistake nicely, followed by the majority of few of the teachers mostly shout at them and none of the teachers mostly make fun of them when they commit mistakes.

Hence, most of the teachers are found to explain to the students their mistake nicely.

Table 6.112: Relation of shouting as a reaction to the mistake of the students with the category of school

| Shouting as a reaction to the mistake of <br> the students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Most of them did | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| Some of them did | 50 | 86 | 136 |
| None of them did | 120 | 63 | 183 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that shouting at students' mistakes is more a government schools' teachers' behavior.

Table 6.113: Relation of making fun of the students as a reaction to their mistake with the category of school

| Making fun of the students as a <br> reaction to their mistake | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Most of them did | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| Some of them did | 30 | 68 | 98 |
| None of them did | 140 | 95 | 235 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that making fun of students' mistakes is more in government schools' teachers' behavior.

Table 6.114: Relation of explaining their mistakes nicely as a reaction to their mistake with the category of school

| Explaining their mistakes nicely as a <br> reaction to their mistake | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Most of them did | 104 | 60 | 131 |
| Some of them did | 59 | 72 | 45 |
| None of them did | 7 | 38 | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | 10 |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that explaining nicely the students' mistakes is more found among the private schools' teachers.

Table 6.115: Frequency of asking questions by the students in the class

| Frequency of asking questions by the <br> students in the class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Often | 42 | 12.4 |
| Sometimes | 113 | 33.2 |
| Rarely | 130 | 38.2 |
| Never | 55 | 16.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that students ask questions sometimes and rarely ( $33.2 \% \& 38.2$ ) when they have face some difficulty in understanding teachers' lecture, followed by the respondent ( $16.2 \%$ ) who said that they have never asked any question and $12.4 \%$ respondents have the habit of questioning when they feel difficulty in understanding teachers' lecture.

Hence, we can say that majority of the students do not raise any questions when they feel difficulty in understanding the teaching in the class.

Table 6.116: Relation of the frequency of asking questions by the students in the class with the category of school

| Frequency of asking questions by the <br> students in the class | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 30 | 12 | 42 |
| Sometimes | 67 | 46 | 113 |
| Rarely | 61 | 69 | 130 |
| Never | 12 | 43 | 55 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that asking questions during class is more found among private school students in comparison to government school students.

Table 6.117: Feeling of enjoyment in answering questions by the students in the class

| Feeling of enjoyment in answering <br> questions by the students in the class | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 150 | 44.1 |
| No | 190 | 55.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that more than half of the respondents (55.9\%) don't enjoy giving answers to the teacher's questions.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents do not like to answer questions that are asked by the teacher. Furthermore, the data also shows that answering questions raised by
the teachers during class is more enjoyable for the private school students $(51 \%)$ in comparison to government school students (38\%).

Table 6.118: Perception of the respondents towards themselves

| Perception of the respondents towards <br> themselves | Frequency | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bright student | 60 | 17.6 |  |
| Average student | 206 | 60.6 |  |
| Weak student | 74 | 21.8 |  |
| Total $\quad \mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $60.6 \%$ ) perceive themselves as average students, followed by bright students ( $21.8 \%$ ) and weak students $17.6 \%$. The data further shows that majority of the respondents who perceive themselves as both average ( $56 \%$ ) and bright students ( $75 \%$ ) are found private school background whereas most of the students who perceive themselves as weak (85\%) are from a government school background

Table 6.119: Level of liking school

| Level of liking school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very much | 221 | 65.0 |
| Ok | 105 | 30.9 |
| Do not like | 14 | 4.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that the majority of the respondents ( $65 \%$ ) like their school very much, followed by the respondent ( $30.9 \%$ ) who finds it ok.

Hence, it is clear that most of the students from both the school background like their school very much.

Table 6.120: Frequency of missing school during holidays

| Frequency of missing school during holidays | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 52 | 15.3 |
| Sometimes | 193 | 56.8 |
| Never | 95 | 27.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $56.8 \%$ ) feel that sometimes they miss school during holidays, followed by the respondents ( $27.9 \%$ ) who said that they never miss school during holidays, and (15.3\%) of the students always miss school during holidays.

Hence, it is clear that students of both the background school often miss school during the holidays.

Table 6.121: Level of happiness to get back to school after holidays

| Level of happiness to get back to school after holidays | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 111 | 32.6 |
| Generally | 136 | 40.0 |
| Sometimes | 81 | 23.8 |
| Never | 12 | 3.5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that more respondents (40\%) feel that they generally feel happy to get back school after holidays, followed by the respondents ( $32.6 \%$ ) who always feel happy to get back school after holidays and (23.8\%) students who never feel happy.

Hence, we can see that students mostly feel happy to get back to school after the holidays.

Table 6.122: Relation of happy to get back to school after holidays with the category of school

| After holidays happy to get back school | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Always | 30 | 81 | 111 |
| Generally | 81 | 55 | 136 |
| Sometimes | 54 | 27 | 81 |
| Never | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| Total | 170 | 170 | 340 |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that government school students are happier to get back to school in comparison to private school students.

Table 6.123: Reason for absence from school

| Perception | Reason for absence from school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sickness |  | Weddings/fes <br> tivals in the <br> family |  | Housework <br> to be <br> attended to | Visit aunts, <br> uncle <br> grandparent <br> s, etc. | Did not feel <br> like going to |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Yes | 234 | 68.8 | 179 | 52.6 | 99 | 29.1 | 140 | 41.2 | 101 |
| No | 106 | 31.2 | 161 | 47.4 | 241 | 70.9 | 200 | 58.8 | 239 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data confirm that majority of the students were absent from school because of sickness ( $68.8 \%$ ), followed by wedding/festivals in the family (52.6\%).

Table 6.124: Relation of an absence of sickness in school between private and government school students

| Sickness | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 108 | 126 | 234 |
| No | 62 | 44 | 106 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data confirm that the students unable to come to the school because of sickness are mostly from a government school.

Table 6.125: Relation of an absence of attending weeding in school with the category of school

| Wedding | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 78 | 101 | 179 |
| No | 92 | 69 | 161 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data confirm that the students unable to come to the school because of attending weddings and festivals are mostly from a government school.

Table 6.126: Relation of the absence of attending housework in school with the category of school

| Housework attend | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 4 | 95 | 99 |
| No | 166 | 75 | 241 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data confirm that the students unable to come to the school because performing housework and festivals are mostly from a government school.

The students unable to come to the school because of visit aunts and did not feel like going to school are almost equally from both the school background.

Table 6.127: Measures taken by the teacher to discipline children

| Measur es were taken by the teacher to | Explain their mistakes nicely |  | Give an angry look |  | Shout at them |  | Slap/ pull ears/ punish them |  | Ask to stand up/ kneel down etc. |  | Send out from the room |  | Send notes to their parent |  | Send to the home |  | Send to the principal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```discipli ne childre n``` | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | $\mathbf{P}$ | F | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Often | 133 | 39.1 | 20 | 5.9 | 9 | 2.6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2.9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2.6 |
| Someti me | 118 | 34.7 | 72 | 21.2 | 48 | 14.1 | 37 | 10.9 | 81 | 23.8 | 32 | 9.4 | 60 | 17.6 | 6 | 1.8 | 85 | 25.0 |
| Rarely | 68 | 20.0 | 76 | 22.4 | 66 | 19.4 | 55 | 16.2 | 71 | 20.9 | 36 | 10.6 | 60 | 17.6 | 30 | 8.8 | 61 | 17.9 |
| Never | 21 | 6.2 | 172 | 50.6 | 217 | 63.8 | 248 | 72.9 | 167 | 49.1 | 272 | 80.0 | 210 | 61.8 | 304 | 89.4 | 185 | 54.4 |
| Total | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 | 340 | 100 |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the most popular measures taken by teachers to discipline children which are often used are explaining their mistake to the students nicely ( $39.1 \%$ ), followed by sending them to the principal ( $25 \%$ ) and ask them to kneel down/stand up (23.8\%) which is used sometimes.

Table 6.128: Relation of explaining mistake nicely as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Explain mistake nicely as a measure <br> taken by the teacher to discipline <br> students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 73 | 60 | 133 |
| Sometime | 68 | 50 | 118 |
| Rarely | 22 | 46 | 68 |
| Never | 7 | 14 | 21 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that using explaining the student's mistake nicely as a measure to discipline students is popular in both government and private schools almost equally.

Table 6.129: Relation of give angry look as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Give an angry look as a measure taken by <br> the teacher to discipline students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Often | Private | Govt. | 20 |
| Sometime | 0 | 20 |  |
| Rarely | 19 | 53 | 76 |
| Never | 116 | 41 | 56 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that using giving an angry look as a measure to discipline students is more popular among the government schools.

Table 6.130: Relation of shouting as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Shouting as a measure taken by the <br> teacher to discipline students | School |  | Notal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Sometime | 12 | 36 | 48 |
| Rarely | 26 | 40 | 66 |
| Never | 132 | 85 | 217 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that shouting at students as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally more is visibly more popular among the government schools

Table 6.131: Relation of slap, pull ears or pinch as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Slap, pull ears or pinch as a <br> measure taken by the teacher to <br> discipline students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Sometime | 7 | 30 | 37 |
| Rarely | 20 | 35 | 55 |
| Never | 143 | 105 | 248 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |
| Source: Field Work |  |  |  |

The above table shows that slapping and pulling ears as a measure to discipline students is more popular among the government schools.

Table 6.132: Relation of stand up or kneeled as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Stand up or kneel down as a measure <br> taken by the teacher to discipline <br> students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 10 | 11 | 21 |
| Sometime | 22 | 59 | 81 |
| Rarely | 24 | 47 | 71 |
| Never | 114 | 53 | 167 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that letting students stand up or kneel down as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally more is more popular among the government schools

Table 6.133: Relation of sending out of the room as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Sending out of the room as a measure taken <br> by the teacher to discipline students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sometime | Private | Govt. |  |
| Rarely | 9 | 23 | 32 |
| Never | 17 | 19 | 36 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | 128 | 272 |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that sending them out of the room as a measure to discipline students is more popular among the government schools

Table 6.134: Relation of sending notes to the parents as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Sending notes to the parents as a measure <br> taken by the teacher to discipline students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Sometime | 51 | 9 | 60 |
| Rarely | 28 | 32 | 60 |
| Never | 81 | 129 | 210 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that sending notes to the parents as a measure to discipline students is more popular among private schools

Table 6.135: Relation of sending to the principal as a measure taken by the teacher to discipline students with the category of school

| Sending to the principal as a measure taken <br> by the teacher to discipline students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Often | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| Sometime | 46 | 39 | 85 |
| Rarely | 31 | 30 | 61 |
| Never | 91 | 94 | 185 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that sending students to the principal as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally more is popular among both government and private schools almost equally.

Table 6.136: Reasons for getting punishment by the students in the last year

|  |  |  | Coming <br> late to school |  | Not weari ng school unifor m |  | Forget ting books |  | Not doing homew ork |  | Talking in the class |  | Using bad langu age |  | Fightin g with other boys |  | cheatin g |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in the last year | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Often | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | . 6 | 4 | 1.2 | 31 | 9.1 | 9 | 2.6 | 1 | . 3 | 3 | . 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Sometime | 19 | 5.6 | 37 | 10.9 | 38 | 11. 2 | 60 | 17.6 | 66 | 19.4 | 76 | 22.4 | 25 | 7.4 | 75 | 22.1 | 18 | 5.3 |
| Rarely | 28 | 8.2 | 43 | 12.6 | 40 | $\begin{gathered} 11 . \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 46 | 13.5 | 55 | 16.2 | 63 | 18.5 | 48 | $14 .$ | 49 | 14.4 | 27 | 7.9 |
| Never | 293 | 86.2 | 26 0 | 76.5 | 26 0 | $\begin{gathered} 76 . \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 67.6 | 188 | 55.3 | 19 2 | 56.5 | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78 . \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | 62.6 | 29 5 | 86. 8 |
| Total | 340 | 100 | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 100 | 34 0 | 10 0 | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 100 | 340 | 100 | 34 0 | 100 | 34 0 | 10 0 | 34 0 | 100 | 34 0 | 100 |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that most of the students don't generally receive punishment for their actions in the class in the last year. But occasionally they were mostly punished for talking in the class ( $22.4 \%$ ), fighting with other boys ( $22.1 \%$ ), not doing homework (19.4\%)

Table 6.137: Relation of getting punished for not doing homework by the teacher with the category of school students

| Getting punishment for not doing homework <br> by the teacher | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 29 | 2 | 31 |
| Sometime | 40 | 26 | 66 |
| Rarely | 33 | 22 | 55 |
| Never | 68 | 120 | 188 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the students who get punished for not doing homework are mostly from private school backgrounds.

Hence, it suggests that private school teachers take homework of the students more seriously.

Table 6.138: Relation of getting punishment for talking in the class by the teacher with the category of school students

| Getting punishment for talking in the class | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Sometime | 48 | 28 | 76 |
| Rarely | 42 | 21 | 63 |
| Never | 74 | 118 | 192 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the students who get punishment (though occasionally) more for talking in the class are mostly from private school backgrounds. Hence, it suggests that private school teachers take discipline in the class more seriously.

Table 6.139: Relation of getting punishment for using bad language by the teacher with the category of school students

| Getting punishment for using bad language | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Sometime | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| Rarely | 13 | 35 | 48 |
| Never | 152 | 114 | 266 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the students who get punishment, though occasionally more for using bad language in the class are mostly from government school background.

Hence, it suggests that government school students are more using foul language in the class.

Table 6.140: Relation of getting punishment for fighting with other students by the teacher with the category of school

| Getting punishment for fighting with other <br> students | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Often | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Sometime | 31 | 44 | 75 |
| Rarely | 23 | 26 | 49 |
| Never | 115 | 98 | 213 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the students who get punishment, though occasionally more for fighting in the class are from both government and private school backgrounds.

Hence, fighting in the class is a common problem in both government and private schools.
Table 6.141: Relation of getting punished for cheating by the teacher with the category of school students

| Getting punishment for cheating | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Sometime | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Rarely | 8 | 19 | 27 |
| Never | 162 | 133 | 295 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the students who get punished for cheating in the class are mostly from government school background.

Table 6.142: Number of teachers teaching this year

| Number of teachers teaching this Year | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-4$ | 1 | .3 |
| $5-8$ | 206 | 60.6 |
| $9-12$ | 133 | 39.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the respondents ( $60.6 \%$ ) reported that they have 5-8 teachers teaching them this year, followed by the respondent (39.1\%) who said that they are taught by 9-12 teachers.

Table 6.143: Relation of teachers are teaching in this year with the category of school

| Number of teachers teaching <br> this year | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $1-4$ | 1 | 0 | 206 |
| $5-8$ | 116 | 90 | 133 |
| Above 8 | 53 | 80 | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ |  |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the students who were taught by 5-8 teachers this year are mostly from private schools and the students who were taught by more than 8 teachers are mostly from government schools.

It is important to mention here that the average class size of private schools studied here is significantly smaller than the government schools. Moreover, in almost all government
schools proxy teachers more regularly use to take classes in the absence of the regular teachers which raises the total no of teachers taking a class in a particular year.

Table 6.144: Number of teachers recognizes students by name

| Number of teachers recognizes students by name | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-4$ | 181 | 53.2 |
| $5-8$ | 45 | 13.2 |
| $9-12$ | 13 | 3.8 |
| All | 101 | 29.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that majority of the respondents (53.2\%) finds that 1-4 teacher know them by name, followed by the respondents (29.7\%) who reported that all the teachers recognize them by name.

Table 6.145: Relation of teachers who recognizes students by name with the category of school

| Number of teachers recognizes students by <br> name | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $1-4$ | 77 | 104 | 181 |
| $5-8$ | 29 | 16 | 45 |
| $9-12$ | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| All | 51 | 50 | 101 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that majority of private school teachers recognize their students by name. Hence it is expected that in the private school there can be a close teacher-student relationship in comparison to government schools.

Table 6.146: Showing individual interest in students by teachers

| Showing individual interest in students by <br> teachers | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 153 | 45.0 |
| $3-4$ | 17 | 5.0 |
| $6-7$ | 2 | .6 |
| Few of them | 148 | 43.5 |
| All of them | 19 | 5.6 |
| None | 1 | .3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $45 \%$ of the respondents reported that few of the teachers take an individual interest in their studies, followed by the respondents (43.5\%) who find that only 1-2 teachers take an individual interest.

Hence we can say that majority of the teachers do not prefer to spend time to take an individual interest in their studies.

Table 6.147: Relation of showing individual interest in students by teachers with the category of school

| Showing individual interest in <br> students by teachers | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $1-2$ | 77 | 76 | 153 |
| $3-4$ | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| $6-7$ | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| few of them | 60 | 88 | 148 |
| all of them | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| None | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data shows that though most of the teachers from both the government and private schools don't prefer to take an individual interest in students' studies still the proportion of private schools' teachers who are taking an individual interest in studies of students is partially more.

Table 6.148: Number of teachers approachable during problem in the study

| Number of teachers approachable during <br> problem in the study | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 155 | 45.6 |
| $3-4$ | 35 | 10.3 |
| $5-6$ | 3 | .9 |
| $7-8$ | 1 | .3 |
| Few of them | 130 | 38.2 |
| All of them | 16 | 4.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that (45.6\%) of the respondents reported that only 1-2 teachers take individual interest when they have any difficulties in their studies, followed by the respondents ( $38.2 \%$ ) find that only a few of the teachers take an individual interest.

Hence we can say that majority of the teachers from both school backgrounds do not have the time to take individual interest when they feel any difficulties in their studies.

Table: 6.149: Approachability of the teachers to discuss personal problems

| Approachability of the teachers to discuss <br> personal problems | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 84 | 24.7 |
| No | 256 | 75.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $75.3 \%$ ) responded that when they have a personal problem they never feel free to discuss their problems with any of their teachers.

Hence, it is clear that students never feel comfortable sharing their problems with their teachers. But private school teachers are more approachable (32.3\%) for the students to discuss personal problems in comparison to government school teachers (17\%).

Table: 6.150: Relation of the respondents with their teacher

| Relation of the respondents with their teacher | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Better than most of the other children | 75 | 22.1 |
| Less well than most children | 50 | 14.7 |
| About the same as children | 215 | 63.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (63.2\%) finds that they get well with their teacher about the same as other children, followed by the respondents ( $22.1 \%$ ) who thinks that they get better than most of the other children and (14.7\%) reported that they get less well than most of the children.

Hence we can say that majority of the students from both government and private schools get well with their teachers.

Table: 6.151: Expected percentage of marks this year

| Expected percentage of marks this year | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60-64$ | 36 | 10.6 |
| $65-69$ | 47 | 13.8 |
| $70-74$ | 47 | 13.8 |
| $75-79$ | 39 | 11.5 |
| $80-84$ | 36 | 10.6 |
| $85-89$ | 65 | 19.1 |
| $90-94$ | 60 | 17.6 |
| $95-99$ | 10 | 2.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $19.1 \%$ of the respondents are expecting $85-89 \%$, followed by the respondents ( $17.6 \%$ ) 90-94\%, 65-69 and 70-74 (13.8 each)\%, 60-64 and 80-84 (10.6\% each) ,60-64 (10.6\%), 75-79 (11.5\%) and 95-99 (2.9\%).

Hence, we can say that students are expecting a different percentage according to their level of expectation.

Table: 6.152: Relation of Expected percentage of marks this year with the category of school

| Expected percentage of marks <br> this year | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $60-64$ | 0 | 36 | 36 |
| $65-69$ | 0 | 47 | 47 |
| $70-74$ | 0 | 47 | 47 |
| $75-79$ | 6 | 33 | 39 |
| $80-84$ | 29 | 7 | 36 |
| $85-89$ | 65 | 0 | 65 |
| $90-94$ | 60 | 0 | 60 |
| $95-99$ | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table establishes that private school students are significantly expecting more percentage of marks in their upcoming examination in comparison to their government school counterparts.

Table: 6.153: Future plan after leaving school

| Future plan after leaving school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Go to college | 169 | 49.7 |
| Get a job straight away | 117 | 34.4 |
| Stay a home | 4 | 1.2 |
| Get training for a job | 50 | 14.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data shows that half of the respondents (49.7\%) prefer to go to the college after leaving school, followed by the respondents ( $34.4 \%$ ) who prefer to opt for a job and (14.7\%) preferred to get training for a job.

Hence we can say that majority of the students prefer to go to college after leaving school.
Table: 6.154: Relation of the future plan after leaving school with the category of school

| Future plan after leaving school | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Go to college | 99 | 70 | 169 |
| Get a job straight away | 42 | 75 | 117 |
| Stay a home | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Get training for a job | 28 | 22 | 50 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that government school students prefer to get a job, followed by joining college after leaving school, whereas private school students prefer to join college followed by getting a job after leaving school.

Table: 6. 155: Categorization of reasons for discontinuing education

| Push Factors | Pull Factors |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fees too expensive | Needed to stay home to look after <br> siblings |
| Financial Constrains | Needed for domestic work at home |
| Transport too expensive | Had to do paid work to earn money |
| Not safe to travel to school | Family member ill/disabled/elderly |
| Poor academic performance | Family issues, e.g. problems at home |
| Absence from school/truancy | Need to learn a trade/skill |
| Less interesting classes | Looking for work |
| Can't understand the content of the lesson | Need to look after children |
| Lack of Extracurricular activities at the <br> School |  |

Major push factors explaining dropouts in the present study are lack of interest of the students in studies, taking care of younger siblings, financial constraints, poor facilities in the school, lack of motivation of parents, absorption into the labor market, and bad school environment especially no effective teaching. Concerning parental education, it has been observed parents of drop out students were comparatively poorly educated than parents of non-dropout students. Also, specifically mothers of dropouts were quite poorly educated. The education of the mother is considered an important factor which can lead to a reduction in dropouts. A positive relation between family size and the dropout rate is also observed in the study, it can be explained keeping in mind the larger financial burden of the family and less amount of resources per child.

The reasons put forward by children are myriad and also related to specific stages of adolescence, such as puberty, agency, as well as household circumstances, and school factors. The fact that pull factors account for more than of all those who dropped out needs to be seriously considered in future policy formulation. Educational interventions should not be confined only to focusing on 'school quality', although this also needs attention. Pull factors that are often ignored while discussing education need to be given due priority, particularly in light of Sustainable Development Goal 4 which aims that 'no child left behind'. Universal public provisioning of the education sector, with safe transport facilities, and residential facilities at secondary and higher education levels, may be necessary to ensure that girls from the most remote and disadvantaged locations continue in education is the way forward. Absence from school/truancy, one of the most cited reasons for discontinuation of education, also needs to become a focus for future research, especially as absenteeism has been reported to be more frequent amongst students from lower-income families or specific cultural backgrounds (Romero and Lee 2007). Improve and upgrading teaching and curricula to make school more relevant and engaging and enhance the connection between school and work is the way forward. The students and parents of particularly the public-school background need to be convinced
about the merit of education and how it will help them to get stable jobs and status in society.

Moreover, there is also a needs to improve instruction, and access to supports, at these schools for struggling students and build an overall school climate that fosters academics where parent's engagement strategies can be realized to accomplish the progress of accomplishment of the students. The most disadvantaged families must be provided with social security so that children are not pulled into work (both domestic and paid) at an early age, with negative long-term consequences. Schools need to develop district-wide (or even state-wide) early warning systems to help them identify students at risk of failing in school and to develop mechanisms that trigger and ensure there is follow through on, the appropriate support for the students. As preschool and early reading skills have a significant association with late drop-outs, it is also critical that both the Ministry of Women and Child Development and the Ministry of Human Resource Development build the capacity of preschool teachers to provide quality stimulation and early literacy skills.

Table 6.156: Preference of jobs after education

| Preference for jobs after education | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Teacher | 106 | 31.2 |
| Lecturer /professor | 51 | 15.0 |
| Doctor / engineer | 44 | 12.9 |
| Business | 79 | 23.2 |
| Professional jobs | 60 | 17.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $31.2 \%$ of the respondents prefer to be teacher, followed by the respondents ( $23.2 \%$ ) who want to do business, ( $12.9 \%$ ) prefer to be doctor or engineer, (15\%) preferred to be lecturer/professor, and (17.6\%) respondents prefer to do professional jobs.

Hence we can say that students prefer different jobs according to their level of expectation Table 6.157: Relation of preference of jobs after education with the category of school

| Preference for jobs after education | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Teacher | 49 | 57 | 106 |
| Lecturer /professor | 38 | 13 | 51 |
| Doctor / engineer | 42 | 2 | 44 |
| Business | 27 | 52 | 79 |
| Other | 14 | 46 | 60 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the government school students prefer to be teachers, followed by business and other professional jobs whereas most of the private school students prefer to be teachers followed by doctors or engineers and lecturers.

Table 6.158: Reasons for opting the preferred job

| Reasons for opting the preferred job | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parents advice | 108 | 31.8 |
| Guardians advice | 45 | 13.2 |
| Personal thinking | 166 | 48.8 |
| Friends influence | 21 | 6.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that almost half of the respondents (48.8\%) reported that they have decided their future jobs based on personal thinking, followed by the respondents (31.8\%)
who said that they have to proceed according to their parents' advice, ( $13.2 \%$ ) will opt for the job according to guardians' advice.

Hence, it is clear that both the private and government school students opt for a future job which is mostly based on their thinking.

Table 6.159: Participation in extracurricular activities

| Participat <br> ion in <br> extracurr <br> icular <br> activities | Assignm <br> ent <br> presenta <br> tion |  | Debates |  |  | Quizzes |  | Drama |  | Music <br> competiti <br> on |  | Essay <br> competiti <br> on |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 112 | 32.9 | 110 | 32.4 | 140 | 41.2 | 109 | 32.1 | 136 | 40 | 110 | 32.4 |  |
| No | 228 | 67.1 | 230 | 67.6 | 200 | 58.8 | 231 | 67.9 | 204 | 60 | 230 | 67.6 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondent participated in the quiz, followed by music completion, assignment presentation in the category of extracurricular activities in their school. Diverse literature on the importance of extracurricular activities established that the participation in extracurricular activities have a positive outcome on the students as it led to higher achievement and performance among them (Stephens and Schaben, 2002; Hollrah, 2001; Hass, 2004; Mark Rivera, 2010; Whitley, 1998; Ponter, 1999), increase in self-esteem develop better social skills, and build better relationships with friends and adults. (Helm, 1991), positive impact on reading and mathematical scores (Southgate \& Roscigno, 2009), they also live healthier lives and make better decisions concerning their health (Medline Plus, 2010; Yancey, 2007; Burnette, 2001; Metzl \& Shookhoff, 2002).

Table 6.160: Relation of Assignment presentation with the category of school

| Assignment presentation | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 104 | 8 | 112 |
| No | 66 | 162 | 228 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data establish that assignment presentation is mostly done in private schools.
Table 6.161: Relation of debating competition with the category of school

| Debates | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 90 | 20 | 230 |
| No | 80 | 150 | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ |  |
| Source: Field Work |  |  |  |

The above data establish that debating is mostly organized in private schools.
Table 6.162: Relation of quiz competition with the category of school

| Quizzes | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 93 | 47 | 140 |
| No | 77 | 123 | 200 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data establish that though few of the government school students do participate in quiz completions, they are significantly outnumbered by their private school counterparts.

Table 6.163: Relation of drama competition with the category of school

| Drama | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 78 | 31 | 109 |
| No | 92 | 139 | 231 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data establish that though few of the government school students do participate in drama completions they are significantly outnumbered by their private school counterparts.

Table 6.164: Relation of drama competition with the category of school

| Music competition | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 90 | 46 | 136 |
| No | 80 | 124 | 204 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data establish that though few of the government school students do participate in music completions they are significantly outnumbered by their private school counterparts.
Table 6.165: Relation of essay competition with the category of school

| Essay competition | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 85 | 25 | 110 |
| No | 85 | 145 | 230 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data establish that essay competition has mostly participated in private schools' students.

Table 6.166: Winning awards in extracurricular activities

| Winning awards in extracurricular <br> activities | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 187 | 55.0 |
| No | 153 | 45.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (55\%) reported that they have won prizes in extracurricular activities in their school and more students from private schools $(61 \%)$ are wining rewards in extracurricular activities than their government school counterparts (49\%).

Table 6.167: Participation in sport activities

| Participation in sport activities | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 214 | 62.9 |
| No | 126 | 37.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data shows that the majority of the respondents (62.9\%) participated in sports in their school and that more students from private schools (69.41\%) are participating in sports than their government school ( $56.47 \%$ ) counterparts.

Table 6.168: Type of sports activities participated in intra-school level

| Type of sports activities participated in <br> intraschool level | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indoor games | 59 | 17.4 |
| Outdoor games | 64 | 18.8 |
| Both | 94 | 27.6 |
| None | 123 | 36.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the students don't participate in any sports activities, followed by those (27.6\%) who participated in both indoor and outdoor games and ( $18.8 \%$ ) in outdoor and ( $17.4 \%$ ) in indoor games.

Table 6.169: Relation of sports activities participated in intra-school level with the category of school students

| Type of sports activities <br> participated in intra-school level | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Indoor games | 30 | 29 | 59 |
| Outdoor games | 42 | 22 | 64 |
| Both | 49 | 45 | 94 |
| None | 49 | 74 | 123 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table confirms that more private school students are participating in all the categories of sports activities in comparison to government school counterparts.

Table 6.170: Type of sports activities participated at inter-school level

| Type of sports activities participated at <br> inter-school level | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indoor games | 54 | 15.9 |
| Outdoor games | 42 | 12.4 |
| Both | 20 | 5.9 |
| None | 224 | 65.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the students don't participate in any sports activities at the inter-school level, followed by those ( $15.9 \%$ ) who participated in indoor games and (12.4\%) in outdoor games, and (5.9\%) in both indoor and outdoor games.

Table 6.171: Relation of sports activities participated in inter-school level with the category of school students

| Type of sports activities <br> participated at inter-school level | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Indoor games | 21 | 20 | 41 |
| Outdoor games | 22 | 33 | 55 |
| Both | 17 | 3 | 20 |
| None | 110 | 114 | 224 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table confirms that more private school students are participating in both indoor and outdoor ( $85 \%$ ) and only the outdoor category of sports activities $(40 \%)$ in comparison to government school counterparts at the inter-school level. But more government school students are participating in outdoor games (60\%) at the inter-school level than their private school counterparts.

Hence, though more exposure to sports is given in the private schools which are reflected in their participation at the intra-school level but particularly in the outdoor games category more government school students are performing, as they are better sportsmen.

Table 6.172: Learning activities outside school

| Learning activities outside school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 162 | 47.6 |
| No | 178 | 52.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that almost half of the respondents (47.6\%) learn other activities outside school, followed by the respondents ( $52.4 \%$ ) who do not learn any activity outside school. Moreover, the data also establishes that private school students (70.58\%) prefer to learn activities outside school more than their government school (24.70\%) counterparts.

Table 6.173: Preferences of parents after school for their children

| Preferences of parents after school for their <br> children | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Finish school and join college | 199 | 58.5 |
| Finish school and take up a job | 79 | 23.2 |
| Don't know | 62 | 18.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the respondents (58.5\%) reported that their parents want them to finish their school and then go to college, followed by the respondents $(23.2 \%)$ whose parents prefer them to finish school and take up a job and $18.2 \%$ of the respondent said that they don't know what their parents want.

Hence, the majority of the students' parents want their children to continue their studies after school.

Table 6.174: Relation of Preferences of parents after school for their children with the category of school students

| Preferences of parents after school <br> for their children | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Finish school and then go to college | 120 | 79 | 199 |
| Finish school and take up a job | 16 | 63 | 79 |
| You don't know parents like to do | 34 | 28 | 62 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the majority of the parents who wants their children to continue their study, send their children to private school ( $60.30 \%$ ) and the majority of the parents who prefer their children to take up a job after their school, send their children to government schools (79.74\%).

Hence, private school parents are mostly in favor of continuing their children's' education whereas job is the preference of most of the parents of government school students.

Table 6.175: Status of books at home

| Status of books at home | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lots of books for you to read | 52 | 15.3 |
| Few books for you to read | 204 | 60.0 |
| Number books at all | 84 | 24.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data shows that the majority of the respondents ( $60 \%$ ) confirms that few books are available for them to read at home, followed by the respondents ( $24.7 \%$ ) who said that they don't have any book to read at home and (15.3\%) reported that have lots of books to read at home. The data also confirms that out of the students who have few books $(59.31 \%)$ and lots of books ( $80.76 \%$ ) are mostly from private school backgrounds whereas a huge majority of the students $(91.66 \%)$ who don't have any books to read at home are from government school backgrounds.

Hence, the lack of books at home is one of the major hindrances that government school students are facing in the present study.

Table 6.176: Awareness of reservation seats in educational institutions

| Awareness of reservation seats in <br> educational institutions | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 210 | 61.8 |
| No | 130 | 38.2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that the majority of the respondents (61.8\%) are aware of reservation of seats for schedule caste and schedule tribe, followed by the respondents $(38.2 \%)$ who don't know about it. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents who know about the reservation of seats are from private school backgrounds (55.23\%) in comparison to government school counterparts.

Table 6.177: Award of prizes, certificate or medal in merit

| Award of prizes, certificate or medal in merit | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 61 | 17.9 |
| No | 279 | 82.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above data shows that ( $82.1 \%$ ) of the respondents never won any certificate or prize for their merit, followed by the respondents $(17.9 \%)$ who reported that they have got a medal or certificate. The data also shows that the majority of the respondents (74.40\%) who got awards or awards for their merits in academics are from private school backgrounds.

Table 6.178: Expected level of education to be achieved

| The expected level of education to be achieved | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduation | 136 | 40.0 |
| Postgraduate, PhD | 168 | 49.4 |
| Technical education | 36 | 10.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
|  |  |  |

Source: Field Work

The above data shows that almost half of them (49.4\%) respondents want to continue their education till post-graduation or Ph.D., followed by the respondents (40\%) who reported that they will prefer to continue their education till graduation.

Table 6.179: Relation of continuing education with the category of school students

| Continue education | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Graduation | 55 | 81 | 136 |
| Postgraduate and above | 97 | 71 | 168 |
| Technical education | 12 | 24 | 36 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $57.73 \%$ ) who prefer to continue their studies till post-graduation and above are mostly from private school backgrounds and students who prefer to continue their studies till graduation are more
from government school background (59.55\%). Moreover, technical education is also preferred more by government school students (66.66\%).

Hence, private school students are aspiring to continue their education significantly longer than their government school counterparts but government school students are more interested in technical education than private school students.

Table 6.180: Practice of taking private tuition

| The practice of taking private tuition | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 190 | 55.9 |
| No | 150 | 44.1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that more than half of the respondents (55.9\%) take private tuition and the majority of them are private school students ( $76.47 \%$ ) who take private tuition in comparison to government school counterparts ( $35.29 \%$ ).

Table 6.181: Reasons for taking private tuition

| Reasons for taking private tuition | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deficiencies in studies | 114 | 33.5 |
| Classes not held regularly at school/college | 72 | 21.2 |
| Because friends are there | 4 | .9 |
| Don't take | 150 | 44.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that ( $33.5 \%$ ) of the respondents take private tuition because they find deficiencies in them, followed by the respondents ( $21.2 \%$ ) who take it as classes are not held regularly at school.

Table 6.182: Relation of reasons for taking private tuition between government and private school students

| Give reasons for taking private tuition | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Deficiencies in studies | 87 | 27 | 114 |
| Classes not held regularly at school/college | 22 | 50 | 72 |
| Because friends are there | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| Don't take | 40 | 110 | 150 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table confirms that the majority of the private school students take private tuitions as they find the deficiency in themselves whereas most of the government school students take private tuitions as classes are not held regularly at their respective schools.

Hence, the above table exposes the quality of classes in government schools as perceived by the students.

Table 6.183: Source of finance for education

| Source of finance for education | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parents | 234 | 68.8 |
| Other relatives | 74 | 21.8 |
| Personal efforts like tuition /part-time work | 19 | 5.6 |
| Loan | 13 | 3.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

The above data shows that the majority of the respondents (68.8\%) confirms that the source of finance for their education is their parents, followed by the respondents ( $21.8 \%$ ) who said that they are dependent on other relatives.

Hence it is clear that students mostly depend on parent's income for completing their education in both government and private schools.

Table 6.184: Use of internet by the students

| Use of internet by the students | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 218 | 64.1 |
| No | 122 | 35.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the respondents ( $64.1 \%$ ) use the internet and private school students are more updated ( $82 \%$ ) for using internet facilities in comparison to government school counterparts.

Table 6.185: Source of information used for studies

| Source of information used for studies | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Google | 54 | 15.9 |
| Educational app | 12 | 3.5 |
| Goggle /youtube | 87 | 25.6 |
| Goggle / you tube / educational website | 59 | 17.4 |
| Not using | 128 | 37.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the respondents who use the internet are using Google and youtube ( $25.6 \%$ ) as a platform to take information regarding their studies, followed by Goggle/youtube / educational website (17.4\%), and only Google (15.9\%).

Table 6.186: Relation of the source of information with the category of school students

| Source of information used for studies | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Google | 25 | 29 | 54 |
| Educational app | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Goggle /you tube | 69 | 18 | 87 |
| Goggle / you tube/website | 59 | 0 | 59 |
| Not using | 5 | 123 | 128 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The table clearly shows that private school students use more diverse internet platforms to get information regarding their studies in comparison to their government school counterparts who are mostly confined to either Google or youtube for getting that information.

After going through detailed data on the perspective of students towards educational institution as a whole, which is covering their performance, educational institute, their teachers, parents, government, their achievements, expectation and lacunas, and their perspective towards a possible solution the findings of the chapter can be summarized as follow.

For the present study 170 students, each is interviewed from 6 private and government schools that are selected based on the highest enrollment. They are further divided into 170 male $(50 \%)$ and 170 female students $(50 \%)$. More than half of the respondents are in the age group of 15 to 17 years age which is followed by $33.5 \%$ of respondents are from 18 to 20 years of age.

The study established that almost twice the number of private schools students' mothers are salaried employees in comparison to government schools, which will have an impact on their economic status and also the time that they can give to their children.

As far as showing interest in subjects though the majority of both the category of schools finds some subjects interesting, but out of the students who find most subjects interesting are mostly from private school background and the students who find none of the subjects interesting are mostly from government school background. The data reveals that government school students mostly leave the problem they face in solving mathematical sum and go on to the next problem more in comparison to private school students. They also take help from their classmates and their teachers while solving the sum in mathematics more in comparison to private school students.

When the new school year begins, parents, students, and teachers need to establish an understanding of homework policies and expectations. How often will homework be given? When is homework due (daily, weekly, specified for each assignment)? How much time will each assignment take to complete? How much does homework count toward grades? Often teachers send home a copy of homework policies at the beginning of the year. Homework serves the purpose of acquiring effective habits of self-discipline and time management, it develops initiative and learns to work independently, gain a sense of personal responsibility for learning, develop research skills, such as locating, organizing, and condensing information, learn to use libraries and other reference resources. Homework can also bring parents and teachers closer together-parents who supervise homework and assist their children with assignments learn more about their children's education and the school. In the present study, homework is not found to be very popular among the government school students as though the majority of the students have the habit of doing homework, but all the students from private schools do homework, whereas all the students who don't do homework are all from government schools. The majority of the private school students are doing their homework by self-study, followed by help from
parents/ tutors whereas the majority of the government school students are doing their homework by self-study followed by home guidance. Most of the government school students reported that they either get too little or no homework at all, whereas the majority of the private school students find their homework too much or just enough. Hence, the data shows that private school students are given more homework than their government school counterparts. Government school students find homework helpful only occasionally more in comparison to private school students, whereas more private school students find homework always helpful than their government school counterparts. Though the majority of the students are not satisfied with their performance in homework or classwork, but it is established that private school students are far more satisfied with their performance in classwork and homework in comparison to their government schools' counterparts. The data also shows that students who get punished for not doing homework are mostly from a private school background. Hence, it suggests that private school teachers take homework of the students more seriously and also involve parents updating them about the progress of their wards and in the process in the education of the students as a whole through homework.

The data shows that private school students would not be happy if they could stop going to school in comparison to government school counterparts. The study also established that apart from school characteristics, the social and economic factors of the household contribute significantly to the discontinuation of children's education. To analyze the reasons for school dropouts more meaningful, we can organize the imperative reasons into three broad categories 1. Reasons related to children (not interested in studies/ truant behavior, repeated failure), Reasons related to Household (cost too much, required for household work, Further education not considered necessary, Required for work on farm/family business, Required for the care of a sibling, Required for outside work for payment in cash or kind), School related reasons (school too far, Did not get admission, Transport not available/too costly, Not safe to send girls, No proper school facilities for girls, No female teacher). Though it may not be strictly possible to identify all the reasons
mentioned in these three broad categories, it will help us to understand how each of these factors responsible for the higher school dropout. This is important because the improvement in school facilities will help only to a limited extent. The improvement in the economic condition of the household can have a higher impact. Even the changes in social factors and attitudes will influence the education of the children considerably.

Moreover, private school students get more praise from their teachers and they do their homework or classwork more than their government school counterparts. Praising students' good work is more found in private schools. Hence, most of the teachers are found to explain to the students their mistake nicely. The data shows that shouting at students' mistakes is more a government schools' teacher behavior. To add to it even making fun of students' mistakes is more a government schools' teacher's behavior, whereas explaining nicely the students' mistakes is more found among the private schools' teachers.

Asking questions in the class is established as a major problem particularly for the Government-school students which are mainly due to shyness, fear of peer, fear of appearing dumb, difficulty in forming the question which leads to problems as gaps in knowledge reinforces bad habit for future learning, hinders self-esteem. Hence teachers have an imperative responsibility here to draw students out of their shell and cultivate the love of learning that is integrated within every person. Therefore, they can make asking questions like a "game". Making a schedule of the practice of questioning and inform the students a day in advance. They can also inculcate the habit in groups or introduce a question box where the students can put their questions and it can be read in front of the students periodically. As teachers work closely with students in creative ways, these students can be identified and helped.

Though the majority of the students describes themselves as average students, the respondents who perceive themselves as both average and bright students are found private school background whereas most of the students who perceive themselves as weak
are from government school background. The data reveals that most of the students from both the school background like their school very much, but the private school students miss their school more than the government school students. The data also confirms that the students unable to come to the school because of sickness, attending weddings and festivals, performing housework, visit aunts, and did not feel like going to school are mostly from government school background. The data shows that using the method of explaining the student's mistake nicely as a measure to discipline students is popular in both government and private schools almost equally. The data also shows that giving angry look, shouting at students as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally more, slapping and pulling ears, stand up or kneel down as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally, sending them out of the room as a measure to discipline students is more popular among the government schools. and sending notes to the parents as a measure to discipline students is more popular among private schools. The data also shows that sending students to the principal as a measure to discipline students, though used occasionally more is popular among both government and private schools almost equally. Students who get punishment, though occasionally more for talking in the class are mostly from a private school background. Hence, it suggests that private school teachers take discipline in the class more seriously. Government school students are more using foul language, fighting, and cheating in the class.

It is important to mention here that the average class size of private schools studied here is significantly smaller than the government schools. Moreover, in almost all government schools proxy teachers more regularly use to take classes in the absence of the regular teachers which raises the total no of teachers taking a class in a particular year. It is expected from the data that in the private school there can be close teacher-student relationships in government schools as they recognize their students by more by name. The above data shows that though most of the teachers from both the government and private schools don't prefer to take an individual interest in students' studies still the
proportion of private schools that are taking an individual interest in studies of students is partially more. The data also confirms that private school teachers are more approachable for the students to discuss the personal problem in comparison to government school teachers. Though students are expecting different percentages according to their level of expectation, the data establishes that private school students are significantly expecting more percentage of marks in their upcoming examination in comparison to their government school counterparts.

When we asked about their future plan, the government school students prefer to get a job, followed by joining college after leaving school, whereas private school students prefer to join college followed by getting a job after leaving school. Moreover, we can say that students prefer different jobs according to their level of expectation. The majority of the government school students prefer to be teachers, followed by business and other professional jobs whereas most of the private school students prefer to be teachers followed by doctors or engineers and lecturers. Hence, it is clear that both the private and government school students opt for a future job which is mostly based on their thinking.

In the case of participating in extracurricular activities, the study establishes that though few of the government school students do participate (in assignment presentation, debating quiz completions, drama completions music completions, essay competition, etc), they are significantly outnumbered by their private school counterparts. In the very expected line, the data also confirms that more students from private schools are winning awards in extracurricular activities than their government school counterparts. But surprisingly, though more exposure to sports is given in the private schools which are reflected in their participation at the intra-school level, particularly in the outdoor games category more government school students are performing, as they are better sportspersons enrolled there. The response of the principals on the reasons for the performance in both academics and extracurricular activities in government schools is mostly restricted to the role played by the sports teacher as an imperative cause behind that. In the case of
private schools, the principals give the credit to good administration, robust teaching methods, the role played by teachers and students together with parents. Hence private schools are better understanding the importance of the involvement of different agents for the success of a student.

Furthermore, the majority of the students' parents want their children to continue their studies after school. Besides, private school parents are mostly in favor of continuing their children's' education whereas job is the preference of most of the parents of government school students. The data also confirms that the lack of books at home is one of the major impediments that government school students are facing in the present study.

The majority of the students have not got any rewards or awards for their merit yet. The data shows that majority of the respondents who got rewards or awards for their merits in academics are from private school backgrounds. Furthermore, private school students are aspiring to continue their education significantly longer than their government school counterparts. The study shows that the majority of private school students (76.47\%) take private tuition in comparison to government school counterparts. (35.29\%), as they find the deficiency in themselves whereas most of the government school students take private tuitions as classes are not held regularly at their respective schools. The students studied are mostly depending on the parent's income for completing their education in both government and private schools. Moreover, though the majority of the respondents (64.1\%) use the internet, private school students are more updated for using internet facilities in comparison to government school counterparts. The data clearly shows that private school students use more diverse internet platforms to get information regarding their studies in comparison to their government school counterparts who are mostly confined to either Google or youtube for getting those pieces of information.

## 6.4: Perspectives of the Parents:

This part of the study deals with the background, the perspective of the parents towards their children's education, their educational institute, their aspirations, their achievements and lacunas, and their perspective towards a possible solution. The chapter covers a detailed in-depth understanding of the parent's perception towards educational institutions as a whole.

The study is conducted on $(50 \%)$ government school parents and the rest ( $50 \%$ ) from private school parents, who are further subdivided into five each from the six schools selected for the study. The data also reveals that majority of the respondents practice Hindu religion ( $90 \%$ ) which is followed by Islam (10\%)

Table 6.187: Language used in the house by children

| The language used in the house by children | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assamese | 21 | 70.0 |
| Bengali | 6 | 20.0 |
| Hindi | 3 | 10.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents interact at their house in the Assamese language (70 \%) which is followed by Bengali (20\%) and Hindi (10\%).

Hence we can say that majority of the students interacting with their families at home in the Assamese language followed by the Bengali language and Hindi language.

Table 6.188: Number of members living in the household

| Number of members living in the household | Frequency | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-3$ | 5 | 16.7 |  |
| $4-6$ | 21 | 70.0 |  |
| $7-10$ | 3 | 10.0 |  |
| $11-14$ | 1 | 3.3 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |  |
| Source: Field Work |  |  |  |

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (70\%) responded 4-6 members are there in their family which is followed by 1-3 members (16.7\%) and 7-10 members (10\%) in their family

Hence we can say that majority of the students have small and very small size family, which is one of the features of urban families.

Table 6.189: Relationship with the child

| Relationship with the child | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Father | 15 | 50.0 |
| Mother | 14 | 46.7 |
| Uncle /aunt | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that (50\%) of the respondents are fathers, followed by mothers (46.7\%).

Table 6.190: Age group of the respondents

| The age group of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-40$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| $41-50$ | 14 | 46.3 |
| $51-60$ | 12 | 43.3 |
| $61-70$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (46\%) are from the 41-50 age group followed by 51-60 (40\%) and 30-40 age group (10\%).

Hence almost half of the respondents are in the middle age, followed by higher middleaged parents.

Table 6.191: Educational qualification of the respondents

| Educational qualification of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Up to H.S | 13 | 43.3 |
| Graduation | 10 | 33.3 |
| Post-graduation above | 5 | 16.7 |
| Under Metric | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that $43.3 \%$ of the respondents have up to HS Qualification, followed by the respondents $33.3 \%$ who have only graduation and $16.7 \%$ of respondents have M.A and above qualification.

Hence the data reveals that a majority of the parents are undergraduate. Followed by $(33.3 \%)$ graduate and $16.7 \%$ have a master's degree.

Table 6.192: Relation of educational qualification of the respondents with the category of school

| Educational qualification of the respondents | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Up to H.S | 3 | 10 | 13 |
| Graduation | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| Post-graduation above | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Under metric | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 15 | 30 |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that majority of the parents of the students of private schools are having graduation and post-graduation degrees, whereas most of the parents of the students of government school are having only up to a Higher secondary degree.

Hence, most of the parents of the students of private schools are more qualified than the parents of government school students.

Table 6.193: Occupation of the respondents

| Occupation of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service | 18 | 60.0 |
| Business | 12 | 40.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table reveals that a majority of the parents (60\%) are service holders, Followed by parents (40\%) who are pursuing business.

Table 6.194: Relation of occupation of the respondents with the category of school

| Occupation of the respondents | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Service | 12 | 6 | 18 |
| Business | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that majority of the parents of the students of government school are doing business, whereas most of the private school students' parents are working in service.

Hence, service is more common among the parents of private school students, and parents of government school students are mostly engaged in business.

Table 6.195: Nature of the employment of the respondents

| Nature of the employment of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Temporary | 2 | 6.7 |
| Permanent | 20 | 66.7 |
| self-employed | 8 | 26.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents (66.7\%) are permanent service holder followed by the respondents who are self-employed (26.7\%) and working in temporary jobs (6.7\%)

Hence the data reveals that a majority of the parents are permanent service holders who are having secured financial status.

Table 6.196: Relation of nature of the employment of the respondents with the category of school

| Nature of the employment of the <br> respondents | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Temporary | 0 | 2 | 20 |
| Permanent | 13 | 7 | 8 |
| Self-employed | 2 | 6 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that most of the permanent employees (86\%) are the parents of the private school students, whereas most of the self-employed employees ( $40 \%$ ) are the parents of the students from a government school.

Table 6.197: Monthly family Income of the respondents

| Monthly family income of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5000-10000$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| $10001-20000$ | 8 | 26.7 |
| $20001-30000$ | 4 | 13.3 |
| $30001-40000$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| $40001-50000$ | 7 | 23.3 |
| Above 50000 | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that almost one-fourth of the respondents ( $26.7 \%$ ) responded that their monthly income is $10001-20000$ which is followed by 40001 to 50000 ( $23.3 \%$ ), above $50000(16 \%), 20001-30000(13.3 \%), 30001-40000(12 \%)$ and $5001-10000(10 \%)$ respectively. Data reveals that there is a mixed blend of monthly income in the families.

Table 6.198: Relation of monthly family income of the respondents with the category of school

| Monthly family income of the respondents | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $5000-10000$ | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| $10001-20000$ | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| $20001-30000$ | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| $30001-40000$ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| $40001-50000$ | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Above 50000 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows that the majority of the parents ( $80 \%$ ) of the students from private schools are earning above 40000 monthly, whereas most of the parents $(86.6 \%)$ of the students from government schools are earning between 5000 to 30000 monthly.

Hence the parents of the private school students are found to be financially more stable than the parents of government school students.

Table 6.199: Locality of the house

| The locality of the house | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largely business area | 4 | 13.3 |
| Largely residential area | 13 | 43.3 |
| Fairly mixed area | 13 | 43.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that ( $43.3 \%$ ) of the respondents are residing in a largely residential area which is followed by a fairly mixed area (43.3\%) and large business area (13.3\%) Hence the data reveals there is not a significant difference in children's locality.

Table 6.200: Locality of the house

| The locality of the house | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clean | 27 | 90.0 |
| Dirty | 2 | 6.7 |
| Average | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the house ( $90 \%$ ) where respondents are living is clean locality, followed by households ( $6.7 \%$ ) which are found in dirty and average (3.3\%) localities.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents are staying in clean localities.
Table 6.201: Income category of the people living around the respondents

| Income category of the people living around the <br> respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mostly upper-income group | 2 | 6.7 |
| The most upper and middle-income group | 10 | 33.3 |
| Mostly middle-income group | 9 | 30.0 |
| Mostly middle and lower-income group | 6 | 20.0 |
| Mostly lower income group | 1 | 3.3 |
| A mixture of upper-middle and lower-income groups | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that most of the respondents (33.3\%) are living with people who have upper and middle income which is followed by middle-income group (30\%), mostly middle and lower-income group (20\%), and a mixture of the upper, middle and lowerincome group (6.7\%).

Hence we can say that there is a mixed blend of income groups living around them in their locality.

Table 6.202: Type of residence of the respondents

| Type of residence of the respondents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apartments | 12 | 40.0 |
| Pucca house | 13 | 43.3 |
| Hut | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that ( $43.3 \%$ ) of the respondent responded that they are residing in a pucca house followed by apartments (40\%) and hut. (16.7\%)

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents are staying both apartments and pucca houses.

Table 6.203: Relation of type of residence of the respondents with the category of school

| Type of residence of the <br> respondents | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Flat | 10 | 2 | 13 |
| Pucca house | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| Hut | 0 | 5 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | ( |

Source: Field Work
The above data shows the majority of the parents (67\%) of the private school students are staying in apartments and most of the parents ( $46 \%$ ) of students of government school are staying in pucca houses followed by hut (38\%).

Hence the economic condition of the parents of both the category of schools is reflected in their type of residence.

Table 6.204: No of rooms in the house of the respondent

| No of rooms in the house of the respondent | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-2$ | 4 | 13.3 |
| $3-4$ | 20 | 66.7 |
| $5-6$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) have 3-4 rooms in their house, followed by 5-6 rooms ( $20 \%$ ) and 1-2 rooms ( $13.3 \%$ ).

Hence we can say that majority of the families have a small structure of houses with mostly 3-4 rooms as land is very costly in Guwahati city.

Table 6.205: Type of kitchen in the house of the respondent

| Type of kitchen in the house of the respondent | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Separate | 23 | 76.7 |
| The room in which they are living has a kitchen | 7 | 23.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (76.7\%) have a separate kitchen in their house followed by respondents (23.3\%) who have a kitchen in their same living room.

Table 6.206: Number/ nature of toilets

| Number/ nature of toilets | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Two or more | 17 | 56.7 |
| One | 11 | 36.7 |
| Common with other families | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (56.7\%) responded that they have two or more toilets in their houses which is followed by the respondents ( $36.7 \%$ ) who responded that they have one toilet and (6.7\%) viewed that they have common toilets with other families.

Hence we can say that almost all the respondents have separate toilet facilities in their house.

Table 6.207: Ceiling Fans in the house

| Ceiling Fans in the house | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Present | 29 | 96.7 |
| Absent | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents $96.7 \%$ have ceiling fans in their house. Moreover, all the respondents have lighting arrangements in their homes.

Table 6.208: Reading arrangements of the respondent's children

| Reading arrangements of the respondent's children | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The child has his table and chair | 21 | 70.0 |
| Table and chair shared by the siblings in the family | 7 | 23.3 |
| Some improved arrangement | 1 | 3.3 |
| No facilities for study | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (70\%) responded that the children have his/her table and chair which is followed by those who (23.3\%) responded that table and chair are shared by the siblings in the family.

Hence we can conclude that almost all the respondents have separate arrangements for studying the children.

Table 6.209: Relation of the reading arrangement of the respondents with the category of school

| Reading arrangement of the respondents | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| The child has his/her table and chair | 10 | 11 | 21 |
| Table and chair shared by the siblings in the family | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Some improved arrangement | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| No facilities for study | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data shows that students of both the category of schools are mostly given separate place for studying.

Table 6.210: Factors considered while selecting the present school

| Factors <br> considered <br> while selecting <br> the present <br> school | Convenient <br> locations |  | School is <br> free |  | Fees are <br> reasonable | The school <br> is best in <br> the city | Run by <br> managem <br> ent <br> belongs to <br> the same <br> religion | School <br> provides $\backslash$ <br> a good <br> education |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ |
| Yes | 18 | 60.0 | 8 | 26.7 | 20 | 66.7 | 15 | 50.0 | 7 | 23.3 | 17 | 56.7 |
| No | 12 | 40.0 | 22 | 73.3 | 10 | 33.3 | 15 | 50.0 | 23 | 76.7 | 13 | 43.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the parents consider convenient location (60\%), reasonable fees ( $66.7 \%$ ), quality of education provided by the school ( $56.7 \%$ ), and the ranking of the school (50\%), before selecting a school for their children.

The data shows that convenient location and fee structure of the school is equally preferred by both government and private school student's parents, but the quality of education provided (65\%) is preferred more by private school parents in selecting the school of their children.

Table 6.211: Aspiration to change the present school of the children

| An aspiration to change the present school of the children | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 5 | 16.7 |
| No | 21 | 70.0 |
| Can't say | 4 | 13.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table reveals that the majority of the respondents( $70 \%$ ) don't want to change the school of their children which is followed by parents (16.7\%) who are not sure and those who want to change the school ( $13.3 \%$ ) of the children.

Hence we can conclude that majority of the respondents are satisfied with the present school of their children.

Table 6.212: Frequency of the respondent's children's attendance in school

| Frequency of the students' attendance in school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regularly | 15 | 50.0 |
| Miss school occasionally | 13 | 43.3 |
| Miss school often | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents' children (50\%) are visiting their school regularly which is followed by respondents (43.3\%) whose children miss school occasionally in the last one year.

Hence we can say that most of the children of the respondents are visiting their school regularly. But the private school students are comparatively more regular (69.23\%) than their government counterparts, and more students from government schools are not attending their school occasionally ( $75 \%$ ).

Table 6.213: Extent of regularity in the school by the students

| Extent of regularity in the school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never missed school | 6 | 20.0 |
| Missed school only when very sick | 18 | 60.0 |
| Missed school for a reason other than sickness | 4 | 13.3 |
| Not applicable | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents ( $60 \%$ ) responded that their children missed the school only when they are sick, followed by those who never missed school (20\%) and those who missed school for a reason other than sickness (13.3\%).

Hence we can conclude that majority of the respondents' children missed school only when they were very sick.

Table 6.214: Children absent in school to visiting relatives and attending weddings

| Children absent <br> in school to visit <br> relatives | Frequency | Percentage | Children absent <br> in school for <br> festival /wedding | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-3$ | 20 | 66.7 | $1-3$ | 18 | 60.0 |
| $4-6$ | 6 | 20.0 | $4-6$ | 9 | 30.0 |
| $7-10$ | 4 | 13.3 | $7-10$ | 3 | 10.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondent's children were absent for 1-3 days in school to visit relatives (66.7\%) and attend festivals and weeding (60\%).

Hence we can say that majority of the students were absent mostly not more than three days for either visiting relatives or attending festivals and weeding and most of them are from private school background ( $75 \%$ and $78 \%$ respectively of the total absentees).

Table 6.215: Knowledge of performance of the children in the school

| Knowledge of performance of the children in the school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 20 | 66.7 |
| No | 10 | 33.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) are aware of the performance of their children in school.

Table 6.216: Level of satisfaction with the child's performance in school

| Level of satisfaction with the child's <br> performance in school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very satisfactory | 12 | 36.7 |
| Satisfactory | 13 | 43.3 |
| Unsatisfactory | 4 | 13.3 |
| No response | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

Table number 6.219 shows that most of the respondents (43.3\%) are satisfied with the performance of their children in school, followed by very satisfied (36.7\%) ones, unsatisfactory ( $13.3 \%$ ), and the respondents ( $6.7 \%$ ) who did not respond.

Hence the majority of the respondents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the performance of their children in school.

Table 6.217: Relation of the level of satisfaction with child's performance in school with the category of school

| Level of satisfaction with the <br> child's performance in school | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Very satisfactory | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Satisfactory | 8 | 4 | 12 |
| Unsatisfactory | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Not applicable | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the parents of government students are more satisfied with the performance of their children than the parents of private school students.

Hence, though the performance of private school students is comparatively much better than the government school students, on the contrary, government school parents are more satisfied with their children's performance in school. Therefore, it suggests that private school parents are more ambitious in their expectations from their children.

Table 6.218: Parents expectation of marks to be secured from their children

| Parents expectation from their children (in \%) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-59$ | 1 | 3.3 |
| $60-69$ | 7 | 23.3 |
| $70-79$ | 5 | 16.7 |
| $80-89$ | 6 | 20.0 |
| $90-99$ | 11 | 36.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that ( $36.7 \%$ ) of the respondents reported that they are expecting from their child above $90 \%$, which is followed by the respondents 60-69 (23.3\%), 80-89 (20\%), 70-79 (16.7\%) and 50-59 (3.3\%)

Table 6.219: Relation of the percentage of marks expect from the child by the parents with the category of school

| Parents expectation from their children (in <br> \%) | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| $50-59$ | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $60-69$ | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| $70-79$ | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| $80-89$ | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| $90-99$ | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data shows that majority of the private school parents' expectation from their children is very high with 90 to $99 \%(73.3 \%)$ and 80 to $89 \%$ ( $27 \%$ ), whereas the majority of the parents of the government school students are expecting 60 to $69 \%$ ( $47 \%$ ), followed by 70 to $79 \%$ ( $33.3 \%$ ) from their children in school.

Hence, private school parents' expectation is far more than the government school parents, which may be reflected in their level of satisfaction.

Table 6.220: Capacity of the children to achieve

| Capacity of the children to achieve | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Below their capacity | 2 | 6.7 |
| Above their capacity | 8 | 26.7 |
| In keeping with their capacities | 20 | 66.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) responded that their children are keeping with their capacities which are followed by those ( $26.7 \%$ ) who believe their children are achieving above their capacity.

Parents of both government and private school mostly believe that their children are keeping with their capacities

Table: 6.221: Conveying satisfaction to the child

| Conveying satisfaction to the child | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 12 | 40.0 |
| Often | 8 | 26.7 |
| Sometimes | 6 | 20.0 |
| Rarely | 2 | 6.7 |
| Never | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that more respondents (40\%) responded that they always convey their satisfaction to their children, followed by those ( $26.7 \%$ ) who reported to convey it often, and sometimes $20 \%$.

Hence we can say that majority of the parents are mostly satisfied and convey their satisfaction to their children.

Table 6.222: Conveying dissatisfaction to the child

| Conveying dissatisfaction to the child | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 10 | 33.3 |
| Often | 13 | 43.3 |
| Sometimes | 6 | 20.0 |
| Rarely | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that more respondents (43.3\%) responded that they often convey their dissatisfaction to their children, followed by those ( $33.3 \%$ ) who convey it always, and sometimes $20 \%$.

Hence we can say that majority of the parents are when dissatisfied with the performance of their children use to convey it to them.

Table 6.223: Perception of homework

| Perception of homework | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential for children | 24 | 80.0 |
| All studies should be completed at school | 6 | 20.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents ( $80 \%$ ) find homework essential for children, followed by those ( $20 \%$ ) who think that all studies should be completed at school.

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents from both categories of schools are in favor of homework.

Table 6.224: Perception of the volume of Homework

| Perception of the volume of Homework | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Too much | 5 | 16.7 |
| Enough | 15 | 50.0 |
| Not enough | 6 | 20.0 |
| No homework is given | 1 | 3.3 |
| Don't know | 3 | 10.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that half of the respondents (50\%) find the amount of homework enough for the students, which is followed by those respondents ( $20 \%$ ) who believe that it is not enough and (16.7\%) said that it is too much.

Hence we can say that though most of the respondents from both government and private schools are more in the favor of the existing volume of homework given to the child by the school, bit majority of the parents who find it too much are private school background students' parents.

Table 6.225: Expectation towards the level of education of the children

| The expectation of the level of education | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Complete schooling and then go for higher education | 19 | 63.3 |
| Complete schooling and take up some technical or <br> vocational training | 5 | 16.7 |
| Complete schooling and then start working | 6 | 20.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (63.3\%) responded that they want their children to complete their school and then go for higher education, followed by those $(20 \%)$ who responded that they want their children to complete their schooling and then start working and $(16.7 \%)$ responded want their children to take up some technical or vocational training after their schooling.

Hence we can say that higher education is preferred by most of the parents for their children after their schooling.

Table 6.226: Relation of expectation towards the level of education with the category of school

| The expectation of the level of education | School |  | (hotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Complete schooling and then go for higher education | 14 | 5 | 19 |
| Complete schooling and take up some technical or <br> vocational training | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Complete schooling and then start working | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the government school patents (40\%) want their children to start working after their schooling, whereas most of the private school
students' parents ( $93.3 \%$ ) want their children to continue their studies and go for higher education.

Hence there is a clear difference between the government and private school parents' expectations towards their children after completing their schooling.

Table 6.227: Perception of the importance of scoring marks in school

| Perception of the importance of scoring marks | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very important | 19 | 63.3 |
| Important | 8 | 26.7 |
| Not so important | 3 | 10.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents ( $63.3 \%$ ) finds scoring marks in school very important, followed by those who find it important (26.7\%)

Hence we can say that majority of the respondents give importance to obtaining good marks at school.

Table 6.228: Rationale for the importance of scoring marks in school

| Rationale for the importance of scoring <br> marks in school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| For getting admission in prestigious colleges | 18 | 60.0 |
| For getting good jobs | 10 | 33.3 |
| Any other | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents (60\%) thinks scoring mark is important for getting admission into the prestigious colleges which are followed by those ( $33.3 \%$ ) who believe it is important for getting a good job.

Hence, admission to a prestigious college and getting a good job are the reasons for parents preferring their children to score good marks in school.

Table 6.229: Frequency of supervision of the child's study by other members of the family

| Frequency of supervision of the child's study <br> by other members of the family | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regularly | 3 | 10.0 |
| Sometimes | 21 | 70.0 |
| Rarely | 5 | 16.7 |
| Never | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals that the majority of the respondents (70\%) responded that other members of the family supervise their child in studies only sometimes, followed by rarely $(16.7 \%)$. Only a mere ( $10 \%$ ) of the respondent responded that these supervisions are done regularly in their family.

Hence we can say that in the majority of the respondents' families, supervision in their children study by other members of their family is not a regular phenomenon.

Table 6.230: Relation of the frequency of supervision of the child's study by other members of the family with the category of schools

| Frequency of supervision of the child's <br> study by other members of the family | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Regularly | Private | Govt. | 3 |
| Sometimes | 3 | 0 |  |
| Rarely | 11 | 4 | 11 |
| Never | 0 | 10 | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 1 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{y y y n}$ |  |  |  |

Source: Field Work

The data shows that though both the category of school parents find the supervision done by their family member in the studies of the children mostly sometimes, all the respondents who responded that these supervisions are regular are all from private school background and the majority of the parents who find that these supervisions are rarely ( $73 \%$ ) or never done, are from government school background.

Table 6.231: Perception towards the reason for not supervising the child in studies

| Perception towards the reason for not supervising the <br> child in studies | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As the child study independently | 10 | 33.3 |
| The child is old enough does not need supervision | 8 | 26.7 |
| Don 't find the time to supervise your child | 6 | 20.0 |
| Not applicable | 6 | 20.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveals more respondents ( $33.3 \%$ ) responded that their child is not supervised as they study independently which is followed by those (26.7\%) who responded that they feel their children are old enough and ( $20 \%$ ) who don't need supervision and those who don't find the time to supervise their children.

Table 6.232: Relation of perception towards the reason for not supervising the child in studies category of school

| Perception towards the reason for not <br> supervising the child in studies | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Child studies independently | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| The child is old enough does not need <br> supervision | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Don 't find the time to supervise your child | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Not applicable | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data shows that an equal number of both of the school's parents and their family members don't supervise their children in studies as study independently, but most government school students' parents and their family members don't supervise their children as they don 't find the time.

Table 6.233: Preference for tuition or coaching for children

| Preference for tuition or coaching for children | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 19 | 63.3 |
| No | 11 | 36.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that the majority of the respondent ( $63.3 \%$ ) give their children tuition and coaching.

Hence the majority of the parents are in the favor of giving tuition of their child
Table 6.234: Relation of preference for tuition or coaching for children with the category of school

| Preference for tuition or coaching for <br> children | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 12 | 7 | 19 |
| No | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
When we try to see the breakup of the data in government and private schools we can observe that majority of the parents who prefer to send their children for tuition and coaching are mostly ( $80 \%$ ) from private school background, whereas the majority of the government school students' parents( $53.3 \%$ ) are not sending their children to these tuitions and coaching.

Hence, tuition and coaching are more popular among parents of private school students.
Table 6.235: Perception of the importance of education in getting a job

| Perception of the importance of education in getting a job | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Of great importance | 25 | 83.3 |
| Of some importance | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (83.3\%) find that education as very important for getting a job. followed by those( $16.7 \%$ )who find it somewhat important for getting jobs

Table 6.236: Occasion of meeting the child's teacher

| The occasion of meeting the child's teacher | To attend the P.T.A |  | At the parentteacher meeting |  | When the respondents are called by the teacher |  | Not applicable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| Yes | 7 | 23.3 | 20 | 66.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 3 | 10.0 |
| No | 23 | 76.7 | 10 | 33.3 | 26 | 86.7 | 27 | 90.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |

Source: Field Work
The above data reveal that majority of the respondents don't attend parent-teacher association ( $76.7 \%$ ) or when teachers call them for meetings ( $86.7 \%$ ), only in case of the parent-teacher meet, the majority of the respondents (66.7\%) are meeting with their children's teacher.

Hence, both P.T.A and prescription of the teacher to meet is not taken seriously by most of the parents.

Table 6.237: Relation of attending parent-teacher association with the category of school

| Attend the PTA | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| No | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data confirms that though P.T.A is not very popular among the parents but the private school parents prefer to visit their children's school a little more often (34\%) than the government school parents (13.33\%).

Table 6.238: Relation of attending parent-teacher meetings with the category of school

| Attend parents teachers meeting | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Yes | 14 | 6 | 20 |
| No | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The data establish that majority of the private school parents (94\%) are attending the parent-teacher meeting in comparison to government school parents (40\%).

Table 6.239: Reason for meeting with the teacher by the respondents

| Reason for meeting with the teacher | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child performing badly | 1 | 3.3 |
| Child behaving badly | 3 | 10.0 |
| Attendance issue | 10 | 33.33 |
| Not Applicable | 16 | 53.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents (53.3\%) were never asked to meet by the teacher, followed by those $(33.3 \%)$ who were told to meet the teacher for the poor attendance of the students, and as the child was behaving badly ( $10 \%$ ).

Hence most of the parents never called by the teachers of their children to meet.
Table 6.240: Reason for not meeting with the teacher by the respondents

| Reason for not meeting with the teacher | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No time to attend the P.T.M | 1 | 3.3 |
| No occasion to meet | 6 | 20.0 |
| No purpose for meeting the teachers | 9 | 30.0 |
| Not applicable | 14 | 46.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data reveals that the majority of the respondents (46.7\%) use to meet teachers, which is followed by those ( $30 \%$ ) who never find any occasion to meet and those ( $20 \%$ ) who did not see the need for such a meeting.

Table 6.241: Relation of the reason for not meeting with the teacher by the response with the category of school

| Reason for not meeting with the teacher by the <br> respond | School |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| No time to attend the P.T.M | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| No occasion to meet | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| No purpose for meeting the teachers | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Not applicable | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that out of the majority of the parents who don't meet with their children's teacher are mostly from government school background, and their reason for not meeting is mostly because of lack of purpose to meet (40\%), followed by no occasion suitable to meet( $33.33 \%$ ). Out of the few times who could not meet with their children's teacher is mainly because of the lack of any purpose ( $20 \%$ ).

Table 6.242: Type of newspaper subscribed to the house

| Type of newspaper subscribed to the house | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National | 5 | 16.7 |
| Regional vernacular | 12 | 40.0 |
| English regional | 11 | 36.7 |
| Don't subscribe | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that more respondents (40\%) subscribe to regional vernacular newspapers, followed by English regional newspapers (36.7\%), national newspapers (16.7\%), and local newspapers (6.7\%).

Hence we can say that regional vernacular and English regional are the most popular newspapers among the respondents.

Table 6.243: Relation of type of newspaper subscribed at the house with the category of schools:

| Type of newspaper subscribed at the house | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| National | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Regional vernacular | 2 | 9 | 11 |
| English regional | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Don't subscribe | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data confirms that regional vernacular newspapers are mostly preferred by the parents of government school students and English regional newspapers are mostly preferred by the parents of private school students.

Therefore, though regional newspapers are preferred by the parents of both the category of school, but the difference lies in their preference for the language of the newspaper.

Table 6.244: Frequency of reading newspapers

| Frequency of reading newspapers | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily | 14 | 46.7 |
| Sometimes | 8 | 26.7 |
| Rarely | 6 | 20.0 |
| Never | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that more respondents (46.7\%) read newspapers daily followed by sometimes ( $26.7 \%$ ) and rarely ( $20 \%$ )

Hence most of the parents prefer to read the newspaper daily.
Table 6.245: Relation of the frequency of reading newspaper of the respondents with the category of school

| Frequency of reading newspapers | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Daily | 13 | 1 | 14 |
| Sometimes | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Rarely | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Never | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The data shows that the majority of the parents ( $87 \%$ ) of private school students read newspapers daily, whereas most of the parents of government school students are reading newspapers either sometimes (47\%) or rarely (40\%).

Hence there is a clear difference in the frequency of reading newspapers between the parents of government and private school students.

Table 6.246: Frequency of taking children out with parents

| Frequency of taking children out with <br> parents | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regularly | 6 | 20.0 |
| Sometimes | 18 | 60.0 |
| Rarely | 5 | 16.7 |
| Never | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
The above table shows that majority of the respondents (60\%) take their children out with them only sometimes, followed by those who take them regularly (20\%), and rarely 16.7\%

Hence taking children out with them is not a regular phenomenon.
Table 6.247: Level of happiness of the child at school

| Level of happiness of the child at school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very happy | 10 | 33.3 |
| Happy | 15 | 50.0 |
| Can 't say | 5 | 16.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that half of the respondents (50\%) find their children happy at their respective schools followed by those (33.3\%) who find them very happy there, and the rest (16.7\%) are unaware of it.

Table 6.248: Frequency of failing of the children at school

| Frequency of failing of the children at school | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never | 26 | 86.7 |
| Once | 4 | 13.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Field Work

The above table shows that majority of the respondents' children (86.7\%) never failed in any exam followed by those (13.3\%) who failed only once.

Hence the majority of the students never fail in their academic life till now.
Table 6.249: Relation of the frequency of failing of the children at school with the category of school

| Frequency of failing of the children at school | School |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Govt. |  |
| Never | 15 | 11 | 26 |
| Once | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |

Source: Field Work
Though the majority of the students never fail in their academic life till now, but out of those who failed only once are all from government schools.

After going through detailed data on the perspective of parents towards the institution of education as a whole, covering the background of the parents, their perspective towards the performance of the educational institute of their children and their teachers, achievements, expectation, and lacunas of the students and the institutions and their
perspective towards a possible solution. The findings of the chapter can be summarized as follows.

For the present study, 15 parents are interviewed each from the government schools and private schools. The study shows that the majority of the respondents practice Hindu religion ( $90 \%$ ) which is followed by Islam ( $10 \%$ ). Moreover, the majority of the students are interacting with their families at home in the Assamese language followed by the Bengali language and Hindi language. And the majority of them are multilingual. The data also confirms that the majority of the students have small and very small size family, which is one of the features of urban families and most of the respondents are the parents of the students. Almost half of the respondents are in the middle age, followed by higher middle-aged parents. The data established that most of the parents of the students of private schools are more educationally qualified than the parents of government school students. Moreover, service is more common among the parents (60\%) of private school students, and parents of government school students are mostly engaged in business ( $40 \%$ ). The data shows that most of the permanent employees ( $86 \%$ ) are the parents of the private school students, whereas most of the self-employed employees (40\%) are the parents of the students from government schools. Furthermore, the data shows that majority of the parents ( $80 \%$ ) of the students from private schools are earning above 40000 monthly, whereas most of the parents ( $86.6 \%$ ) of the students from government schools are earning between 5000 to 30000 monthly. Hence, the parents of private school students are found to be financially more stable than the parents of government school students. Though the majority of the respondents are staying in both apartments and pucca houses but majority of the parents $(67 \%)$ of the private school students are staying in apartments and most of the parents ( $46 \%$ ) of students of government school are staying in pucca houses followed by hut (38\%). Hence, the economic condition of the parents of both the category of schools is reflected in their type of residence. The data also confirms that the majority of the families have a small structure of houses with mostly 3-4 rooms as land is very costly in urban areas. Furthermore, the majority of the families have a
separate kitchen and almost all the respondents have separate toilet facilities in their house. The data reveals that the majority of the respondents have ceiling fans, lighting arrangement, a separate place for studying. The data also shows that the convenient location and fee structure of the school, is preferred by both government and private school students' parents, but the quality of education provided and ranking of the school is preferred by private school parents in selecting the school of their children. Though the majority of the respondents are satisfied with the present school of their children and most of the children of the respondents are visiting their school regularly. The problem of absenteeism has not emerged much from the study and those who are an occasionally absent majority of them are absent from their school only when they are very sick or for either visiting relatives or attending festivals and weeding.

The data also shows that the majority of the respondents (73\%) are aware of the performance of their children in school and the parents of government students are more satisfied with the performance of their children than the parents of private school students. Hence, private school students' parents' expectation is far more than the government school parents, which may be reflected in their level of satisfaction. Moreover, parents of both government and private schools believe that their children are keeping with their capacities. Hence the majority of the parents are mostly satisfied and convey their satisfaction to their children. The majority of the parents are when dissatisfied with the performance of their children use to convey it to them. Henceforth majority of the students never fail in their academic life till now. Though the majority of the students never fail in their academic life till now, but out of those who failed only once are all from government schools.

As far as future planning is concerned, higher education is preferred by most of the parents for their students after their schooling. Hence there is a clear difference between the government and private school parents as far as their expectations towards their children after completing their schooling, as private school parents prefer their children to
continue studies, and Government school parents are favoring their children to join jobs. Moreover, in the present study, the majority of the respondents give importance to obtaining good marks at school, and admission to a prestigious college and getting a good job are the reasons for parents preferring their children to score good marks in school.

When asked about the perspective towards homework, most of the respondents are in favor of the volume of homework given to their child by the school. The majority of the respondents from both government and private schools think homework is essential for children as it helps the child cover again what has been taught at school and as It makes for compulsory study at home. The respondents who believe that all studies should be completed at school from both the government and private school as they find the hours of work put in at school are sufficient for the children, followed by children come home very tired and have no time to rest or play. In the majority of the respondents' families, supervision by other members of their family in their children's study is not a regular phenomenon, but it is more frequent among private school students. Besides, the majority of the parents who prefer to send their children for tuition and coaching are mostly ( $80 \%$ ) from private school background, whereas the majority of the government school students' parents (53.3\%) are not sending their children to these tuitions and coaching. Hence, tuition and coaching are more popular among parents of private school students. The majority of the parents ( $80 \%$ ) more from private school background send their children for tuitions as they believe that it helps the child to get individual attention which is not possible at school and enables him to perform better, but more parents (47\%) of government school students prefer tuition for their children as they find their child is weak in their studies/certain subjects and needs additional help.

The above data reveal that majority of the respondents meet their children's teacher during the parent-teacher meeting but the Parent Teacher Association (P.T.A) is not very popular among the parents, but the private school parents (94\%) are attending the parentteacher meeting in comparison to government school parents (40\%). The data confirms
that regional vernacular newspapers are mostly preferred by the parents of government school students and English regional is mostly preferred by the parents of private school students. Therefore, though regional newspapers are preferred by the parents of both the category of school, but the difference lies in their preference for the language of the newspaper even there is a clear difference in the frequency of reading newspaper by the parents of government and private school students. Most of the parents of both government and private school students would advise their children to take the job offered to them and also continue their studies

The majority of the government school parents give credit to the success of children at school to the child themselves whereas most of the private school parents share the credit equal to the parents, teachers, and children.

