

**IDENTIFICATION OF FACTORS
FOR LOW PERFORMANCE OF
SCHOOLS IN X CLASS PUBLIC
EXAMINATION**

Asha K V D Kamath
Programme Coordinator

B.Phalachandra
G. Viswanathappa
Associated Faculty Members



REGIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
[National Council of Educational Research & Training, New Delhi]
Mysore 570 006

March 2009

Acknowledgement

I sincerely thank all the Resource Persons for participating in the development of the tools and analysis of data. I thank the Field Investigators for taking all pains to visit the schools, administer the tools and consolidate the huge amount of data within the specified time. I thank my B.Ed. students (2007-09) for extending a helping hand in tallying the responses.

I also thank SCERT, Hyderabad, Government Examinations, Hyderabad, SSA, Hyderabad and Ananthapur, APSW Residential School, Hindupur and BEO, Ananthapur, for their cooperation during the programme.

I sincerely thank Prof.B.Phalachandra, Head, DE, for his academic support and guidance at every stage of the programme. Work would not have been possible without the support of Associated Faculty members and I thank them whole heartedly.

Finally, I owe my gratitude to the Principal, RIE, Mysore and all my colleagues of the Department of Education and the Computer Processing Unit for their support.

Asha K V D Kamath
Programme Coordinator

CONTENT

	Page No.
1.0 Introduction	1
<i>1.1 Secondary Education in India</i>	1
<i>1.2 National Curriculum Framework 2005 on School and Secondary Education</i>	6
<i>1.3 Report of CABE Committee set up by MHRD</i>	14
2.0 Meetings and Workshops	21
<i>2.1 Inhouse Meeting</i>	21
<i>2.2 Field visit for Discussion Meeting</i>	21
<i>2.3 Workshop for Preparation of Tools</i>	23
<i>2.4 Workshop for consolidation of data</i>	23
<i>2.5 Workshop for Analysis of Data</i>	23
3.0 Methods and Procedure	25
<i>3.1 Design of the study</i>	25
<i>3.2 Sample</i>	25
<i>3.3 Tools used in the Study</i>	26
<i>3.4 Administration of Tools</i>	30
4.0 Analysis of Data	35
<i>4.1 Responses of the Sample</i>	35
4.1.1 Responses of Headmasters/ Headmistress (HMs)	35
4.1.2 Responses of the Teachers	47
4.1.3 Responses of the Students	61
4.1.4 Responses of the Parents	79
4.1.5 Responses of SMC Members	86
<i>4.2 General Observations made by the Programme Coordinator and Field Investigators</i>	89
<i>4.3 Findings of the Study</i>	92
5.0 Major Findings and Discussion	97
References	104
Appendices	
I. <i>Questionnaires</i>	
a) Headmaster / Headmistress	i
b) Teachers	vi
c) Students	x
d) Parents	xiii
e) SMC members	xv
II. <i>Resource Persons</i>	xvii
III. <i>List of Field Investigators</i>	xix

IDENTIFICATION OF FACTORS FOR LOW PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS IN X CLASS PUBLIC EXAMINATION

1.0 Introduction

Education is one of the needs of human beings in today's world. In a welfare state like India, it is one of the important activities of the government to provide education to its people. Therefore, a number of programmes were taken up by the governments at Central and State levels to extend education for all. A good beginning was made by making primary education compulsory, though it could not be achieved completely. Several committees and commissions were also set up to study the status of education and to give recommendations. Improving quality of education was one of the goals with special focus on Secondary Education.

1.1 Secondary Education in India

In our country, school education is divided into Elementary Education (classes I to VIII), Secondary Education (Classes IX and X) and Higher Secondary Education (classes XI and XII). Among these, Secondary Education is an important stage in the school system and it is more so because many students discontinue their education after this stage due to various reasons. Therefore, it is necessary that the government gives due importance to this stage and not only aim at enrollment and retention of students but also to aim at providing quality education, equalizing educational opportunity and making examination reforms.

Quality

Over the years there has been a tremendous expansion of secondary education. But the quantitative expansion has also brought a slide in the quality of education. A lot of educationists today are very much concerned with the decline in quality.

“Quality is not merely the quantum of knowledge imparted to students but also the effectiveness with which they are able to utilize this knowledge in meeting challenges of tomorrow”. The quality concern includes “not only the content but also the process” when the process is involved the quality of teachers also comes into consideration.

Quite often the quality is mistaken for the percentage of pass students a school produces during the Board examinations. May be the Board exam. results might be giving an insight into the quality but to equate that with quality may be misleading. According to L.C. Singh (1995) “for want of better universally accepted indicators learner’s achievement can be considered as indicator of quality”.

Another aspect of quality is its utility for the present and the future. According to Prof.Dave (1995)

“What is learned in the schools becomes obsolete quite soon. The need to acquire new knowledge and skills from time to time throughout the life span of an individual increases very fast. For this reason, the basic initial education of the primary and secondary will have to be designed in such a way that the school graduates continue their education on their own by practicing self learning. ...To meet this learning needs, secondary schools will have to add a new objective to their curriculum: the objective of fostering skills and competencies of learning how to learn”.

The country today has a National Curriculum Framework. Even while talking about the local content, our classrooms and textbooks are yet to be oriented to that. For most of the students in rural parts of the country, every thing they learn is always meaningless and abstract. It is high time that the textbooks, curriculum, examinations, etc. take into account the need of the learner.

Equalisation of Educational Opportunity

The 1968 document emphasized equalization of educational opportunity. It had specifically mentioned the need to remove regional imbalances and making educational opportunity available to disadvantaged sections of the society. Policy 1986 had drawn attention to this and stated “To promote equality, it will be necessary to provide equal opportunity to all not only in access but also in conditions of success” (Arjun Dev, 1995).

Examination Reforms

Generations of Indians have been writing examinations. Every one who can have an opinion finds virtues or condemns it. Examinations as they are functioning is a concern. And it is the worst feature of Indian education. A lot of things have been said against the prevailing system of examination and its consequences. The influence of examinations is so deep that they decide the study habits of students and teaching practices of teachers. Further, dominance of public exams have led to many unethical practices. This has led to memorization and recall of information rather than understanding. This has failed to measure pupils' growth in critical areas.

Quality Secondary Education

Government has not been blind towards improving Secondary Education in India. Several attempts have been made by them and even researches have taken place which strengthened the hands of the government in making programmes and policies. Some of them have been described in the following paragraphs.

A policy on education was evolved not as a lifeless document but as a manifestation of national awakening in regard to education and the crucial role it can play in nation building, economic reconstruction and social transformation. A new perspective, new modalities have emerged. Now education is an integral part of a life long process. A child centred approach to education with the teacher as a facilitator in the learning process is the key to the new strategy in the transaction of the curriculum. The teaching learning process will be directed to the total development.

Chattapadhyaya (1986) while discussing School Education Policy made some concrete suggestions as below :

- Education is to be taken in the sense of learning and its proper locus is society....
- In the modern context, the educationist should be concerned more with the needs of society than those of the State.
- Education should aim at making all people, especially the young ones, receptive to the ideas and techniques for social transformation and economic development.

- The basic aim of the new education policy should be to transform our present society into a learning society.

Malhotra (1986) discussed some issues of School Education and recommended the following measures for improvement.

- Organising networks of educational institutions to form school complexes in which the big and better schools will join in partnership with the small and ill-equipped schools in attending to the schooling needs of all children in the given area.
- Establishment of resource centers in which a variety of materials would be available for use by children.
- The linkages of the education system with the world of work need to be pursued vigorously at all levels of school education.
- Vocationalisation of education at the higher secondary stage should be promoted.

Prem Kripal (1986) in his paper described the scope of education. It is clear that the scope of education continues to extend in time and space, comprehending the whole span of life for the overall integration of human personality and the quest of a larger awareness which can serve the emerging needs of man as a worker, as a citizen, as a person and even a creator.

The life long span of education, the multiplicity of its awareness, the primacy of the learner, the choice of new technologies of communication..... unfold a scenario of education which will be entirely new in its scope and range.

Arjun Singh (1995) expressed his concern towards Secondary Education and stated that Secondary Education is the anchor bay of education. A large section of rural students drop out at this stage. This stage determines the quality of university education. The concept of quality should be reviewed and expanded so as to give secondary education more relevant objective.

According to him “Knowledge without conscience leads to the perdition of the souls”. There is a need for values to be inculcated. Values like respect for the dignity and distinctive character of one’s fellow human beings, respect for different cultures, tolerance, clear awareness of one’s rights and duties and respect for work.

To him, enrolment of girls is another aspect. Providing trained teachers, strengthening and modernization of preservice and inservice teacher training on professional lines is necessary. He said inbuilt mechanism to ensure teachers’ accountability is to be thought of and the teachers need to have key elements like inspiration, abstraction. According to him, morning assembly should start with classical music. In residential schools, classical music should be played during meal time. Yoga should find a place in the time table. At least once a week there must be an outside inspirational input.

Arora (1995) made specific recommendations for staff development. They are

- systematic staff development programme for teachers
- periodical inservice education of teachers
- improve the quality of training to enhance motivation in teachers
- develop a feeling of satisfaction to enhance motivation

Gupta’s (2000) study on secondary school pupil teachers revealed that gender difference does not make difference in creativity among teachers.

Mehta Jagruthi (2000) studied on “Cognitive processes, self-perception, motivation and behaviour as factor of academic achievement’. The study revealed that high performing students are superior to low performing students in planning and perception of social support is high in high performing students.

Kumudavalli, S. (1999) studied relationship between medium of instruction and achievement. It revealed that medium of instruction did not make difference in academic achievement.

Behera (2002) in his study came out with the findings that

- Parents’ education level has positive influence on the performance of the child

- There is significant relationship between academic achievement and study habits among students.

Kaur's (2001) study revealed that there is a positive correlation between achievement motivation and academic achievement.

The above studies have revealed the following.

- There is a need to establish resource centers
- Secondary education is the anchor bay of education.
- Trained teachers are to be provided to schools
- Inservice teacher training is to be strengthened.
- Inbuilt mechanism to be thought of to ensure teachers' accountability.
- Periodic inservice education is to be given to teachers.
- Medium of instruction did not make any difference in the academic achievement of students.
- Parents' education level has positive influence on the performance of the child.
- There is positive relationship between study habits and academic achievement.
- There is positive correlation between achievement motivation and academic achievement.

Even the NCF 2005 has made observations, remarks and recommendations regarding school education and teacher education. Some of them which are relevant to secondary education are described in the following passages.

1.2 National Curriculum Framework 2005 On School / Secondary Education

Guiding Principles

The NCF 2005 has identified the following already articulated ideas for special attention and implementation. They are

- connecting knowledge to life outside the school,
- ensuring that learning is shifted away from rote methods,

- enriching the curriculum to provide for overall development of children rather than remain textbook centric,
- making examinations more flexible and integrated into classroom life and
- nurturing an over-riding identity informed by caring concerns within the democratic polity of the country.

In addition to these there are new concerns and developments which the new curriculum is required to respond related to secondary education. They are

- Including and retaining all children in school through a programme that reaffirms the value of each child and enable all children to experience dignity and confidence to learn.
- Addressing the disadvantages arising from inequalities of gender, caste, language, culture and religion.
- Development of self-esteem and ethics and cultivating children's creativity and respect for children's native wisdom and creativity.
- Making the system less bureaucratic; teachers more accountable, schools more autonomous and responsive to the needs of children.
- Critical pedagogy to be practiced in all dimensions of school education.
- Making productive work an effective pedagogic medium.
- Making children sensitive to the environment and the need to protect it.
- Living in harmony within oneself and with one's natural and social environment and building a culture of peace.
- Fostering democracy as a way of life rather than a system of government and also internalize principles of equality, freedom, justice, secularism, etc.
- Education system needs to respond to the cultural pluralism inherent in our society.
- Education should strengthen our cultural heritage and national identity.

Examination Reforms

- Learning without burden – the public examination at the end of X and XII is to be reviewed with the view to replace the prevailing text based and quiz type questioning.

- One of the steps required to improve the validity of current examinations – the process of paper setting is to be overhauled. Focus should shift to framing good questions rather than mere setting papers. These questions could be used while generating question papers.
- Teachers who value papers should be offered adequate remuneration for ensuring better quality and consistency.
- Wider range of performance parameters on the mark sheet can be presented through wider use of computers.
- It is also possible to analyse the quality and consistency of various examiners.
- Need to shift towards school based evaluation and devise ways in which the internal assessment is more credible.
- Each school should evolve a flexible and implementable scheme of continuous and comprehensive evaluation – for diagnosis, remediation and enhancing learning.
- More varied modes of assessment beyond the examination hall, paper-pencil test like – oral testing, group work evaluation, open book exam, exams without time limit.
- ‘One-exam-fits-all’ principle while being organizationally convenient, is not student centred one.
- Under no circumstance should board or State level exams held at V, VIII or XI classes. Even making X exam optional should be explored.
- Need to delink the school leaving board exams from competitive entrance exams.

Content of Secondary Education

- Three language formula is an attempt to address the challenges of linguistic situation in India.
- English needs to find its place along with other Indian languages.
- Input-rich communicational environments are a prerequisite for language learning whether first or second.
- Mathematics is a compulsory subject at the secondary stage, access to quality mathematics education is the right of every child.

- At the secondary level, students begin to perceive the structure of mathematics as a discipline.
- There is a growing realization of the need to have a place of knowledge of Computer Science and Information Technology at the secondary stage.
- Science at secondary should be learnt as a composite discipline.
- Social Science will have a wide range of content drawn from disciplines of history, geography, political science, economics, sociology and anthropology. The content of Social Sciences need to focus on a conceptual understanding rather than lining up facts for memorization and examination.
- There is an urgent need to integrate art education into informal education.
- The health needs of adolescents, particularly, their reproductive and sexual health needs require to be addressed.
- Sports programmes for children to be taken care of.
- Work Education to be given due importance.
- Education for Peace need to be strengthened.
- Habitat and Learning or Environmental Education as part of different disciplines.

School and Classroom Environment

Physical Environment

- Classrooms can be brightened by allowing adequate natural light and made lively by displaying children's works on walls as well as different parts of the school.
- Large permanent displays painted on the walls are over stimulating and with time they become monotonous. Instead smaller sized judiciously chosen murals may be a better way of adding colour to the school. Most of the wall displays may be of children's work or teachers' work and should be changed periodically.
- The physical layout of the classroom could be altered so that the children can sit together in small groups or gather in a large circle or sit on their own.
- The furniture should be such that there is place for children to keep their belongings, wide enough and have back support for the physical comfort of the children.

- Classroom space and walls can be used for pedagogic purposes.
- Children can be encouraged to participate in activities to make classrooms and school attractive. Care should be taken to avoid these activities being pushed over the lower caste children or on girls, etc.

Nurturing an Enabling Environment

- An enabling nurturing environment is where children feel secure where there is absence of fear and is governed by relationships of equality and equity.
- Teachers have a great role in creating a nurturing environment.
- Participation of all children can be realized through an integrated and well designed curriculum. Democratic participation is also a means of empowering the weak and marginalized. The principle of participation should be integrated into all areas of concern for children.
- A policy of inclusion for all children from disadvantaged and differently abled also have a right for equal opportunities.
- Excessive emphasis on competitiveness and individual achievement is found in most of the urban schools catering to the urban middle class. This does not contribute to learning. This quite often takes different colours like labelling dullards, segregating from achievers, fear of failure, etc. Therefore, the schools which emphasise intense competition must not be treated as examples for others.
- The school practices like corporal punishments, verbal and non-verbal humiliation, regulations of dress, uniform, etc. are used as forms of discipline. These require to be reexamined since they cause more harm than helping in learning.
- Need to evolve rules or systems for students and teachers participatory management.
- Schools could invite community members to school and give them a role in influencing the curricular process.
- Schools should also look for ways in which parental participation and involvement can be encouraged and sustained.
- In order to make school environment supportive and to strengthen the relationship of the school with parents and local community, institutional

structures like Parent-Teachers Association, local level committees and Alumni Associations can be thought of.

- Functioning library in each school is a must. It should cater to the needs of teachers, students and members of the community.
- Educational Technology should become a means of enhancing the curricular reform. It should treat students and teachers not merely as consumers but also as producers. Providing children more direct access to multimedia equipment, Information and Communication Technology and allowing them to mix and make their own productions and to present their own experiences could provide them new opportunities.
- Equip the schools with tools that are necessary for art and craft work, and also for their curricular subjects.
- Plurality of alternative materials.
- Calendar of a school should take into local needs such as weather, agricultural season, etc. Flexibility may also be provided for the timings of the 'School Day'.
- Morning Assembly can be used for reading the news headlines, performing some physical exercises and singing National Anthem.
- School periods could be ideally of 45 minute duration. For some activities it could be double periods.

Changed Role of Teachers

- From being a source of knowledge to being a facilitator of transforming information into knowledge, a supporter in enhancing learning.
- From teacher centre, design to learner centric flexible process.
- From teacher direction and decisions to learner autonomy.
- From teacher guidance and monitoring to facilitating, supporting and encouraging learning.
- From passive reception in learning to active participation in learning.
- From learning within the four walls of the classroom to learning in the wider social context.
- From knowledge as 'given' and fixed to knowledge as it evolves and is created.

- From disciplinary focus to multidisciplinary, educational focus.
- From appraisal, short, few to multifarious, continuous.
- Teacher autonomy essential for a learning environment.

Child as an Active Learner

- Making a meaningful experience for children along with the effort to move away from a textbook culture.
- Child centred pedagogy – It means giving primacy to children’s experiences and ensuring their active participation.
- Learning plans need to respond to physical, cultural and social preferences within the wide diversity of characteristic needs.
- School pedagogic practices need to nurture and build on the students’ active and creative capabilities.
- Learning is active and social.
- The curriculum must enable children to find their voices, nurture their curiosity – to do things, to ask questions and to pursue investigations.
- Children learn in a variety of ways.
- Learning takes place both within school and outside school.

Assessment and Evaluation

- Board examinations negatively influence all testing and assessment throughout the school years.
- A good evaluation and examination system can become an integral part of the learning process.
- Evaluation should be a way of providing credible feedback.
- Present evaluation is inadequate because it measures and assesses very limited faculties.
- It does not provide a complete picture of an individual’s abilities.
- Purpose of evaluation is to improve the teaching learning process.
- It is not necessary to conduct tests and exams frequently. Rather the routine activities and exercises can be effectively employed to assess learning.
- Assessment needs to be comprehensive.

- Maintaining a daily diary based on observation helps in continuous and comprehensive evaluation.
- The belief that assessment must lead to finding learning difficulties to them be remediated is often impractical.
- Self report by the learners on their learning can provide teachers an insight into children's educational progress.
- Type of questions set for assessment need to go beyond the textbook.
- Questions which are open ended and challenging are also to be used.
- Open book examinations is a challenge worth trying.
- Promoting competition through ranking has negative impact.
- The absurd and unnecessary importance given to term examinations often creates stress and burn out.
- Not only learning outcomes but also learning experiences themselves must be evaluated.
- Children should be encouraged to evaluate their own work.
- Qualitative statements about child's achievement and learning would provide a more holistic assessment.
- At classes IX and X Assessment may be based more on tests, examinations and project reports along with self assessment.

Concern for Quality

- Common school system to ensure comparable quality in different regions of the country.
- Inclusive environment where children belonging to linguistic and religious minorities need special care.
- Academic planning in participative manner.
- Improvement of physical resources.
- Address the diverse needs of students.
- Headmasters have a pivotal role in providing academic leadership. But they are neither having power nor ability to do that. Capacity building among the Head teachers is must.
- Monitoring for quality is to be seen as different from Inspection – or policing of schools by the Departments.

- In order to improve quality and provide academic support to teacher, a pool of resource persons at different levels can be thought of.

Inservice Education

- Inservice education for professional growth and is an agent for change in school related practices.
- Provides opportunity to update knowledge.
- Inservice and Refresher courses should be related to specific needs of the teachers and evaluation and follow up should be part of the scheme. (Acharya Rammurthi Commission Report)
- Institutions like DIETs, IASEs and CTEs set up for providing inservice education. Under DPEP brought block and cluster resource centers for pedagogic renewal.
- Most of the inservice programmes have become lecture based with little opportunity for activity based teaching.
- Dissemination of technologies can serve to build positive ethos for curricular reforms.

1.3 Report of CABE Committee set up by Ministry of Human Resource Development (2005)

The Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) set up a CABE Committee in 2005. This Committee has come out with its report on Universalisation of Secondary Education. Its guidelines, vision and recommendations are described/quoted in the following paragraphs.

We must move towards a globally competitive order that shall be sustainable. To achieve this is to invest heavily in education. Universalisation of Secondary Education (USE) should be our goal.

“...A democratic citizen should have the understanding and the intellectual integrity to shift truth from falsehood, facts from propaganda and to reject the dangerous appeal of fanaticism and prejudice. He must develop a scientific attitude of

mind to think objectively.... They should reject whatever arrests progress and forces of justice”.

How can Education contribute to this?

“...The object of a democratic education is therefore, the full, all round development of every individual’s personality....the view of education that emerges from this basic concept transcends, the narrow academic approach and broadens out into education for living and education to initiate the students into the many sided art of living in a community.... No education is worth its name if it does not inculcate the qualities necessary for living graciously, harmoniously and efficiently.”

“Another important aim which the secondary school must foster is the development of a sense of true patriotism....” “this involves three things.

1. A sincere appreciation of the social and cultural achievements of one’s own country.
2. Readiness to recognize its weaknesses, frankly and to work for their eradication and an earnest resolve to serve it to the best of one’s ability.
3. Harmonizing and subordinating individual interests to broader national interests. The school must address itself to building up this rich three fold concept of patriotism”.

Universalisation of Secondary Education is a precondition for equitable social development.

Kothari Commission Report (1964-66) remarked, “Education can be organized to promote social justice or to retard it...”

Universalisation of Secondary Education would call for a paradigm shift in conceptualizing Secondary Education in its structural as well as curricular dimensions. Then it can become powerful means of social transformation. Four guidelines suggested are:

1. **Universal Access** : Access to be envisaged in physical, social, cultural and economic terms. Needs redefinition of basic features of the Indian School. Barrier free physical access to be provided to bring the disabled into the mainstream. The child’s disability disappears and the child becomes as capable as the rest of the peers.

The disability is a social construct. The matter does not end at solving the problem at the physical level but needs a change in the mind set of peer group, teachers and planners.

2. **Equality and Social Justice:** Equality and justice towards secondary education, inside secondary education, through secondary education. When a child is empowered to understand, question and deal with the above, the child would continue to seek equality and justice in his or her life.

We must draw attention to 'SIX DIMENSIONS' of equality and social justice for which school education should strive.

- i) Gender
- ii) Economic Disparity
- iii) Social disparity (SCs/STs)
- iv) Cultural – linguistic
- v) Disability (Physical, Mental)
- vi) Rural – Urban

Structural difference is also looked into - Private school vs. Government school. Common school system is an answer here.

3. **Relevance and Development**

- i) Unfold full potential of the child.
- ii) Play role in linking the child with society.
- iii) Build up citizenship
- iv) Evolve values in plural society.
- v) Skill formation in the context in the changing technology which demands formation of multiple skills. Ability to continue to learn or unlearn.

4. **Structural and Curricular Aspects :** These four together mean paradigm shift necessary for motivating Universalisation of Secondary Education (USE). This takes time.

Make secondary education inclusive. Follow the ideas of paradigm shift i.e. reconceptualisation of access itself, socio-cultural ambience of the classroom, notion of knowledge, values, skills and relationship between what is learnt inside the school and what is available outside.

Vision of Emerging Universalisation of Secondary Education

International Commission on Education for the 21st Century mentioned. Human beings live in four plans.

1. Physical
2. Intellectual
3. Mental
4. spiritual

So education should enhance strength in all the above four areas. The Commission has identified four pillars. They are

1. Learning to know
2. Learning to do
3. Learning to live
4. Learning to be

So future education then would be Holistic Responsive education facilitating manifestation of perfection already in man and woman. It also implies the cognitive, emotional and physical attributes of future citizens to be founded on a sound value paradigm. This demands reconceptualisation of secondary education and building a fresh new concept.

Education of Adolescence

These are the years of transition. Experience in schooling has to be designed to be responsive to the needs of transition and stabilization. Since a large number of students are likely to transit from education to world of work.

Girls need special attention, because of prejudices, taboos, social stigma. It will be necessary to develop girls' friendly curriculum.

Conclusion

No great purpose will be served with mere expansion of secondary education. For achieving the mission of quality schooling for all for optimization of talents,

education has to be reconceptualised as education of the adolescents in transition, as education for nurturing multiple intelligence and capabilities.

Secondary Education in India – Future Scenario

Secondary Education needs a fresh look for the following reasons.

1. Growth of Indian Economy
2. To meet the challenges of globalisation
3. To meet the increasing demand for secondary education

USE will need to fulfill 3 major criteria.

1. Universal Enrolment in 9th and 10th.
2. Universal Retention achieving zero drop out rate.
3. Universal Performance at a predetermined level wherein at least 60% of the 10th grade will achieve 60% mastery over subjects other than learning tasks.

Special efforts will be required for achieving equity, social justice and performance of all the diverse groups of learners. Mere lateral expansion of secondary schools can only serve the purpose of universal access. Extra classrooms and teachers will not ensure quality. For quality education, all schools should be upgraded qualitatively.

It will be necessary to develop norms for schools while there should be a core set of national norms, they should be further elaborated with locale specificity in each state, district and block.

Open Learning System

It will be necessary to design, create and establish alternative educational provisions for prospective learners.

Recommendations

1. Commercialisation of School Education and Teacher Education must be curbed.
2. Increase in the proportion of allocation is necessary to move towards USE.

3. Heads of Schools must be trained, preferably through a six month diploma with three months of practice and practical exercise.
4. Teacher education should aim to cater to the goals stipulated in the report.
5. Fully qualified teachers on full salary basis must be appointed.
6. Decentralized, micro level planning is necessary.
7. USE needs more than increase in the enrolment. There is a need to shift the paradigm.

Effectiveness of USE depends on the change of the focus. The new secondary education policy should be education of the adolescence for nurturing multiple intelligence in order to fructify full potential of each child. Accordingly curriculum has to be flexible, offering interest and capability based choices, supported by constructivist approach to learning and the flexible scientifically designed assessment system.

2.0 Meetings And Workshops

In connection with the programme three meetings and three workshops were held. Details are given in captions 2.1 to 2.5.

2.1 Activity 1 : Inhouse Meeting (8th August 2008)

As a part of the programme inhouse meeting was held on 8th of August 2008 and discussed about the programme. The following members of the Institute and the DMS participated in the meeting.

Prof.B. Phalachandra
Dr. Manjula P.Rao
Dr.G.Vishwanathappa
Sri K Ganapathy Bhat
Dr Asha K.V.D. Kamath

The members gave the following suggestions.

- To interact with classroom teachers and heads of schools.
- To find reasons from different groups of people who are the stakeholders of the result.
- To look into profiles of schools in terms of X class result and categorise into high and low performing schools.
- To develop separate tool for different people – HMs, teachers, students, parents, SMC members.
- To refer to research studies on correlates of achievement prior to development of tools.

2.2 Activity 2 : Field Visit for Discussion Meeting (8th and 9th Sept. 2008)

To discuss about the programme with the officials of Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, the Programme Coordinator along with Dr.G. Vishwanathappa, the State Coordinator and also an Associated faculty of the programme formed visiting team and made a visit to Hyderabad on 8th September 2008.

The visiting team met Mr.Jesupadam, Director, SCERT, Hyderabad and briefed about the programme. On our request, he nominated one person Mr.Raghava Reddy of SCERT as the local coordinator and assured all support from SCERT.

The visiting team went to Directorate of Government Examinations and met Smt. Pramavathy Suhasini Kavuri, Director, Government Examinations. She directed her office to provide the information related to result of class X public examination. The team collected information about the result of class X for three consecutive years 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08. With this document, the visiting team returned to SCERT and in discussion with the Director and faculty members selected Ananthapur District as a sample for the study.

The visiting team went to SSA Office and met Dr.Upendra Reddy, the Director of SSA of Andhra Pradesh. The team wanted to know about the studies taken up by SSA related to student achievement at elementary level. As one of the studies was yet to be finalized, much information could not be gathered from SSA Office. But the Director assured to provide support for the study.

On the 9th September 2008, the visiting team went to DEO's office at Ananthapur and met Mr.K.Munaiah, DEO of Ananthapur. After a detailed discussion with the DEO and MEO (Ananthapur), a tentative plan was chalked out for the study. The group also examined the schoolwise result of class X of Ananthapur Dist (March 2008) and decided to select six mandals and from each mandal two low performing schools (LPS) and one high performing school (HPS) for the purpose of data collection.

After deciding on the number of mandals, the group wanted to visit one high performing and one low performing schools in Ananthapur. The DEO and MEO of Ananthapur advised the visiting team to go to Chukulur and Tadipatri. Therefore, the visiting team accompanied by the MEO of Ananthapur Town visited Z.P. High School, Tadipatri, one of the high performing schools, had an hour long discussion with the teachers, and the Headmistress and their MEO. They described the efforts made by them towards improving the result of the school and recognized the contribution of the community in beautification of the school providing study material

and monitoring the attendance of class X students. Later the team visited Z.P.High School, Chukulur and had discussion in the school. The teachers said that they do not have a full time Headmaster and their present headmaster was also I/c MEO. They also had shortage of teachers and more than that the students were from nomadic labour groups and their attendance was highly irregular. The team then, returned to DEO's office at Ananthapur and Mr.Munaiah, the DEO, assured all cooperation for the study. Thus the two day field visit was highly fruitful.

2.3 Activity 3 : Workshop for Preparation of Tools (10th to 13th Nov. 08)

In order to collect data from various sources who are responsible for the performance of students in class X examination, a four-day workshop was held (as per the proposal) at RIE, Mysore from 10th to 13th November 2008, to prepare the tools (details under Caption 3.3).

2.4 Activity 4: Workshop for Consolidation of Data (20th to 22nd Dec. 2008)

After the data being collected from all the six mandals, the group met Mr. Manmada Reddy, BEO, Ananthapur on the 20th of December 2008 and briefed him about the programme and started data consolidation at his office.. There were three more investigators who joined the group. They were Sri M.Nagesh, Sri Nageshwara Reddy and Sri Sreedhar. All he seven members worked as a team, consolidated the data of 540 students, 55 parents, 12 SMC members, 18 HMs and 124 teachers. The consolidation work ended on 22nd December 2008.

2.5 Activity 5 : Workshop for Analysis of Data (between 11th and 24th March 2009)

Another workshop was held at RIE, Mysore for 10 days between 11th and 24th of March 2009. Two local resource persons Smt K.S.Sarasa and Sri K Ganapathy Bhat along with internal resource persons Dr.T.V. Somashekar, Prof.B.Phalachandra and the Programme Coordinator participated in the workshop and completed the analysis of data. The details follow.

The workshop on Analysis of Data started on 11.3.2009 at 10 a.m. The Programme Coordinator and Prof.B. Phalachandra introduced the members to the tasks that have to be completed. The major outline of the tasks were to analyse the

data of the survey, arrive at findings and suggest remedial measures to improve the performance of the schools based on the findings. These should be supported by the existing theories on the similar problems.

The workshop also should collate the information on what have helped in improving secondary education and the facts in NCF 2005 that should be taken note of in enhancing the standards of teaching and learning.

On 11th and 12th March, the members went through the data pertaining to students' response, analysed the data and arrived at certain findings on the facts that appeared to contribute to the low performance of schools. On 13th and 17th March, similar work was done on the data pertaining to the teachers' responses. On 18th and 19th March, analysis of the data on the response of the Heads of the schools and parents were taken up. On 20th, the data regarding SMC members were analysed. During the post-lunch time, the findings of all data were collated and an abstract was worked out. Based on the abstract, the steps that can be taken up by the schools to mitigate the problem were arrived at, based on the discussion.

On 21st March, the books on the problems of research, secondary school education, NCF 2005 and other reports were taken up for discussion and important and significant points from the books were marked out for discussion. In addition to the above mentioned books, the research reports on issues of school and school performance were studied and the suggestions of the report were considered at the background of the findings of the data analysis.

On 23rd and 24th March, a general review of all the readings and findings was taken up. The discussion highlighted the need to keep the recommendations made in the report and NCF 2005 to try and upgrade the performance of low performing schools.

Activity 6 : Report Writing (March - April 2009)

After the completion of the five activities, a detailed report of the programme was written by the Programme Coordinator. Copies of the draft were given to the team members for suggestions and later finalized.

3.0 Methods and Procedure

Methods and procedure followed in the study is described under captions 3.1 to 3.4. They deal with design of the study, sample, tools and administration of tools.

3.1 Design of the Study

In the present study the design was of survey type and the data was collected through administration of tools and holding focus group discussions at schools.

3.2 Sample: After the finalisation of the questionnaires at Ananthapur the Resource Group tentatively decided on the Mandals to be considered as sample for the study and selected six Mandals of Ananthapur. From each of the Mandals, it was decided to choose two low performance schools and one high performance school. The pass percentage of low performance schools ranged from 28% to 52% and the pass percentage of high performance schools ranged from 70% to 93% in the Public Examination held during 2008. The final decision on the selection of schools was held at RIE, Mysore where the Programme Coordinator and Associated Faculty were present. Table 3.1 gives the details of selected schools and their pass percentage in the Public Examination held in 2008 (Sample details given in Table 3.3).

Table 3.1
Selected Schools and their Pass Percentage (2008)

Mandal	Name of the School	Pass percentage	High Performing School [HPS] / Low Performing School [LPS]
Hindupur	Govt. Girls High School, Hindupur	41%	LPS
	Z.P.High School, Malugur	42%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Mudireddypalli	80%	HPS
Parigi	Z.P. High School, Beechiganipalli	37%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Sasanakota	44%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Moda	72%	HPS
Penukonda	Z.P. High School, Mavatur	28%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Penukonda	33%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Venkatagiripalyam	74%	HPS

C.K.Palli	Z.P.High School, Nyamaddala	35%	LPS
	Z.P.High School, Medapuram	52%	LPS
	Z.P.High School, Nagasamudram	81%	HPS
Kalyanadurga	Z.P. High School, Mudinayanipalli	41%	LPS
	Z.P. Girls High School, Narayanapuram	40%	LPS
	Z.P. High School, Daradakunta.	70%	HPS
Ananthapur	Govt. High School (Boys), New Town, Ananthapur.	42%	LPS
	Govt. High School (Girls), Ananthapur	40%	LPS
	A.P. S W.Girls Residential School Kurugunta	93%	HPS

3.3 Tools used in the Study

To study the problem of low performance of students of class X, a workshop was held at RIE, Mysore from 10th to 13th November 2009. The following persons participated as Resource Persons in the preparation of the tools.

1. Prof.M.S.Lalithamma
P.G. Dept of Education
University of Mysore
Manasagangotri, Mysore 570 006
2. Dr.Kumara Swamy
DIET, Vasantha Mahal
Nazarbad, Mysore 570 010
3. Dr.T.Vijaya Kumar
Senior Faculty
National Institute of Rural Development
Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad 500 030
4. Smt K S Sarasa
Retd. Asst. Headmistress
Demonstration School, Mysore
5. Smt.A. Vanaja
Research Associate
NIRD, Hyderabad
6. Prof. B. Phalachandra
Head, Dept. of Education
Regional Institute of Education
Mysore

7. Dr Asha K V D Kamath
Lecturer in Education
Regional Institute of Education
Mysore

The group discussed in depth about the programme and identified the stakeholders for the result of class X examination. The Programme Coordinator presented the experience of the visiting team at Z.P.H.S., Chikalur and Tadipatri. This helped the Resource Persons to visualize the status of class X examination in AP and accordingly the resource group identified Heads of Schools, teachers, students, parents and SMC members as important stakeholders of the result. After identifying them, for each one of them, the resource group identified the possible factors that could influence the performance of the students in the examination related to each of the stakeholders.

Each of the questionnaires were drafted, discussed in groups, changes were incorporated and edited. The following paragraphs give the details. Final form of the Questionnaires are given in Appendix I

Questionnaire A : Questionnaire for Headmaster/ Headmistress (HM) of the School

The questionnaire intends to find out primarily about the HM and the school – workload of teachers, teacher absenteeism, substitution class, monitoring, adequacy of number of teachers, teacher qualification and subjects taught, community support, additional help to students, panel inspection, inservice programmes, use of library and labs, student support system and suggestions for improvement. Information related to above areas have been covered in the questionnaire.

Questionnaire B : Questionnaire for Teachers Handling class X

This part intends to elicit information regarding teachers' qualification, teaching experience, travel time, workload, class size, use of TLM, planning classroom environment, parental support, training for facing the exam, infrastructure facilities, monitoring, previous learning, feedback mechanism, teachers' rapport with colleagues, teacher support, school environment, school support and inservice programme. The questionnaire covers almost all the intended areas.

Questionnaire C : Questionnaire for students of class X (2008-09)

The questionnaire for students tries to find out the reason for poor performance, through responses - the subjects they like, subjects that are easy, subjects that are difficult, regularity of attendance, attitude of parents and teachers towards their performance, whether the students take initiative in finding the answer for difficult questions, whether the teachers are willing to help them when they go for help, whether the students get punishment by teachers or parents for their poor performance, the amount of time they get at home for studying, the amount of time taken by the household work they have to do and whether they find time to attend the special classes conducted by the school. The questionnaire covers all the above areas.

Questionnaire D : Questionnaire for Parents of the students of class X (2008-09)

The questionnaire aims to find out the degree of parental involvement in the child's learning process. It tries to find out if the parents visit school regularly, if the parents know the difficult subject, amount of time available at home for activities, whether the parents have provided extra help for learning, whether they monitor their ward's study, whether they have lessened the household duties to enable them to study, what do they expect of their children and what do they expect of the school.

Questionnaire E : Questionnaire for School Management Committee (SMC) Members

The questionnaire aims to find out the positive contribution of the SMC members by asking them about the frequency of their visit to school, their awareness about problems of the school, how did they contribute to the development of the school and whether they are satisfied with the performance of the school.

As per the recommendations of the Resource Group and for the convenience of students, parents and SMC members the tools were translated into Telugu and a visit of the Programme Coordinator was also planned to Ananthapur for the tryout of the tool.

Try out of the Tools

After advance intimation to BEO's office, Ananthapur, the Programme Coordinator went to Ananthapur on 26th November 2008 and had discussion with the

AD I/c BEO and intimation was sent to two Heads of Schools and two teachers from one low performing school and one high performing school to be in the office on 27th November 2008. On the 27th November 2008, the following members were present in BEOs office to try out the tools.

1. Sri G.Subba Rao
AC, Govt. Examinations
Ananthapur
2. Sri Y.V.Chalapathi
Asst. Director, I/c DEO
Ananthapur
3. Sri M Thippeswamy
Headmaster
Govt. High School (Boys)
New Town, Ananthapur.
4. Sri G.B. Nethikantaiah
School Assistant
Govt. High School (Boys)
New Town, Ananthapur
5. Sri N.S.M. Umamaheshwara
Headmaster
Z.P. Boys High School
Bethalapathi, V.K. Mandal
Ananthapur
6. Sri Venkata Subba Rao
School Assistant
Z.P. Boys High School
Bethalapalli, V.K.Mandal
Ananthapur

The above members along with the Programme Coordinator went through the Telugu and English version of the questionnaires suggested a few changes which were incorporated in the final form of the tool. Later, the A.C. Govt. Examinations and I/c DEO along with Programme Coordinator discussed about the sample schools to be selected for the study.

3.4 Activity : Orientation of Field Investigators and Administration of Tools

Administration of tools is one of the important activities of the programme. To administer the tools, three persons were appointed as Field Investigators from 15th to 19th December 2008 and also continued to work from 20th to 22nd December 2008 for data compilation. They were directed by the Programme Coordinator about the tasks that were required to be performed by them. Three more persons were included in the group at Ananthapur during data compilation. The table 3.2 gives the details about the Field Investigators, Investigators, duration of the work and venue.

Table 3.2
Visits of Field Investigators

Sl. No.	Name		Dec. 08	Venue
1.	Sri Rajendra Kumar Gowrigari 6-21, NMP Road Basinikonda Post Madanapalle 517 325 Chittoor	Field Investigator	15 – 19 20 – 22	Penugonda, C.K. Palli Ananthapur
2.	Sri K Maruthi Dodagatta (Post and Village Roddam 515123 Ananthapur	Field Investigator	15 – 19 20 – 22	Hindupur Parigi Ananthapur
3.	Sri Narendranatha Reddy D.No.4/883, Papampet K.C.D. Road Ananthapur 515 001	Field Investigator	15 – 19 20 – 22	Ananthapur Kalyanadurga Ananthapur
4.	Sri M Nagesh Guntapalli (Vill) Jakkasamudram (PO) Gorantla, Ananthapur	Investigator	20 – 22	Ananthapur
5.	Sri S Nageshwara Reddy Shivajinagar H.B.Colony Ananthapur	Investigator	22	Ananthapur
6.	Sri B. Sreedhar Shivajinagar H.B. Colony Ananthapur	Investigator	22	Ananthapur

Data Collection: The three Field Investigators visited the schools between 15th and 19th of December 2008 met the HM, teachers handling class X, students of class X (2008-09), parents of students of class X and the SMC members of the concerned schools and requested them to respond to the questionnaire. The table 3.3 gives the details regarding the number of individuals to whom the tools were administered in low performing and high performing schools.

Table 3.3

Tool Administration – Number of Respondents (Sample)

Sl. No.	Name of the School	Mandal	No. of Heads of Schools			No. of Teachers			No. of Students			No. of Parents			No. of SMC Members			Pass % 2008 Public Exam
			M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	
a) Low Performing Schools																		
1.	ZPHS, Mavatur	Penukonda	1	-	1	2	4	6	19	11	30			4	2	-	2	28
2.	Govt. High School	Penukonda	-	1	1	6	4	10	16	14	30			7	-	-	-	33
3.	ZPHS, Medapuram	C.K.Palli	-	1	1	3	2	5	18	12	30			2	1	-	1	52
4.	ZPHS, Nyamaddala	C.K.Palli	1	-	1	4	2	6	8	22	30			5	1	-	1	35
5.	Govt.H.S. Girls	Hindupur	-	1	1	-	7	7	-	29	29			4	-	-	-	41
6.	ZPHS, Malagur	Hindupur	1	-	1	3	2	5	13	18	31			-	-	-	-	42
7.	ZPHS, Sasanakota	Parigi	-	1	1	4	3	7	13	14	27			9	3	-	3	44
8.	ZPHS, Beechigaripalli	Parigi	1	-	1	5	1	6	15	15	30			4	1	-	1	37
9.	ZPHS, Muddinayanipalli	Kalyanadurga	1	-	1	4	1	5	14	16	30			2	-	-	-	41
10.	ZPHS, Girls	Kalyanadurga	-	1	1	1	7	8	-	30	30			-	-	-	-	40
11.	Govt. H.S. New Town Boys	Anantapur	1	-	1	6	3	9	30	-	30			-	-	-	-	42
12.	Govt.High School (Girls)	Ananthapur	-	1	1	-	4	4	-	30	30			-	-	-	-	48
	Total		6	6	12	38	40	78	146	211	357			37	8	-	8	
b) High Performing Schools																		
1.	ZPHS, Venkatagiripalya	Penukonda	1	-	1	7	2	9	18	12	30			5	1	1	2	74
2.	ZPHS, Nagasamudram	C.K.Palli	-	1	1	3	2	5	14	16	30			2	1	-	1	81
3.	ZPHS, Mudireddipalli	Hindupur	1	-	1	4	3	7	11	19	30			1	1	-	1	80
4.	ZPHS, Modha	Parigi	1	-	1	5	5	10	19	14	33			10	-	-	-	72
5.	ZPHS, Doradaleunta	Kalyanadurga	1	-	1	6	-	6	12	18	30			-	-	-	-	70
6.	APSWR Girls School, Kurugunta	Ananthapur	-	1	1	3	6	9	-	30	30			-	-	-	-	93
	Total		4	2	6	28	18	46	74	109	183			18	3	1	4	
	Grand Total		10	8	18	66	58	124	210	320	540			55	11	1	12	

The details related to visits made by Programme Coordinator and Field Investigators are given below.

Table 3.4
Field Visit for Data Collection

Date	Programme Coordinator	Field Investigator 1	Field Investigator 2	Field Investigator 3
15.12.2008	Mudireddipalyam, Hindupur GGHS, Hindupur ZPHS, Beechigaripalli, Parigi	ZPHS, Mavatur, Penukonda	ZPHS, Muddireddypalli, Hindupur	ZPHS, Duradakunta, Kalyanadurga ZPHS (Girls) School, Kalyanadurga
16.12.2008	ZPHS, Malugur, Hindupur ZPHS, Modha, Parigi ZPHS, Sasanakota, Parigi	ZPHS, Mavatur Govt. High School, Penukonda	ZPHS, Maluguru, Hindupur	ZPHS, Muddinayanapalli, Kalyanadurga
17.12.2008	ZPHS, Mavatur, Penukonda GHS, Penukonda ZPHS, Venkatagiripalya, Penukonda ZPHS, Nyamaddala, C.K. Palli	ZPHS, Venkatagiripalem ZPHS, Namaddela Govt. High School, Penukonda (2 nd time)	ZPHS, Beechiganipalli, Parigi; Govt. Girls High School, Hindupur	APSWR School, Kurugunta, Ananthapur
18.12.2008	ZPHS, Nagasamudram, C.K.Palli ZPHS, Medapuram, C.K.Palli GGHS, Ananthapur	ZPHS, Medapuram Govt. High School, Penukonda (3 rd time)	ZPHS, Sasanakota, Parigi; ZPHS, Moda, Parigi	Govt. High School (Boys), New Town, Anantapur Govt. Girls High School, Anantapur
19.12.2008	GGHS, Kalyanadurga ZPHS, Doradakunta, Kalyanadurga ZPHS, Muddinayanapalli,	ZPHS, Nagasamudram	ZPHS, Mudireddipalli	All schools revisited along with the Programme Coordinator

	Kalyanadurga A P Social Welfare G H S, Kurugunta, Ananthapur Govt. Boys H S, New Town, Ananthapur			
20.12.2008 to 22.12.2008	Consolidation of data at DEO's office, Ananthapur	Consolidation of data at DEO's office, Ananthapur	Consolidation of data at DEO's office, Ananthapur	Consolidation of data at DEO's office, Ananthapur

Though the questionnaires were administered to so many individuals, in few cases, it was not possible to get the complete information as the persons were either on leave or not full-fledged worker in the present position. It is surprising to note that from 18 schools, it was possible to collect information from only 55 parents and 12 SMC members. This shows the extent of relationship between the schools and the community. From four of the low performing schools, we could not gather information from parents and SMC members.

During the collection of data, the Programme Coordinator visited all the six mandals, interacted with the available HM and teachers regarding the performance of the school in class X public examination. The teachers explained the efforts made by them to improve the performance of the schools and also described the hurdles on their way of achieving the goal.

4.0 Analysis of Data

A workshop was held at RIE, Mysore for 10 days between 11th and 24th of March 2009. Two local resource persons Smt K.S.Sarasa and Sri K Ganapathy Bhat along with internal resource persons Dr.T.V. Somashekar, Prof.B.Phalachandra and the Programme Coordinator participated in the workshop and completed the analysis of data based on the responses given by the Headmasters, Teachers, Students, Parents and SMC members.

4.1 Responses of the Sample

The sample comprised of 18 HMs, 124 teachers, 540 students, 55 parents and 12 SMC members. They were administered questionnaires and their responses have been tabulated and interpreted under captions 4.1.1. to 4.1.5.

4.1.1 Responses of Headmasters of the Schools

From the 18 schools, all the HMs either regular or whoever was officiating on the day of the visit of Field Investigator, filled in the questionnaire and provided required information for the study. In a few cases officiating HM could not provide some information. However, collected data is presented in Table H-1 to H-17.

Table H-1

Gender, Age group and teaching experience of Heads of Schools

	Gender			Age group in years				Teaching experience in years			
	M	F	N	<30	30-40	>40	N	<10	10-12	>20	N
LPS	6	6	12	1	1	9	11	1	6	4	11
%	50	50		9.09	9.09	81.81		9.09	54.55	36.36	
HPS	4	2	06	1	1	4	6	2	-	4	6
%	66.67	33.33		16.67	16.67	66.66		33.33		66.66	

Table H-1 shows that the number of male and female heads of schools is uniform in LPS i.e. 50% each. About 82% of the HMs of LPS are aged more than 40 years. About 67% of HMs of HPS have put on more than 20 years of teaching experience.

Table H-2

Experience as Head of school and experience as Head in the present school

Experience as Head of school (in years)				Experience as Head in present school (in years)			
	<5	5-10	>10	N	<5	>5	N
LPS	9	2	1	12	10	2	12
%	75.0	16.67	8.33		83.33	16.67	
HPS	5	-	1	06	6	-	06
%	83.33	-	16.67		100	-	

. In LPS 8.33% of HMs have more than 10 years of experience in heading the schools while in HPS 16.67% of HM have more than 10 years of experience in heading the school.

In the HPS all the HMs have less than 5 years of experience in heading that school.

Table H-3

HM's Perception of performance of their schools

	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	N
LPS	-	1	8	1	10
%	-	10	80	10	
HPS	01	4	1	-	06
%	16.67	66.67	16.67		

80% of the HMs in LPS say that the performance of their schools is satisfactory. About 67% of HMs of HPS have graded their schools as good about 17% have graded as very good. This shows that the HMs know that their schools are doing well.

Table H-4

Teachers: Adequacy of numbers, sufficiency of qualified/trained teachers, satisfaction with their teaching competencies

Adequacy of no of teachers			Sufficiency of qualified/trained teachers			Satisfaction with teaching competency			
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	6	6	12	6	6	12	9	-	9
%	50	50		50	50		100		
HPS	3	3	06	4	2	06	4	1	5
%	50	50		66.67	33.33		80	20	

All the headmasters of low performing schools say that they are satisfied with the teaching competencies of their teachers. With regard to satisfaction of headmasters of High performance schools in relation to teaching competencies of their teachers 80% seem to have satisfied while 20% seem to have not satisfied. This may hold good as the result of these schools average from 70% to 93% and there is every scope for improving the teaching competencies of the teachers.

Table H-5
Other responsibilities of HMs other than heading the school

Other responsibilities			Responsibilities stated
	Yes	No	N
LPS	7	3	10
%	70	30	
HPS	5	-	5
%	100	-	

Table H-6
Subject handled for class X

	Telugu	Eng.	Hindi	Maths	Science	Soc.Sc.	N
LPS	0	2	1	4	3	1	11
%	-	18.18	9.09	36.36	27.27	9.09	
HPS	-	-	-	2	2	-	4
%				50	50		

Table H-7
Number of periods per week

	<5	5-10	11-15	16-25	26-36	N
LPS	1	5	-	3	2	11
%	9.09	45.45		27.27	18.18	
HPS	-	-	1	2	1	4
%	-	-	25	50	25	

All the Headmasters of HPS have taken up other responsibilities while only 70% of HMs from LPS have taken other responsibilities. Though about 37% of HMs handle Mathematics about 28% HMs handle Science and 19% handle English in low performing schools, many of the failures are found in those three subjects in low performing schools. About 55% of headmasters in low performing schools handle less than 10 periods per week in spite of which the performance is low. In addition to that 70% of HMs say that they have other responsibilities too like heading school complex, NEPGEL work, clerical work, open schools, etc. As this can hinder the performance, there is a need to reduce other responsibilities to improve performance of students.

Table H-8
Monitoring of academic work

Scrutiny of	Low Performing Schools(LPS)					High Performing Schools(HPS)				
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	N	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	N
Teachers Dairy	2	4	4	1	11	-	6	-	-	06
%	18.18	36.36	36.36	9.09			100			
Programme of work	3	-	2	1	06	2	3	-	1	06
%	50		33.33	16.67		33.33	50	-	16.67	
Students notebook	3	1	3	1	08	2	2	2	-	06
%	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5		33.33	33.33	33.33		
Scholastic records	2	2	4	2	10	-	1	2	1	04
%	20	20	40	20			25	50	25	
Attendance register-Teachers	10	-	1	-	11	6	-	-	-	06
%	90.9		9.1			100				
Attendance register-Students	8	3	-	-	11	6				06
%	72.72	27.27				100				
Evaluated answer scripts	-	4	3	4	11		1	3	1	05
%		36.36	27.27	36.36			20	60	20	

As per Table H-8 in HPS teachers' diary is scrutinized every week but it is not regular in LPS.

Attendance register of students and teachers are checked every day in HPS but in LPS it is 72.72% and 90.90%

Regarding evaluation of answer scripts, 60% of the HMs of HPS say that they evaluate answer scripts every month whereas in LPS about 28% of HMs say that they evaluate answer scripts monthly.

**Table H-9
Observing Classroom Teaching**

	Daily	Monthly	N
LPS	4	7	11
%	36.36	63.64	
HPS	2	4	06
%	33.33	66.66	

**Table H-10
Identification of low achievers**

	Are they identified			Where are they identified		
	Yes	No	N	Beginning of the year	After mid-term exam	N
LPS	10	1	11	5	5	10
%	90.90	9.10		50	50	
HPS	6	0	06	3	3	6
%	100	-		50	50	

HMs claim that they observe classroom teaching of their school teachers either daily or monthly.

Low achievers are being identified by both HPS and LPS and the actions taken to improve their performance does not differ much as expressed by the HMs.

The responses of the HMs state that they have taken following actions to improve the performance of low achievers.

A. Actions taken in low performing schools

- Handing over the groups to teachers
- Practising questions regularly
- Special classes, intensive coaching
- Tests
- Being strict with the homework
- Motivating students
- Peer learning

B. Actions taken in high performing schools

- Special classes
- Special work with limited questions
- Selection of small questions
- Test in multiple choice items and short answers
- Drilling the important topics

Few HMs have mentioned on type of remedial teaching taken up by the schools. They are as follows:

A. Remedial teaching in low performing schools

- Drilling important questions
- Conducting tests,
- Strict study hours
- Conducting special classes
- Allotment of TLM

B. Remedial teaching in high performing schools

- Peer group learning
- Additional classes
- Selecting easy chapters
- Special coaching

Table H-11

Preparations of question papers by the teachers

	Prepared by self	Supervise	Check the question paper	N
LPS	4	1	1	6
%	66.67	16.67	16.67	
HPS	2	-	1	3
%	66.67	-	33.33	

Most of the headmasters (66.67% in both the groups) claim they only prepare question papers. Some say they supervise or check the papers prepared by the teachers.

In both LPS and HPS, HMs are taking appropriate steps to cater to the needs of low performers by assigning them to the teachers to provide some remedial help.

The responses to the question on the steps taken to fix the responsibility of low performers to the teachers, the HMs have listed the action taken in their schools. They are being consolidated and listed below.

A. Fixing responsibilities of low performers in LPS

- Adopt low performers
- Practicing model question papers
- Teach well
- Give instructions
- Discussion with parents
- Preparing easy questions
- Sparing extra time for students

B. Fixing responsibilities of low performers in HPS

- Less content, more drilling
- Small groups of 4-5 students given to each teacher

Table H-12
Issue of progress report

	Regular issue			Ensure parents signature			Discuss with Teachers		
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	10	1	11	6	2	08	10	1	11
%	90.90	9.10		75	25		90.90	9.10	
HPS	6	0	06	6	-	06	6	-	06
%	100			100			100		

Except one in all the rest of the LPS the Progress Reports (P.R.) are issued regularly. In 25% of the cases parents' signature is not taken on the P.R. and in 10% of the cases the performances of students is not discussed with the Teachers by the HMs. In HPS there is cent percent compliance recorded in all the three aspects.

The following support have been given to teachers in solving academic problems by the HMs of the schools (consolidated form of the responses).

A. Support given in Low Performing Schools

- Conducting staff meeting
- Giving necessary instructions
- Providing library and financial support
- Taking model class
- Maintaining harmony with teachers
- Supplying low cost TLM

B. Support given in High Performing Schools

- Giving TLM & textbook in time
- Conducting staff meeting
- Monthly discussions
- Giving freedom to subject teachers
- Giving remedial material

Table H-13
Organising PTA and SMC meetings

	PTA meeting			SMC meeting		
	Yes	No response	N	Yes	No response	N
LPS	9	2	11	8	3	11
%	81.82	18.18		72.73	27.27	
HPS	6	0	06	6		06
%	100			100		

Among the HPS the PTA and SMC meetings are held regularly in all the schools. But in LPS 81.82% HMs state that PTA meetings are held and 72.73% HMs say that SMC meetings are being held. The remaining have felt no purpose is being served by these meetings.

Help of PTAs and SMCs in school developmental activities.

The HMs have expressed that they receive following help from PTAs and SMCs.

A. Help received in Low Performing Schools

- keep track of the attendance of students
- give valuable suggestions
- participate in activities held in schools

B. Help received in High Performing Schools

- no much help is received
- encourage teachers to improve results
- discuss about school with all the teachers

Headmasters of LPS feel the PTAs and SMCs do help in some activities. But the HMs of HPS feel not much help is received by them.

Table H-14
Library facility availability and functioning

Availability of library facility	Library used by teachers			Library used by students					
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	10	1	11	9	2	11	9	2	11
%	90.90	9.10		81.80	18.20		81.80	18.20	
HPS	5	1	6	4	2	06	5	1	6
%	83.4	16.6		66.4	33.20		83	17	

One school in both HPS and LPS do not have library.

Among LPS 81.80% of HMs reported library being used by teachers and 18.20% said teachers are not using it. The same number is true of students too. Among the HPS groups too the picture is not different.

The following are the actions taken by HMs to make the library facility available to students and teachers:

a) Action taken for library facility to be made available to students in LPS

- books are given to students once a week
- books distributed to the teachers
- books given during library period
- hanging books/magazines on ropes
- one teacher is incharge of library

b) Action taken for library facility to be made available to students in HPS

- distribute books to students
- one teacher is incharge of library

c) Action taken for library facility to be made available easily to teachers in LPS

- hanging newspapers, magazines on ropes
- subject wise classification of books

- d) **Action taken for library facility to be made available to teachers in HPS**
- can visit library any time
 - supporting materials are issued

Table H-15
Laboratory facility, availability and its use

	Availability of lab facilities			If yes, its use by teachers for teaching			Frequency of use			
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Regu- larly	Once in a week	Whenever wants	N
LPS	5	5	10	5	4	9	1	2	3	6
%	50	50		55.56	44.44		16.67	33.33	50	
HPS	2	4	6	2	4	6	-	-	2	2
%	33.33	66.67		33.33	66.67					

In 50% of LPS, lab facility is available and it is being used by teachers for teaching whenever necessary

Among the HPS, only 33.33% have lab facility and teachers use it whenever necessary.

Table H-16

Additional help to low performers, regularity and teachers support

	Regularity in providing additional help to low performers			Teachers support in giving additional help to low performers		
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	8	2	10	10	1	11
%	80	20		90.90	9.10	
HPS	6	-	6	6	-	6
%	100			100		

Additional help to low performers is given in most of the schools in both groups. While all the HMs of HPS opine that they get teachers support in providing additional help to low performers, it is only 91% in LPS

**Table H-17
Panel Inspection**

	Need for panel inspection			Was it held in the near past			Holding of last panel inspection					
	Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N	Before 2003			After 2003		
							Yes	No	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	10	1	11	2	9	11	1	10	11	-	-	-
%												
HPS	6	-	6	2	3	5	2	4	6			
%												

Panel inspection is done in most cases but it was not done in many cases in the recent past. In fact it was not at all held after 2003.

All HMs agree that it is possible to improve the result of the schools though difficult. They have asked for following support (consolidated responses of all the HMs).

1. Parent co-operation
2. Special coaching
3. Students regularity
4. In-service programme to teachers
5. Model test
6. Weekly test
7. Old question papers
8. Preparing action plan
9. Water and toilet
10. Monitoring

Findings based on responses of HMs

1. HM's with more number of years of experience influence performance of the schools positively.
2. The HM's of LPS are aware of the low performance of their schools but they are not able to achieve high performance due to several factors.
3. HMs of all LPS are satisfied with the teaching competency of their teachers, though the performance level remains low.
4. Arranging substitution class and monitoring the work done during those classes have a positive impact on the performance level of the students of HPS.

5. Maintenance and monitoring of teachers' diary is better in HPS compared to LPS.
6. Attendance Register of Students and Teachers is checked daily in HPS while it is not so in LPS
7. Regular evaluation of answer scripts have reflected in the better performance of students.
8. Additional help given to low performing students in HPS contributed to the higher performance of schools
9. Panel inspection and feedback are felt necessary to improve the performance of schools.
10. Other responsibilities of the HMs have hindered their teaching work in the LPS.

4.1.2 Responses of the Teachers

124 teachers (78 from LPS and 46 from HPS) responded to the questionnaire (Appendix I-B). Their responses have been consolidated in 29 tables from T1 to T29 and observations written below them.

Table T – 1

Teachers : Age, Gender and Caste/ Category

	Age in years			N	Gender		N	Category				N
	<30	30-40	>40		M	F		SC	ST	OBC	Gen	
LPS	7	29	38	74	36	38	74	4	1	28	39	72
%	9.46	39.19	51.35		48.65	51.35		5.56	1.39	38.89	54.17	
HPS	11	14	21	46	29	17	46	6	2	19	11	38
%	23.91	30.43	45.65		63.04	36.96		15.79	5.26	50.0	28.95	

As per Table T1, teachers above 40 years are 51.35% and female teachers are also 51.35% in the LPS. Caste statistics does not reveal any reason for low performance of schools.

Table T – 2

Experience : Teaching - Evaluation

	Teaching experience in years			N	Teaching experience in class X in years			N	Evaluating SSC papers in years			N
	<5	5-10	>10		<5	5-10	>10		<5	5-10	>10	
LPS	4	19	50	73	16	41	12	69	24	17	7	48
%	5.48	26.03	68.49		23.19	59.42	17.39		50.0	35.42	14.58	
HPS	7	14	23	44	17	14	9	40	11	8	1	20
%	15.91	31.82	52.27		42.50	35.0	22.50		55.0	40.0	5.00	

Table T.2 shows that total teaching experience of teachers in HPS is higher than the teaching experience of teachers in LPS. This has contributed to the better performance. Similarly experience in evaluating SSC papers has contributed to the better performance.

Table T-3**Teachers – Subject Specialisation and Subjects Taught**

	Subject Specialisation						N	Subject Taught						N
	T	E	H	Sc	M	S.Sc.		T	E	H	Sc	M	S.Sc.	
LPS	8	16	5	26	10	22	87	15	12	7	24	14	21	93
%	9.19	18.39	5.75	29.88	11.49	25.29		16.13	12.90	7.53	25.81	15.05	22.58	
HPS	9	7	6	16	10	5	53	6	9	6	27	8	5	61
%	16.98	13.21	11.32	30.19	18.87	9.43		9.48	14.75	9.84	44.26	13.11	8.20	

Subject specialization of teachers has influenced the performance of schools. In LPS only 11.49% of teachers have specialized in Maths but it is being taught by 15% of the teachers. Whereas in HPS 18.87% have specialized in Maths but it is being taught only by 13.11% of teachers.

Table T-4**Affiliation to Professional Bodies**

	Yes	No	N
LPS	43	15	58
%	74.14	25.86	
HPS	14	11	25
%	56.00	44.00	

According to Table T.4, affiliation to professional bodies does not make any influence on the academic performance of the school.

Table T-5**School-Home Distance**

	Distance from Home in kms			N	Mode of reaching Schools				N
	<5	5-10	>10		Personal vehicle	Public transport	Walk	Vehicle and walk	
LPS	36	12	25	83	2	36	26	17	81
%	43.37	14.46	30.12		2.47	44.44	32.10	20.99	
HPS	14	09	15	38	6	9	8	20	43
%	36.84	23.68	39.47		13.95	20.93	18.60	46.51	

Table T-6**Time Taken to reach the school (in minutes)**

	Time taken			N
	<30	30-60	>60	
LPS	55	15	7	77
%	71.43	19.48	9.09	
HPS	28	11	8	47
%	59.57	23.40	17.02	

The study of tables T.5 and T.6 reveals that distance between school and home has not influenced the achievement in HPS and LPS.

Table T-7**Workload and Strength of class**

	Workload per week in no. of periods			N	Strength of each class			N
	<25	25-30	>30		<50	50-70	>70	
LPS	17	45	15	77	31	35	22	88
%	22.08	58.44	19.48		35.23	39.77	25.00	
HPS	7	23	7	37	9	24	7	40
%	18.91	62.16	18.91		22.50	60.00	17.50	

As per Table T.7 the workload of teachers in terms of number of periods has been more or less same in both LPS and HPS. A large percentage have (58.44% in LPS and 62.16% in HPS). 25 to 30 periods of work per week. Class strength is generally more. Only 35.23% in LPS and 22.50% in HPS have less than 50 students in a class. 39.77% in LPS and 60.00% in HPS have a strength in between 50 and 70. In 25% of LPS and 17.50% of HPS it is more than 70. The data shows that smaller classes do not ensure better performance.

Table T-8**Maintenance of Diary and sufficiency of time for completing instruction**

	Maintenance of Diary		N	Sufficiency of time for completing Instruction		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	71	8	79	70	8	78
%	89.87	10.13		89.74	10.26	
HPS	37	2	39	32	8	40
%	94.87	5.13		80.00	20.00	

Table T.8 shows that a high percentage, i.e. 89.87% among LPS and 94.87% among HPS teachers maintain diary. Equally large number consider the time available is sufficient for completing syllabus.

Table T-9
Frequency of Use of Teaching-Learning Material

	Frequency				N
	Everyday	Weekly	Whenever required	Not at all	
LPS	15	1	53	-	69
%	21.74	1.45	76.81		
HPS	2	2	42	-	46
%	4.35	4.35	91.30	-	

About the frequency of using TLM, Table T.9 shows that a large number – 76.81% of LPS and 91.30% of HPS state that they use it wherever required. Though 21.74% in LPS say they use TLM everyday, it is not reflected in the performance of the students.

Table T-10
Teacher Preparation for the Class

	Time taken to prepare for the class (in hours)			N	Prepared in advance		N
	<1	1-2	>2		Yes	No	
LPS	38	28	5	71	76	-	76
%	53.52	39.44	7.04		100	-	
HPS	7	30	7	44	33	-	33
%	15.91	68.18	15.91		100	-	

Table T-11
Mode of Preparation for the Class

	Use prepared notes	Prepare fresh notes	Refer to ready made material	Discuss with colleagues	Library	Internet	Any other	N
LPS	33	49	13	21	15	3	4	138
%	23.91	35.51	9.42	15.22	10.87	2.17	2.90	
HPS	16	30	11	7	11	--	3	78
%	20.51	38.46	14.10	8.97	14.10	--	3.85	

- About the time taken to prepare for class every day Tables T.10 and T.11 show that 53.52% of LPS teachers spend less than an hour. Whereas only 15.91% of HPS teachers said they take less than an hour. 68.18% of HPS teachers spend between 1 and 2 hours in preparation. Among the LPS this was 39.44%. Among the LPS only 7.04% was spent more than 2 hours per day. This number is 15.91% in HPS. By and large the teachers of HPS schools spend more time in preparing for their class. All respondents say they prepare in advance.
- There is not much of a variation among the HPS and LPS teachers about the mode of preparation.

Table T-12

Syllabus completion and Classroom Process

	Syllabus completion		N	Encourage students to ask questions		N	Give group/ pair work		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	72	-	72	77	-	77	71	-	71
%	100	-		100	-		100		
HPS	46	-	46	42	-	42	40	-	40
%	100	-		100	-		100	-	

Both HPS and LPS teachers do complete the syllabus and encourage questions and set group tasks as figured in T.12.

Table T-13

Slow Learners and Information to Parents

	Identification of slow learners		N	Need to inform parents about their child's progress		N
	Identified	Not identified		Yes	No	
LPS	77	-	77	68	5	73
%	100	-		93.15	6.85	
HPS	45	-	45	41	4	45
%	100	-		91.11	8.89	

Table T-14**Steps taken to help slow learners**

	Additional work	More housework	Talk to students	Talk to parents	Diagnosis and remedy	N
LPS	42	30	29	27	45	173
%	24.28	17.34	16.76	15.61	26.01	
HPS	23	12	16	9	24	84
%	27.38	14.29	19.05	10.71	28.57	

Tables T.13 and T.14 indicate the efforts made by schools to identify the slow learners and inform the parents about it and plan certain programme to help them learn better. The data reveals, parental knowledge about their wards learning does not influence the performance. However, certain steps like providing additional work and talking to the students themselves improve the performance to a certain degree.

Table T-15**Other responsibilities of the teachers**

	Other responsibilities			N	Whether it affects teaching work		N
	Office work	Outside work	Cultural activities		Yes	No	
LPS	23	2	5	30	44	25	69
%	76.67	6.67	16.66		63.77	36.23	
HPS	6	3	6	15	21	17	38
%	40.0	20.0	40.0		55.26	44.74	

Table T.15 indicates the extra workload of teachers of LPS and HPS. 76.67% of teachers from the LPS feel that their extra office work affects their teaching work. This additional office work may have affected the input from teachers resulting in the low performance of the schools.

Table T-16

Low Performers

	Low performers can be brought on par with other students		N	Are special classes taken for them		N	How many students attend special classes?			N
	Yes	No		Yes	No		All	Many	Few	
LPS	64	05	69	70	04	74	09	33	21	63
%	92.75	7.25		94.59	5.41		14.29	52.38	33.33	
HPS	36	07	43	44	02	46	16	14	14	44
%	83.72	16.28		95.65	4.35		36.36	31.82	31.82	

Table T-17

Regularity in attending special classes

	Yes	No	N
LPS	18	14	32
%	56.25	43.75	
HPS	24	05	29
%	82.76	17.24	

Tables T.16 and T.17 indicate a good relationship between regularity in attending the special classes and good performance. As per the tables, 36% of teachers of HPS have said that all students attend special classes but only 14% of teachers of LPS have said that all students attend special classes. With regard to regularity of students in special classes, about 83% of HPS teachers have said that students are regular in attending special classes. This shows that greater the regularity in attending special classes greater is the performance of the students.

Table T-18

Students being prepared from Class VIII to face the Public Examination

	Yes	No	N
LPS	61	11	72
%	84.72	15.28	
HPS	29	09	38
%	76.32	23.68	

Table T-19

Reasons for not understanding the Concepts of Class X

	Lower concepts are not clear	Difficult to understand	Students are irregular	Distracted by electronic media	Link concepts not covered	Poor language skills	N
LPS	25	13	28	19	8	37	130
%	19.23	10.0	21.54	14.62	6.15	28.46	
HPS	18	7	5	5	2	25	62
%	29.03	11.29	8.06	8.06	3.23	40.32	

Tables T.18 and T.19 reveal that though 84.72% of students of LPS get prepared for the public examination from class VIII, it is not reflected in their performance in the public examination. The students from LPS are poorer regarding language skills, mastery of basic concepts and regularity.

Table T-20

Classroom Environment

	Well ventilated		N	Good blackboard		N	TLM displayed		N	Comfortable furniture		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	69	7	76	67	8	75	55	19	74	29	46	75
%	90.79	9.21		89.33	10.67		74.32	25.68		38.67	61.33	
HPS	45	1	46	43	1	44	37	5	42	27	18	45
%	97.83	2.17		97.73	2.27		88.1	11.90		60.0	40.0	

Table T.20 shows teachers' perception of facilities in the classroom.

- A very high percentage (90.79% among LPS and 97.83% among HPS) feel their classrooms are well ventilated. Similarly a large percentage (89.33% of LPS and 97.73% of HPS) feel they have good blackboards.
- In HPS, 88.1% feel they have TLM displayed in the classrooms and among the LPS it is a little low i.e. 74.32%. What is important is that 25.68% of LPS feel, they do not have these materials displayed in the classrooms.
- Among HPS teachers 60% feel they have comfortable furniture for students whereas only 38.67% among LPS feel they have such furniture.
- Compared to HPS the LPS have less comfortable furniture and less TLM displayed.

Table T-21
Evaluation of Student Performance

	Unit test prepared by self		N	Tests on model of Public Exam		N	Supervision done during test		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	77	0	77	76	0	76	76	0	76
%	100	-		100	-		100	-	
HPS	41	0	41	41	0	41	46	0	46
%	100	-		100	-		100	-	

About evaluation, Table T.21 shows that all the teachers in both LPS and HPS have answered in the affirmative. It is surprising that in spite of the efforts taken by the schools students have not been able to perform well in the public examination.

Table T-22
Evaluation of Answer Scripts

	Immediate evaluation of answer scripts		N	Feedback to students			N
	Yes	No		Individual	Group	Both	
LPS	78	0	78	43	41	1	85
%	100	-		50.59	48.24	1.18	
HPS	46	0	46	30	14	1	45
%	100	-		66.67	31.11	2.22	

Table T.22 speaks about the timing of evaluation of answer scripts after the tests. All have stated that they do it immediately after the tests. About the feedback, among the HPS, 66.67% do it individually and 33.11% in group. Among the LPS, it is almost equally divided i.e. 50.59% and 48.24%. What is surprising is among both the groups the ones who did both individual and group were a microscopic minority.

Table T-23
Difference in Performance in School Exam and Public Exam

	There is difference in performance in School Exam and Public Exam		N	Training Strategies for Public Exam		N	Spirit of Public Exam in School Exam		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	40	31	71	76	0	76	74	2	76
%	56.34	43.66		100	-		97.37	2.63	
HPS	25	17	42	42	0	42	44	2	46
%	59.52	40.48		100	-		95.65	4.35	

- As per Table T.23 in LPS 56.34% and in HPS 59.52% of teachers say there is difference in the performance of students at school level and in public examination but those who feel that there are no differences at these levels is also quite high i.e. 43.60% and 40.48%
- All teachers in both groups state that they give training to students for facing public exam. and claim that the school exams are conducted in the spirit of public exam.

Teachers have given various reasons for low performance in public examination. But they are their perceptions rather than reasons.

Reasons for low performance in Public Examination

Teachers were asked to give reasons for low performance of students in the public examination. Various reasons given by them are listed below.

- Distance of examination centers, students stay in lodge – not monitored by parents.
- School exam question papers are prepared by the teachers according to the level of students.
- Hostel students do not study seriously.
- Students are irregular.
- Students have poor language skills.
- Students have examination fear.

Table T-24

Mode of Preparing Students for Public Examination

	Giving repeated exams	Briefing about the exam	Teaching time management	Teaching answering techniques	N
LPS	51	45	28	14	138
%	36.96	32.61	20.29	10.14	
HPS	28	25	17	06	76
%	36.84	32.89	22.37	7.89	

The mode of preparing students is more or less the same in both the groups as indicated in Table T.24. Giving repeated exams is done by 36.96% teachers in LPS

and 36.84% teachers in HPS. Briefing about the exam is resorted by 32.61% and 32.89% of teachers, teaching time management is done by 20.29% and 22.37% in LPS and HPS groups respectively.

Teaching answering technique is resorted to by 10.14% among LPS compared to 7.89% among HPS. This difference is rather astonishing.

Steps to remove fear of examination

Teachers responded to the question 'What steps are being taken by you to remove the fear of examination among the students?'. The responses were consolidated as given below.

- Conducting tests frequently
- Motivating students
- Building confidence
- Explaining about the mistakes committed in the answer scripts
- Giving special instruction
- Conducting model examinations
- Drilling old question papers
- Using TLM
- Moving closely with the students to find their difficulties
- Taking consulting classes
- Removing fear of examination
- Teaching time management
- Guidance
- Discuss about subjects

Table T-25

Help from Colleagues and Recognition by the School

	Take help from colleagues to improve the performance of students		N	Efforts being recognized by the school		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	73	4	77	68	2	70
%	94.81	5.19		97.14	2.86	
HPS	43	2	45	41	5	46
%	95.56	4.44		89.13	10.87	

The data about taking help from the colleagues and getting recognized by the school (Table T.25) reveal that there is no relationship between the help taken, recognition received and the performance of the students. 94.81% of teachers of LPS have received help from colleagues while 95.56% of teachers of HPS have received help from their colleagues. If 97.14% of teachers of LPS have received recognition from the school 89.13% of HPS have received recognition for their efforts to improve the performance of the students.

Table T-26

Action taken when students do not involve in Classroom Activities

	Punish Students	Find reason and final remedy	Inform the Head and Parents	Ignore the students	N
LPS	7	61	34	-	102
%	6.86	59.80	33.33	-	
HPS	6	37	17	-	60
%	10.0	61.67	28.33		

Table T.26 does not show much difference between HPS and LPS with regard to action taken when students do not participate in classroom activities. But it is true that the schools act upon such students and no schools ignore them. Therefore, these actions have not influenced the performance of students.

Table T-27

Special Activities to Encourage Slow Learners

	Talks from experts	Academic Linked co-curricular Activities	Peer group learning	N
LPS	19	17	59	95
%	20.0	17.89	62.11	
HPS	8	9	37	54
%	14.81	16.67	68.52	

Table T.27 shows that the teachers in both the groups say that they follow 'peer group learning' as a popular method for helping the slow learners (62.11% in LPS and 68.52% in HPS).

Other activities like academic linked co-curricular activities were made use by 17.89% in LPS and 16.67% in HPS. Talks by experts were resorted to by 20% in LPS and 14.81% in HPS.

Table T-28

Working Atmosphere and Academic Support at Schools

	Happy with the working atmosphere of the school		N	Getting adequate academic support from higher authorities		N
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
LPS	70	1	71	65	7	72
%	98.59	1.41		90.28	9.72	
HPS	43	2	45	34	7	41
%	95.56	4.44		82.93	17.07	

About satisfaction over working atmosphere at the school as per Table T.28 a overwhelming percentage (98.59 and 95.0) was quite happy. They also reported adequate academic support from higher authorities (90.28% among LPS and 82.93% among HPS).

Table T-29

Support Material required to transact the textual content

	Reference books	Teaching Learning Materials	N
LPS	23	23	46
%	50.0	50.0	
HPS	16	14	30
%	53.33	46.67	

As per Table T.29, half of the teachers in both the groups feel reference books as the support material required to transact the textual content. The other half feels it is the teaching-learning material.

Findings based on the responses of the teachers

The following are the findings of the study based on the responses given by the teachers.

1. The age, gender and caste of the teachers made no impact on the performance.

2. Higher experience in teaching and board paper valuation seem to contributed to the higher performance of students.
3. Subject specialization and the subject taught have influenced the performance of the students.
4. Factors like affiliation to professional bodies and distance between home and school have not influenced the performance.
5. Data collected on issues like (i) Maintenance of diary, (ii) Sufficiency of time, (iii) use of TLM etc. have not influenced performance.
6. HPS teachers spend more time towards preparation and this is one of the reasons for its higher performance.
7. In HPS the use of TLM is greater and it has contributed for better performance.
8. The syllabus completion and classroom process appear to be same in both LPS and HPS, the performance difference cannot be explained through them.
9. Identification of slow learners and the remedial steps to help them are slightly better in the HPS, which might have influenced the performance.
10. The teachers of LPS feel they have more office work to do which is affecting their teaching work. This has affected the performance.
11. Regularity in attending the special classes has enhanced performance.
12. Students from LPS are poorer regarding pre-learning requisites.
13. Teachers claim of preparing students for the Board Exam has not helped them much.
14. Peer group learning is the preferred mode of learning.
15. Satisfactory working environment has not made any difference in the performance.

4.1.3 Responses of the Students

In all 540 students (357 from LPS and 183 from HPS) responded to the questionnaire(Appendix I-C). Their responses have been consolidated and analysed as follows.

Table S-1

Gender

	Boys	Girls	N
LPS	146	211	357
%	39	61	
HPS	74	109	183
%	40	60	

As per table S-1 358 students belong to low performing schools, out of which 39% are boys and 61% are girls. Total number of students from high performing schools is 183, out of which 40% are boys and 60% are girls. As per the table, the percentage of girls is round about 60% and of boys 40%.

Table S-2

Caste of the Students

	SC	ST	OBC	Gen	N
LPS	48	19	201	83	351
%	14	5	57	24	
HPS	45	1	93	44	183
%	24	0.5	51	24	

As per the table S-2, 351 students belong to low performing schools out of which 14% belong to SC, 5% belong to ST, 57% belong to OBC, 24% belong to general category. With regard to students to high performing schools, 24% is SC, 0.5% is ST, 51% is OBC and 24% is general category.

Table S-3

Parental Education

	Father			N	Mother			N
	Illiterate	< 10 th Std.	> 10 th Std.		Illiterate	< 10 th Std.	> 10 th Std.	
LPS	175	108	65	348	236	81	27	344
%	50	31	18		69	24	7	
HPS	89	53	35	174	121	42	13	176
%	50	30	20		68	24	7	

As per the Table S-3, 50% fathers and 69% mothers of students of LP schools are illiterate. This is true with regard to HP schools also. This shows that the education of parents do not directly correspond with the achievement of schools.

Table S-4
Annual Income of the Family

	Less than Rs.12,000	Rs.12,000- Rs.25000	Rs.25000- Rs.50000	More than Rs.50000	N
LPS	235	112	4	-	351
%	67	32	1	-	
HPS	111	125	3	2	241
%	46	52	1	0.8	

Table S-4 shows that 351 students belong to the income group of Rs.12000 to Rs.50000 per annum of which 67% of students belong to the annual income group of Rs.12000, in the LPS. While in HPS 46% of students belong to this low income group. Since the major chunk in LPS is in the lower income group, the income of the family might have played a role in the learning efficiency of students by not procuring support materials for preparing for the exam.

Table S-5
Parental Occupation

	Father				N	Mother				N
	Agricul- turst	Daily wager	Business	Others		Agricul- turst	Daily wager	Business	Others	
LPS	210	82	21	39	352	210	72	18	48	348
%	60	23	06	11		60	21	5	14	
HPS	102	48	05	10	165	121	35	5	8	169
%	62	29	03	06		72	21	2	5	

Table S-5 shows the occupation of parents of LPS and HPS. The analysis reveal that 60% of students' fathers are agriculturists in LPS while 62% of students fathers are agriculturists in HPS. Therefore, occupation of either mother or father has very little to do with school performance.

Table S-6**Birth Order of the child**

	1	2	3	4	>5	N
LPS	122	124	73	26	19	364
%	33.52	34.07	20.05	7.14	5.22	
HPS	59	59	30	17	7	182
%	32.42	37.92	16.48	9.34	3.84	

According to Table S-6, 33% of students in LPS are first borns while 32.42% students in HPS are first borns. 34.07% belong to 2nd in order in LPS while 37.92% belong to 2nd in order in HPS. Birth order of 364 students in LPS and 182 students in HPS reveal that there is no relationship between the birth order of the child and performance.

Table S-7**Class while joining the school**

	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th	N
LPS	234	16	88	14	5	357
%	65.55	4.48	24.65	3.92	1.40	
HPS	122	4	42	5	1	174
%	70.11	2.30	24.14	2.88	0.57	

As per Table S-7, 65% of students have joined at 6th class in LPS while 70% of students have joined in 6th class in HPS. Whereas about 25% of students of both LPS and HPS have joined the school in class VIII. As there is no much difference between these percentages, it reveals that the class to which the students join does not influence the performance of the student.

Table S-8**Good in Studies – A Self image**

	Yes	No	To some extent	N
LPS	284	5	64	353
%	80.45	1.42	18.13	
HPS	139	2	41	182
%	76.37	1.09	22.53	

As per Table S-8, 80% of students of LPS believe they are good. 76.37% of students of HPS believe they are good. Though a higher percentage of students have

a positive self-image in LPS schools, this has not influenced the performance of the students positively.

Table S-9
Subjects liked

Subjects	Telugu	Eng.	Hindi	Maths	Phy. Sci	Nat. Sci	Soc. Sci.	Total N
LPS	187	126	56	126	106	136	83	820
%	22.80	15.36	6.83	15.36	12.93	16.58	10.12	
HPS	87	41	17	65	73	77	56	416
%	20.91	9.85	4.09	15.62	17.55	18.51	13.46	

Table S-9 shows that percentage of students' liking Telugu and mathematics is the same in both the groups.

Table S-10
Subjects liked the least

Subjects	Telugu	Eng.	Hindi	Maths	Phy. Sci	Nat. Sci	Soc. Sci.	Total N
LPS	14	109	141	144	82	46	48	584
%	2.39	18.66	24.14	24.65	14.04	7.87	8.22	
HPS	17	48	107	56	36	34	23	321
%	5.29	14.95	33	17.45	11.21	10.59	7.17	

The table S-10 shows facts regarding the subjects liked least by the students of LPS and HPS. About 25% of the students of LPS have indicated that they like Hindi and Maths the least. This seems to have reflected in the result also, as there are many failures in Hindi and Mathematics. However, 18.66% of LPS students like English less while 14.95% of HPS students like English less.

Table S-11
Student's liking to come to schools

	Yes	No	N
LPS	353	2	355
%	99.45	0.55	
HPS	182	-	182
%	100	-	

Table S-11 indicates in general 99% of students of LPS have a desire and liking to come to school.

Table S-12
Reasons for liking/disliking to come to Schools

	Like to come to school		Dislike to come to school	N
	Study well	Good future	No time	
LPS	252	88	2	342
%	73.68	25.73	0.6	
HPS	124	59	-	183
%	67.76	32.24		

Table S-12 reveals out of 342 students of LPS 73.68% come to school to study and 25.73% have a faith that future will be good if they come to school. The picture is similar in HPS. Out of 183 students, 67.76% come to school to study well while 32.24% come to school as they believe their future will be good, if they come to school.

Table S-13
Missed the classes

	Missed the classes		N	Reasons for missing			N
	Yes	No		Health	Work	Others	
LPS	269	84	353	203	30	35	268
%	76.20	23.80		75.75	11.19	13.06	
HPS	123	54	177	101	28	20	149
%	69.49	30.51		67.79	18.79	13.42	

Table S-13 shows that of the 353 students from the low performance schools who responded 76.20% have missed classes sometime or other, whereas from the high performance respondents of 177, 69.49% have missed classes. There is no high degree of absenteeism observed in low performance schools. Among the reasons for absent among low performance schools of the 268 respondents 75.75% gave ill health as the reason and 11.19% cited works and 13.06 gave other reasons. On this count, the high performance school children too did not differ. Of the 149 respondents 67.79% were absent on health reasons, 18.79% on work related reasons and 13.42% on other grounds.

Table S-14

Area in which students are good

	Sports	Studies	Cultural Activities	N
LPS	114	322	41	477
%	23.90	67.51	8.59	
HPS	63	153	21	237
%	26.58	64.56	8.86	

When the students were asked to identify the area in which they were good at, a total of 477 responses were received from LPS. Table S-14 reveals that among the low performance school children, 23.90% identified that they are good in sports, 67.51% identified it as studies and only 8.59% felt that they are good in cultural activities. In HPS also the students' self-image was almost same. 26.58% identified sports, 64.56% opted for studies and 8.86% considered themselves good in cultural activities.

Table S-15

Students' Perception about how the teacher greets him/her and its effect on Performance in Studies

	Students' Perception on Teacher Grading			N	Effect on Performance in studies			N
	Good	Average	Below Average		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	211	125	13	349	158	145	29	332
%	60.46	35.82	3.72		47.59	43.67	8.73	
HPS	96	78	5	179	51	118	12	181
%	53.63	43.57	2.79		28.18	65.19	6.63	

According to Table S-15 of the 349 responses from low performance group 60.46% feel that they are good in studies in the opinion of their teachers, 35.82% felt they are average and 3.72% considered themselves below average. Among the high performance 179 responded to the query. 53.63% among them thought they are good and 43.57% felt they are average in the opinion of their teachers. Only 2.79% felt they were graded below average. For the query whether the teacher grading affects their studies , 47.59% felt it to be "very much" and 43.67 felt 'to some extent' and 8.73% did not feel that it has any effect in LPS. In the case of HPS group, only 28.18% felt it affect very much and 65.19% gave it only a marginal impact. As in the LP group a very small percentage (6.63) considered it to be of no consequence.

The data indicates, to some extent, the student perception of teachers' opinion about them has more impact on their performance among LPS respondents in comparison to HP respondents.

Table S-16
Liking to the teachers and reasons for liking

	Liking to the teachers			N	Effect on Performance in studies				N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Clarify doubts	Good teaching	No fear	Class is interesting	
LPS	274	73	2	349	103	160	29	40	332
%	78.51	20.92	0.57		31.02	48.19	8.73	12.05	
HPS	147	26	2	175	39	96	13	25	173
%	84.00	14.86	1.14		22.54	55.49	7.51	14.45	

For the question whether they like their teachers, as per Table S-16 of the 349, LPS group respondents 78.51% felt it to be very much and 20.92 as to some extent. Only 0.57% did not like their teachers. Among the HPS group of the 175 respondents 84% felt they liked their teachers. It was slightly higher than the LPS group. 14.86% in the HPS group rated their liking as to some extent and those who did not like were only 1.14%. By and large, there is very little dislike among the respondents towards their teachers.

Students were also asked to give reasons for their liking. Among the LPS group 48.19% said it is good teaching, 31.02% said it was for clarifying doubts, 12.05% liked for making the class interesting and for 8.73% it was because there was no fear. Among the HPS group 55.49% said it is good teaching, 22.54% said it is for clarifying doubts, 14.45% for class being interesting and 7.51% for absence of fear.

Table S-17 (a)

Students' want teachers to ask questions and the chances they get to answer the questions

	Students want teachers to ask questions			N	Students getting chances to answer questions			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	206	138	10	354	136	213	6	355
%	58.19	38.98	2.82		38.31	60.0	1.69	
HPS	102	81	1	184	59	123	3	185
%	55.43	44.02	0.54		31.89	66.47	1.62	

Table S-17 (b)

Teacher reactions to Students' Questions and Answers

	Ignores	Encourages	Criticizes	N
LPS	30	286	27	343
%	8.75	83.38	7.87	
HPS	6	173	7	186
%	3.23	93.01	3.76	

To the question whether the students want their teachers to ask them questions, Table S-17 (a) shows that 354 from the LPS group responded. Of them 58.19% wanted it very much and 38.98% to some extent. Only 2.82% did not want it. Among 184 HPS respondents 55.43% wanted it very much and 44.02% to some extent. A negligible 0.54% did not want it.

About the opportunity to answer the questions (Table S – 17 (a)) from among the 355 LPS, 38.13% said their chances as very much and 60% rated it as to some extent. For 1.69% there was no chance at all. Among the HPS of 185, 31.89% rated their chance as very much and 66.49% as to some extent. Here again the ones who opted for not at all were only 1.62 percent.

Students' perception of teacher reaction to their question was also solicited (Table S-17(b)). Among the 343, LPS respondents 8.75% feel teachers ignore them, 83.38% feel teachers encourage them and 7.87% feel the teachers criticize them. In the HPS of 186 respondents only 3.73% feel teachers ignore them, 93.01% (a large number) feel teachers encourage them and 3.76% feel teachers criticize them.

Table S-18

No. of Friends in the class and seeking help from them for studies

	No. of friends in the class			N	Seeking help from friends for studies			N
	Many	Some	None		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	200	139	7	346	112	206	37	355
%	57.80	40.17	2.02		31.55	58.03	10.42	
HPS	113	67	3	179	37	126	32	195
%	61.75	36.61	1.64		18.97	64.62	16.41	

Table S-19

Students approaching teachers for help and getting help

	Students approaching teachers			N	Students getting help from teachers			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	112	236	10	358	228	112	7	357
%	31.28	65.92	2.79		63.87	34.17	1.96	
HPS	34	137	5	176	123	58	0	181
%	19.32	77.84	2.84		67.96	32.04	0	

Students were also asked to state about the number of friends they had in their class and the extent of that friendship being utilized in their studies. As per table S-18, of the 346 respondents from LPS, 57.80% said they had many friends, 40.17% had some and 2.02% had none. In the HPS, of 183 respondents, 61.75% said they had many, 36.61% said they had some and 1.64% had none.

About seeking help from friends in studies, in the LPS 31.55% considered it to be very much, 58.03% considered it to be 'to some extent' and 10.42% did not seek any help from their friends. In the HPS 18.97% rated it as very much, 64.62% rated it as to some extent and 16.41% did not seek any help from their friends.

About the students seeking help from the teachers as reflected in Table S-19 from LPS, out of 358 respondents, 31.28% rated it as 'very much', 65.92% as 'to some extent' and 2.79% as 'not at all'. Among the HPS respondents of 176, 19.32% rated it as very much, 77.84% as to some extent and 2.84% as not at all.

About students' perception of getting help from teachers when approached, among the LPS 63.87% opted it to be 'very much', 34.17% considered it as to some extent and 1.96% as 'not at all'. Among the HPS the percentages were 67.96 for very much and 32.04 for 'to some extent'.

The above observations show that there is hardly any difference between LPS and HPS with regard to impact of friends and approaching teachers for help, on the performance of students.

Table S-20

Students scolded by parents and reasons for scolding

	Students scolded by parents			N	Reasons for scolding			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Poor in studies	Household work	Others	
LPS	19	156	180	355	111	56	12	179
%	5.35	43.94	50.70		62.01	31.28	6.70	
HPS	11	80	90	181	43	67	5	115
%	6.08	44.20	49.72		37.39	58.26	4.35	

For the question whether children get scolded by their parents Table S-20 shows that of the 355 respondents from LPS only 5.35% said very much, 43.94% rated it as to some extent and 50.70% did not get any scolding. Of the 181 from HPS the percentages were almost the same. Here 6.08% rated it as very much, 44.20% as to some extent and 49.72% as not at all.

About the reasons for scolding in the LPS, 62.01% were charged for being poor in studies, 31.28% were scolded for not doing household work and 6.70% for other reasons. Among the HPS only 37.39% were charged for being poor in studies and 58.26% were scolded for not doing the household work and 4.35% for other reasons. This indicates that both the students and parents of LPS are aware of the low performance in studies.

Table S–21

Students’ Perception of Parental Expectation

	Parents want children to study well			N	Parents scold their children for low marks			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	326	28	--	354	110	215	31	356
%	92.09	7.91	--		30.90	60.39	8.7	
HPS	168	10	2	180	85	82	17	184
%	93.33	5.56	1.11		46.20	44.57	9.24	

About students’ perception of parental expectation about their studies, Table S-21 reveals that of the 354 respondents from LPS, a very high 92.09% said their parents want them to study well and rated it as ‘very much’ and 7.91% rated it as ‘to some extent’. No one rated it be ‘not at all’. Among the HPS all the, 180 students opted for similar rating. Here it is 93.33% ‘very much’, 5.56% ‘to some extent’ and 1.11% as ‘not at all’.

Low marks, children consider the prime reason for their parents scolding them. Among the LPS 30.90% rate it as ‘very much’ and 60.39% rate it as ‘to some extent’. Only for 8.7% it is not a reason. Among the HPS 46.20% rate it as ‘very much’ and 44.57% as ‘to some extent’, for 9.24% it is not a reason for parental scolding.

In both HPS and LPS, 31% to 46% of the students say that their parents scold them for low marks. The scolding seems to have a better impact on students of HPS than the students of LPS.

Table S–22

Involvement of students in household work and its disturbance in studies

	Involvement in household work			N	Disturbance in Studies			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	126	135	21	282	31	173	154	358
%	44.68	47.87	7.45		8.66	48.32	43.02	
HPS	74	74	6	154	12	107	68	187
%	48.05	48.05	3.90		6.42	57.22	36.36	

How do students perceive their involvement in household work affecting their studies? Among 282 respondents (Table S-22) belonging to LPS, 44.68% were ‘very

much' involved in household work, 47.87% were 'to some extent' involved and 7.45% were not involved. Among the 154 respondents of the HPS group 48.05% were 'very much' involved, 48.05% were 'to some extent' involved and 3.90% were 'not involved'. What is interesting is the involvement in household work is a little higher in HPS rather than in the LPS.

What is the perception of children about household work disturbing their studies? In the LPS only 8.66% rated it to affect 'very much', 48.32% felt it disturbs 'to some extent' and 43.02% did not feel it to disturb their studies. In the case of HPS, 6.42% considered it to disturb 'very much', 57.22% considered it disturbs 'to some extent' and 36.36% felt it not coming in the way of their studies.

A very small percentage of students in both HPS and LPS express that their involvement in household work disturbs their studies.

Table S-23
Students' regularity in attending extra classes

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	262	78	6	346
%	75.72	22.54	1.73	
HPS	156	27	3	186
%	83.87	14.52	1.61	

Table S-23 reveals facts about the students attending the extra classes. The response collected from 346 students reveals 75.72% of LPS are regular in attending the extra classes while 83.87% of HPS are regular in attending the extra classes. 22.54% of LPS are slightly irregular while 14.52% of HPS are slightly irregular.

This shows that the regularity of students in attending special classes have contributed to the higher performance of HPS.

Table S-24

Subjects understood well by the students

a) Understanding Telugu

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	319	37	--	356
%	89.61	10.39	--	
HPS	152	31	--	183
%	83.06	16.94	--	

Of the 356 respondents from the low performance schools, 89.61% felt they had no problem in understanding Telugu and in the high performance category of the 183 respondents 83.06% felt the same. None of them felt that they have any serious difficulty.

b) Understanding English

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	170	173	8	351
%	48.43	49.29	2.28	
HPS	78	102	2	182
%	42.86	56.04	1.10	

In the case of English, as given in the above table among the 351 low performance school respondents 48.43% expressed that they understood the subject well. 49.29% said that they understood to some extent. 2.28% had real difficulty. Among the high performance school respondents of 183, these were 42.86%, 56.04% and 1.10% respectively. Once again exhibiting no real deviation between LPS and HPS students, though the difficulty level in understanding English is lower in HPS.

c) Understanding Hindi

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	169	176	8	353
%	48.87	49.86	2.27	
HPS	61	110	12	183
%	33.33	60.11	6.56	

In the case of Hindi as seen in the table S-24 (c), among the 353 low performance school respondents, 47.87% considered their understanding of the language as ‘very much’ and 49.86% considered it to be ‘to some extent’, almost on par with English. 2.28% felt ‘not at all’. In the case of high performance respondents (of 183) only 33.33% considered it to be ‘very much’, 60.11% considered it to be ‘to some extent’ and 6.56% rated if to be ‘not at all’.

d) Understanding Science

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	256	98	1	355
%	72.11	27.60	0.28	
HPS	145	34	1	180
%	80.55	18.89	0.55	

The above table shows that a high percentage of students from both the groups considered that they understand science teaching ‘very much’. Of the 355 from low performance group, 72.11% and 80.55% from 180 of the HPS rated themselves under the ‘very much’ category. But this has not been reflected in the performance of the students of LPS. The ‘to some extent’ category was 27.6% and 18.89% under LPS and HPS.

e) Understanding Maths

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	197	147	22	366
%	53.82	40.16	6.01	
HPS	111	67	4	182
%	60.99	36.81	2.20	

In the case of Maths as depicted by the table S-24(e), of the 366 in LPS 53.82% rated themselves at ‘very much’, 40.16% at ‘to some extent’ and 6.01% at ‘Not at all’ level. Of the 182 HPS respondents, this was 60.99% , 36.81% and 2.20%. This shows that there is greater percentage of students in LPS finding Maths difficult when compared with the students of HPS.

f) **Understanding Social Science**

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	268	81	5	354
%	75.71	22.88	1.41	
HPS	146	37	1	184
%	79.35	20.11	0.54	

The above table shows that there is near perfect parity between Science and Social science scores. Of the 354 LPS respondents, 75.71% rated themselves in the 'very much' category and 22.88% in the 'to some extent' category and only 1.41% in 'not at all' category. Similarly from among the 184 HPS respondents, 79.35% put themselves into the 'very much' category and 20.11% into the 'to some extent' category. Thus, Social Science is a subject which is considered as equally easy/difficult by both the groups.

Overall, the students feel English, Maths and Hindi as having some difficulty in comparison to other subjects.

Table S-26
Regularity in giving Homework and its usefulness in
Answering the Examination

	Regularity in giving homework			N	Usefulness of homework in answering the Exam			N
	Very much	To some extent	Not at all		Very much	To some extent	Not at all	
LPS	102	202	51	355	128	145	84	357
%	28.73	56.90	14.37		35.85	40.62	23.53	
HPS	66	101	12	179	68	78	33	179
%	36.87	56.42	6.70		37.99	43.58	18.44	

Table S-26 reveals facts about regularity in giving homework and finding it useful for the purposes of examination. About 357 students of LPS responded to the questions out of which 28.73% feel that they very regularly get the homework and 35.88% believe it to be useful.

While 36.87% of HPS feel that they get homework very regularly and 37.99% believe it is useful for the purpose of examination, 6.70% feel that they do not get the homework regularly. 18.44% think it has nothing to do with the exam.

The above observations indicate that though homework is given regularly, around 36% of the students feel that it is useful in answering the examinations and around 20% feel that it is not at all useful in answering the examination. But regular homework seems to have influenced the performance of the students.

Table S-27
Parental help in Studies

	Very Much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	193	129	34	356
%	54.21	36.24	9.55	
HPS	107	58	16	181
%	59.12	32.04	8.84	

Table S-27 reveals the parental help received by the students of LPS and HPS. 54.21% of total 356 students from LPS feel they receive parental help very much, while 59.12% of HPS, of 181 students feel they receive parental help very much.

36.24% of LPS feel they receive parental help in studies to some extent while 32.04% of HPS feel they receive help to some extent. 9% of students of both the schools feel they receive no help from parents.

As a higher percentage of HPS students have expressed that they get a lot of help from their parents in studying this has contributed to the performance of students in HPS.

Table S-28**Subjects felt difficult by the students and get help from teachers**

Subjects	Telugu	Eng.	Hindi	Science	Maths	Soc. Sci.	Total N
LPS	17	101	115	62	176	42	513
%	3.31	19.69	22.42	21.57	34.31	8.18	
HPS	8	61	105	26	62	15	277
%	2.89	22.02	37.91	9.39	22.38	5.42	

Table S-29**Subjects in which students get more help from teachers**

Subjects	Telugu	Eng.	Hindi	Science	Maths	Soc. Sci.	Total N
LPS	180	125	94	122	138	119	778
%	23.14	16.07	12.08	15.68	17.74	15.30	
HPS	90	70	38	86	91	94	469
%	19.19	14.92	8.10	18.34	19.40	20.04	

The responses on the subject that is difficult as per Table S-28, 3.31% of 513 students of LPS feel Telugu difficult, 19.29% feel English difficult, 22.42% feel Hindi difficult, 21.57% feel Science difficult, 34.31% feel Maths difficult, 8.18% feel Social Science difficult. From HPS, out of 277 students, 22.02% feel English difficult, 37% feel Hindi difficult and 22.38% feel Maths difficult.

Students' perception regarding the extra help they get from teachers Table S-29 shows that out of 778 responses of LPS 23.14% feel they get extra help in Telugu, of 469 responses of HPS, of about 20% of the students feel they get help in Telugu, English, Maths, Science and Social Science.

Parental help is high in Telugu and low in Hindi, in both LPS and HPS.

Findings based on the responses of the students

1. Gender component has not influenced to the performance of a school.
2. Caste component has not made any difference in the achievement of the students.
3. Educational level of parents has not made any difference in the performance of the school.

4. Income levels of the families have made a difference in the achievement of their wards. Better income families have a positive impact on the performance of their wards.
5. Occupation of parents has not influenced the achievement of the child.
6. Birth order of a student has not made any difference in the achievement.
7. The level at which a student joins the school has no impact on the achievement.
8. Self-image of students do not affect the performance.
9. Liking of a subject is reflected in their achievement in those subjects.
10. Though normal absenteeism has not contributed to achievement adversely, there is a need to improve health conditions of the students, as about 70% of the students absent due to illness and poor health conditions.
11. In spite of students of Low Performing Schools having good self-image in studies, the performance level has not shown any improvement.
12. In case of LPS, positive perception about teachers' grading of students has a positive impact on their performance.
13. The students from both LPS and HPS have a positive perception about their teachers. However, it is higher among the students of HPS when compared with the students of LPS
14. The students from LPS take more help from the peer group than the students of HPS.
15. Involvement in the household work is greater among the students of HPS than LPS.
16. A large number of students from both LPS and HPS do not feel household work affects their studies.
17. Overall, the students of both HPS and LPS feel the subjects English, Maths, Hindi are difficult.
18. Parental contribution is almost the same in both LPS and HPS towards the studies of their wards.

4.1.4 Responses of the Parents

From all the 18 schools, it was possible to get only 55 parents (37 from LPS and 18 from HPS) to respond to the questionnaire. Their responses have been tabulated and presented from Tables P-1 to P-11.

Table P-1
Educational qualification of parents

	Mother				Father			
	Illiterate	<10 th	>10 th	N	Illiterate	<10 th	>10 th	N
LPS	22	11	3	36	12	16	8	36
%	47.83	23.91	6.52		33.33	44.44	22.22	
HPS	13	5	-	18	2	11	5	19
%	72.22	27.78			10.53	57.89	26.32	

Table P-1 reveals literacy level of parents in LPS and HPS.

Of 46 mothers of LPS, 47.83% mothers are illiterate. 23.91% have studied less than 10th standard, 6.52% have studied more than 10th Standard.

Of 36 fathers of LPS 33.33% of fathers are illiterate, 44.44% have studied less than 10th Standard, 22.22% have studied more than 10th Standard.

72.22% of mothers of HPS students are illiterate and 27.78% have studied less than 10th standard.

10.53% of fathers of HPS are illiterate, 57.83% of fathers have studied less than 10th standard, 26.32% have studied more than 10th Standard.

Table P-2

Occupations of the parents and income of the family

	Occupation of parents										Annual income of the family in Rs.			
	Mother					Father					<12000	12000-25000	25000-50000	>50000 N
	Agri	Daily wages	Business	Others	N	Agri	Daily wages	Business	Others	N				
LPS	16	10	1	8	35	17	13	2	4	36	22	17	-	39
%	45.71	28.57	2.86	22.86		47.22	36.11	5.56	11.11		56.41	43.59		
HPS	9	6	1	1	17	10	7	0	2	19	8	9	1	18
%	52.94	35.29	5.88	5.88		52.63	36.84	0	10.53		44.44	50	5.55	

Table P-2 reveals occupations and income group of parents of LPS and HPS.

Of 35 mothers of LPS, 45.71% practice agriculture, 28.57% are daily wagers, 2.86% take up business and 22.86% perform other occupations.

Of 36 fathers from LPS, 47.22% practiced agriculture, 36.11% are daily wagers, 5.56% belong to business and 11.11% perform other occupations.

56.41% come under the income group of less than Rs.12000 per annum.

43.59% come under the income group between Rs.12000 and Rs.25000 per annum and surprisingly none of the families fall under the income group of more than Rs.25000.

In HPS, about 52% parents practice agriculture, about 36% parents are daily wagers and 10% of fathers belong to other occupations.

With regard to income of the family, 50% of family fall under the second category of income that is Rs.12000/- to Rs.25000/- and about 6% of the family has income between Rs.25000/- and Rs.50000/- per annum.

Table P-3
Parental aspiration for sending their children to school

	Get a good job	Study well	Others	N
LPS	28	8	1	37
%	75.68	21.62	2.70	
HPS	14	4	-	18
%	77.78	22.22		

Table P-3 tells about the parental aspiration in sending their wards to school.

Of 37% parents of LPS, 75% send them to school, keeping the job in mind and 21.62% send them to study well.

Of 18 parents of HPS 77.78% send their wards to school for securing good job in future and 22.22% send them to school so that they can study well.

The parents of both the groups have almost the same level of aspiration in sending their children to school. Though there is difference in performance of the students, there is no difference in the level of aspiration of the parents.

Table P-4
Parents visit to school and feeling about teaching

Visit to school and talk to teachers					Feeling that teachers teach well		
	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	N	Yes	No	N
LPS	30	7	-	37	34	3	37
%	81.08	18.92			91.89	8.11	
HPS	12	5	1	18	18	-	18
%	66.67	27.78	5.56		100		

Table P-4 reveals the frequency of parental visit to school.

Of 37 parents of LPS, 81.08% visit the school weekly.

Of 18 parents of HPS, 66.67% visit the school weekly.

91% of LPS parents feel teachers teach well.

All the HPS parents feel teachers teach well.

Table P-5
Study habits of children

	Study			Don't study at all	N
	Daily	Alternative days	Weekly		
LPS	35	2			37
%	94.59	5.41			
HPS	18				18
%	100				

Regarding the study habits of students of 37 students from LPS, 94.59% study daily whereas all the students of HPS study daily. This shows that studying daily and regularly has a positive impact on the performance of the students

Table P-6
Parents feeling about subject as difficult and easy

	Subject felt difficult by the child							Subject felt easy by the child						
	T	E	H	M	Sc	SSc	N	T	E	H	M	Sc	SSc	N
LPS	-	10	9	12	1	-	32	22	2	4	12	11	8	59
%	-	31.25	28.13	37.5	3.13			37.29	3.38	6.78	20.34	18.64	13.56	
HPS	-	5	2	12	-	1	20	16	9	10	5	11	12	63
%	-	25	10	60	5			25.4	14.29	15.87	7.94	17.46	19.05	

Table P-6 reveals the perception of the parents about their child's difficulty or otherwise of a subject. Among the LPS parents, Maths by 37.5%, English by 31.25% and Hindi by 28.13% are considered difficult. Among the HPS parents Maths by 60%, English by 25% and Hindi by 10% are considered difficult. While coming to the subject felt easy the parents of LPS felt Telugu as the easiest, but Mathematics was the second easy subject as expressed by 20.34% parents.

Table P-7
Effort made by parents to improve child's performance in studies

	Providing clock	Sending for tuitions	Providing study space	Getting books	Freeing from household work	Monitoring	N
LPS	21	27	21	19	18	5	111
%	18.92	24.32	18.92	17.12	16.22	4.50	
HPS	10	14	15	9	11	5	64
%	15.63	21.86	23.44	14.06	17.19	7.81	

Table P-7 lists out the facilities provided by the parents to improve the performance of their child. Among the LPS group the most popular facility is private tuition with 24.32% of parents providing it. Providing study space by 18.92%, providing clock by 18.92%, providing additional books by 17.12% and freeing from household work by 16.22% are other means adopted by parents in LPS.

Among the HPS providing study space is done by 23.44%, private tuitions by 21.86%, parents freeing from house hold work and providing clock by 15.63%, parents.

Table P-8
Parental monitoring of the children

	Send to special class	Know the position through progress report	Check the attendance	Discuss with teachers	Discuss with child	Provide outside help	N
LPS	37	29	35	21	9	1	132
%	28.03	21.97	26.52	15.91	6.82	0.76	
HPS	17	17	17	12	6	6	75
%	22.67	22.67	22.67	16	8	8	

Table P-8 gives an insight into parental monitoring of their ward. Both in the LPS and HPS groups sending to special classes(28.03% and 22.67%) knowing the position through progress report (21.97% and 22.67%) and checking the attendance (26.52% & 22.67%) are preferred means. Providing outside help for studies is higher in HPS when compared to LPS as expressed by the parents of LPS (0.76%) and HPS (8%).

Table P-9
Special food provided to the children by the parents

	Need for providing special food			If yes, Special food provided					
	Yes	No	N	Milk	Fruit	Vegetables	Non-veg	Others	N
LPS	36	1	37	14	18	17	13	1	63
%	97.30	2.70		22.22	28.57	26.98	20.63	1.59	
HPS	16	1	17	9	7	7	6	-	27
%	94.12	5.88		33.33	25.93	25.93	22.22		

Table P-9 reveals parents perception of nutritional needs of their children. In both the LPS and HPS a very high percentage of parents (97.30 & 94.12) are aware of the nutritional needs of their children. The second part of the table provides information about different special food items given to their wards. In both LPS and HPS, milk, fruits, vegetables and non-vegetarian food have been provided to the children.

Table P-10
Reason given by parents for the performance of the child

	School cares to the needs of the child	Child works hard	Teachers give special attention	Subjects are taught well	Friends are good	N
LPS	28	35	26	23	22	134
%	20.90	26.12	19.40	17.16	16.42	
HPS	17	14	15	17	13	76
%	22.37	18.42	19.74	22.37	17.11	

As per Table P-10, the parents who are happy with the performance of their children have stated different reasons. Among the LPS group 20.90% say it is because of the school taking care of the child and this number is 22.37% among the HPS. 26.12% among the LPS and 18.42% among HPS say it is because of the hard work of their children. 19.40% among LPS and 19.74% among HPS say it is because of special attention given by the teachers. It is quality of teaching for 17.16% of LPS and 22.37% of HPS parents. The HPS group parents have a 5% higher satisfaction on the quality of teaching.

Table P-11
Parents expectations from the school to improve the performance of the child

	Infra-structure	Guidance services	Appointment of teachers	Provide transport facility	Provide computer facility	Give additional coaching	Provide uniform	N
LPS	16	12	13	2	8	-	3	54
%	29.63	22.22	24.07	3.70	14.81	-	5.56	
HPS	14	4	5	2	4	1	4	34
%	41.18	11.76	14.71	5.88	11.76	2.94	11.76	

Among the expectations of the parents from the school to improve the performance of the child the infrastructure needs are given priority by 29.63% of LPS and 41.18% of HPS. The appointment of teachers (24.07%) is another priority for LPS parents whereas only 14.71% of HPS parents have mentioned about it. Providing guidance services is a requirement of 22.22% of LPS parents and only 11.76% of HPS parents.

Findings based on responses of the parents

1. Maternal literacy and educational level have influenced the HPS.
2. Parental occupations and annual income have an impact on the performance of their wards.
3. Parental visit to school do not seem to influence the performance of their wards.
4. Study habit of students has direct reflection on performance.
5. Parental opinion on the subject difficulty or otherwise in both the groups is the same.
6. Providing more facilities and outside help to study has influenced performance of the children.

4.1.5 Responses of SMC Members

The responses of 12 SMC members (8 from LPS and 4 from HPS) to the various aspects of the school, related to performance of the students including general information have been tabulated and given in Tables from SM – 1 to SM – 8. The discussion on each of the tables is given below.

Table SM - 1
Age and Gender of SMC Members

	Age in years		Gender			
	< 35	35-50	N	M	F	N
LPS	2	6	8	8	-	8
%	25.0	75.0		100.0		
HPS	1	3	4	3	1	4
%	25.0	75.0		75.0	25.0	

Age composition of members of SMCs is more or less the same in both groups. 25% of members in both groups are below the age of 35 years and 75% are between the age of 35 and 50 years. No one is above 50 years.

Gender-wise, all members except one in HPS are male.

Table SM – 2
Education and Occupation of SMC Members

	Education					Occupation					N
	Illite rates	Pri- mary	Sec- ondary	De- Gree	N	Labour	Agri	Busi- ness	Govt office	Pvt office	
LPS	-	3	4	1	8	-	7	1	-		8
%		37.50	50.0	12.50			87.50	12.50			
HPS		1	-	3	4	2	-	-	-		2
%	-	25.0		75.0		100	-	-			

About the Educational level of SMC members in the LPS 37.50% had Primary education and it was 25% among the HPS. 50% of LPS, SMC members had secondary education and 12.50% had a degree. Among the HPS there were no members with secondary education. 75% of them were graduates. In spite of the small sample size it is possible to assume that higher qualification of SMC members has influenced the performance of the students.

Table SM - 3
Frequency of visit and its purpose

	Frequency of visit				Purpose of visit				
	Weekly	Monthly	Whenever called	N	Personal grounds	To discuss School issues	Participate in school Programme	Monitor the schemes	N
LPS	4	4	-	8	-	6	5	4	5
%	50.0	50.0				40.0	33.33	26.67	
HPS	-	2	1	3	-	4	4	4	12
%		66.67	33.33			33.33	33.3	33.3	

The SMC members of LPS visit schools more frequently than members of HPS. Among HPS SMC members, 66.67% say they visit once a month where as among LPS 50% visit weekly and other 50% visit monthly.

About the purpose of the visit 40% of LPS and 33.33% of HPS say it is for discussing school issues and 26.67% of LPS and 33.33% of HPS say it is for monitoring. In both the groups 33.33% say it is for participating in school programmes.

Table SM – 4
Discussion about Teaching and Learning

Discussing with teachers			
	Yes	No	N
LPS	4	4	8
%	50.0	50.0	
HPS	4	-	4
%	100.0		

All the SMC members in the HPS said they discuss about teaching and learning activities with teachers. But this is only 50% among LPS.

Table SM - 5
Regular Participation in School Activities

	Yes	No	N
LPS	2	2	4
%	50%	50%	
HPS	1	2	3
%	33.33%	66.66%	

Regular participation by the SMC members in school activities is higher among the LPS. But their participation is mainly related to providing certain physical facilities to the school and not directly related to student's performance in studies as informed by few SMC members during discussion in the schools.

Table SM – 6
Performance of the School

	Not satisfactory	Average	Very good	Excellent	N
LPS	-	6	2	-	8
%		78%	25%		
HPS	-	-	3	1	4
%			75%	25%	

In the opinion of the SMC members the performance of HPS is excellent for 25% and very good for 75%. Among the LPS, 75% have rated it as average and 25% as very good. What is surprising is no member of the SMC even among LPS has rated it as not satisfactory.

Table SM – 7
Attendance of the Teachers

	Regular	Satisfactory	Irregular	Don't know	N
LPS	6	2	-	-	8
%	75.0	25.0			
HPS	-	4	-	-	4
%	-	100.0			

About the attendance of teachers 75% of respondents in LPS say they are regular and 25% say the attendance is satisfactory. Among the HPS all have responded it as satisfactory.

Table SM – 8
Satisfaction Regarding Functioning of the School

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all	N
LPS	2	6	-	8
%	25.0	75.0		
HPS	2	2	-	4
%	50.0	50.0		

About the satisfaction level among SMC members about the functioning of their school, 25% in LPS said ‘very much’ and 75% as to some extent. Whereas among HPS, it was equally divided. Overall, the satisfaction level among SMC members of LPS is comparatively low.

Findings based on responses of SMC members

1. Age and Gender factors of SMC members have no relevance to performance of students.
2. Higher educational qualifications of SMC members have a positive effect on performance of the school.
3. Frequent visits by the SMC members to the school, do not influence the performance of the students.
4. SMC members discussing educational issues with teachers have a positive impact on performance of students
5. SMC members even from among LPS do not rate their schools’ performance as unsatisfactory
6. SMC members perception of teachers regularity has no influence on performance of the students.

4.2 General Observations made by the Programme Coordinator

The Programme Coordinator had focus group discussion with the Heads of the Schools and the Teachers who were available on the day of the visit. The following observations were made regarding Low and High Performance of Schools based on the discussion.

a) Reasons for Low Performance of Schools

- Teacher posts are not filled.
- No proper laboratory and library facilities.
- Parents do not show much interest to visit and interact with teachers.
- Irregularity of hostel students.
- Large number of students in class.
- No practice of issuing progress reports regularly.
- Students abstaining from school after mid-day meal under some pretext.
- Absence of monitoring of any kind in hostels.
- Basics of subjects are not learnt.
- Poor Language skill of the students.
- Posts of full time HMs are not filled.
- Students are irregular to special coaching classes.
- No in-service programme for teachers on regular basis.
- No TLM is available as per the requirement.
- Examination centers are away and students get disturbed.
- Absenteeism during agricultural seasons.
- Insufficient rooms.
- Delay in supply of textbooks
- No PTA meetings are held

b) Reasons for High Performance of Schools

- Teachers are very cooperative.
- Students are regular.
- Parents and S.M.C. members visit school often.
- Special coaching for slow learners.
- After January revision of portions.
- Group study.

- Parents' cooperation.
- For low achievers more work is given on important topics.
- Vidya volunteers to help failing students.
- Lab. used for demonstrations.
- Books issued from the library for home reading.
- Special attention to C & D group students.
- Each teacher is assigned a group of students.
- Have question bank.
- Conduct tests and prepare study material
- Completion of portions by November and special coaching after December.
- Weekly tests.
- Working out old question papers
- Special time table with periods of 90 minutes after January for special coaching.
- Meeting with parents of slow learners 5 to 6 times during revision.

General Observations made by the Field Investigators

Three Field Investigators were appointed for the purpose of data collection. Each one of them visited six schools in two mandals. Along with administration of questionnaires, they interacted with the members of the schools. Their general observations are given in the following pages.

a) Observations made by the Field Investigator of Hindupur and Parigi

Mandals with regard to Low Performance of Schools

- Lack of teachers.
- Lack of infrastructure facilities.
- Lack of clerical staff.
- Lack of awareness among parents.
- No laboratory and library.
- Untrained Vidya volunteers
- Lack of regular headmasters.
- Lack of community participation in school programmes.
- Lack of supervision (academic and administrative side).

- Additional work to teachers other than teaching (Mid-day meal, Scouts and Guide, NCC).
- Additional work for Headmasters – all clerical work, school complex programme.
- Lack of inservice training programmes.
- Poor academic background of the children.
- Irregularity of students.
- Lack of traveling facilities for teachers to go to schools (Bus facility).

Observations made by Field Investigator of Hindupur and Parigi Mandals with regard to High Performance of Schools

- Good infrastructure facilities
- Experienced teachers
- Library facility
- Science Kit and T.L.M.

b) Observations made by the Field Investigator of Penukonda and C.K.Palli with regard to Low Performance of schools

- Lack of physical infrastructure facilities such as classrooms, lab. facilities.
- Lack of adequate qualified teachers, subject specialized teachers
- The teachers are engaged in other works than instruction.
- Lack of proper planning in teaching
- Students' irregularity
- Special classes are engaged and monitored mainly by the para-teachers than regular teachers.
- The Parents' awareness of education is not up to the expected level.
- No supervision from the higher authorities for the last 3 years in some schools.
- No scope for identification of learner difficulties and remedial instruction.
- Library facility for X std. students is not available in any school.

c) Observations made by the Field Investigator of Kalyanadurga and Ananthapur with regard to Low Performance of Schools

- Students' irregularity
- Lack of supervision
- Lack of support from other teachers
- Less special care to the low performers
- Less dedication for teaching profession.
- Lack of time for remedial classes.
- No proper usage of the available equipments.
- Poor monitoring by the parents .

4.3 Findings of the Study

The following are the findings of the study in relation to the performance of students which have influenced positively.

1. Higher income level students performed better when compared with low income group.
2. Positive perception about the teachers and the trust on their assessment have influenced the performance.
3. Peer group help and learning have influenced the performance of the students.
4. Maternal literacy and education have helped in the performance of the students.
5. Higher educational level of SMC members have influenced the school performance.
6. SMC members awareness of educational issues and discussion about the same with the teachers have influenced the performance.
7. Higher experience in teaching and valuation of Public Examination papers have contributed to better performance.
8. More the time spent by the teachers for preparation, better the performance of the students.
9. Proper and better use of TLM have a positive impact on the performance.
10. Identification of slow learners and providing additional help have a positive impact.

11. Regularity in attending the classes for additional input has a positive impact on the performance of the students.
12. More number of years of experience as a HM, has positively influenced the performance of a school.
13. Monitoring the substitution classes has better impact on the performance.
14. Monitoring teachers' records like Teaching Diary and Programme of work have influenced the performance of the students..

The following are the findings of the study in relation to performance of students that have influenced negatively.

1. Absence of regular panel inspection and feedback.
2. Insufficient library and laboratory facilities
3. Absence of assessment of quality of classroom input, remedial input and evaluation.
4. Increased non-academic work or responsibilities which have come in the way of the quality of academic work and affected the performance.
5. Perception of difficulty of the subjects among the students - English, Mathematics and Hindi is high.

Measures to mitigate the problem of low performance

1. Schools can plan to provide more learning materials – additional books, charts, magazines, newspapers, etc. They can also earmark space, time and provide guidance from competent teachers to use these materials. This would counter the economic disadvantage faced by students from economically weaker sections.
2. Schools should strive to enhance the competencies of teachers and develop positive approach towards students so that their image in the eyes of students is better. For this appropriate strategies may be thought of.
3. It should be encouraged and made mandatory to include peer group activities for both learning and assessment.
4. Involve mothers more in Parent Teacher Meeting and while giving feedback of students' performance, etc.
5. While forming SMCs, care may be taken to induct educationally qualified people. They may also be provided necessary orientation on important issues

connected with the management of the school. They should be sensitized to the development role they are required to play in improving the school effectiveness.

6. The Heads of schools should ensure all the teachers particularly those teaching X class, get an opportunity to value Public Exam papers.
7. Teachers should be encouraged to spend extra hours for preparing for the classes by providing recognition and appreciation. Schools should also procure necessary texts and reference books for this purpose.
8. Schools/ Managements should ensure to provide necessary Teaching Learning Materials (TLM). They may also orient the teachers through appropriate strategies in the effective use of these materials.
9. To ensure regularity of attendance for special classes/ remedial classes, some incentives like snacks can be thought through contributions from the local community.
10. The Heads of schools should monitor teacher records like teacher diary, programme of work, etc. on a regular basis. Monitoring of remedial classes and substitution classes will help in enhancing the performance.
11. The Education Department should see to it that panel inspection is done on regular basis and all the schools in general and low performing schools in particular are covered. Teachers are to be given a performance assessment and encouraged to carry on a better work.
12. Since most of the schools covered under this study have reported lack of library and laboratory facilities, education department should take a pro-active step in providing these to all the schools.
13. Heads of schools and the Department should ensure that the teachers are not drafted for 'other works' at the cost of their classes.
14. Since both students and parents have perceived Maths, English and Hindi as difficult subjects, strategies may be thought of to make the study of these subjects easier.

5.0 Major Findings and Discussion

From the study, it has been found that there are 22 factors responsible for low performance of schools in X class Public Examination. These factors have been classified under.

1. Home factors
2. Student factors
3. School factors

Home factors

There are four home factors which have influenced the performance of students. They are income of the family, parents' visit to school, providing outside help and study space. These have been discussed under (i) to (iv).

- (i) **Income of the Family:** The study has shown that 44% of the family of LPS has an annual income between Rs.12,000 and Rs.25,000 whereas with regard to family of HPS, 50% of the family has an annual income between Rs.12000 and Rs.25000 and 6% of the family has between Rs.25000 and Rs.50000. With higher income, it is possible for the parents to provide better educational facilities to their children in terms of materials and services. Though low income of the family has adversely affected the performance of the students, the educational authorities have no control over it but academic help may be arranged at the school level.
- (ii) **Parents' visit to school :** The study reveals that 19% of parents of LPS and 28% of parents of HPS visit the school regularly once a month and talk to the teachers regarding the progress of their child. The higher percentage of parents' visit to school has contributed to higher performance of students of HPS. This shows that the school has to make arrangements to invite parents to school regularly and brief them about the progress made by their children.
- (iii) **Providing outside help:** The study shows that a higher percentage of parents of HPS (8%) provide outside help to their children as against 1% of parents of LPS providing outside help to their children. This indicates that the outside help taken by the children has positively influenced the performance of students. Therefore, the LPS need to make arrangements to provide additional

help to students in the schools by their teachers/community members. There is a need as 46% of parents of LPS have less than Rs.12000/- as their annual income which will not enable them to send their children to private coaching centers.

- (iv) **Providing space for study** : 23% of the parents of HPS as against 19% of parents of LPS have said that they provide study space to their children. This has created a positive impact on the performance of the students. Therefore, it is necessary that a separate space for study be created for the students. School or the Panchayat can take this issue and try to provide space at community level for the benefit of students.

Student Factors

There are three factors which have been responsible for the low performance of students. They have been discussed from (i) to (iii).

- i) **Study habits**: All the parents of HPS have felt that their children study daily and regularly whereas 95% of parents LPS have said that their children study daily but 5% of the parents have said that their children study alternative days. As good study habit is seen in all the students of HPS, it has a positive impact on the performance of the students. Therefore, parents of LPS have to be advised to monitor the study of their children and develop a right study habit from the beginning of secondary stage.
- ii) **Attending special classes** : About 44% of the teachers of LPS have felt that the students do not attend special classes regularly as against 17% of teachers of HPS. Even during the Focus Group discussion held by the Programme Coordinator, the teachers alleged that in spite of being in the hostels, students do not attend special classes regularly. This necessitates monitoring of studies of hostel students. As the percentage of non-attending of special classes is higher in LPS especially with the children of labour class, school should take measures to see that the students attend special classes regularly by bringing about flexibility in its timings.
- iii) **Difficult subjects** : A large number of parents of LPS find English (31%), Hindi (28%) and Maths (31%) as difficult subjects to their children. Even the responses of the students of LPS have shown that 20% feel English, 23% feel

Hindi and 34% feel Maths as difficult subjects. As the difficulty is felt both by the parents and the students, school can arrange for remedial classes and help students to come out of the feeling of difficulty and boost their confidence with regard to those subjects.

School Factors

There are many factors related to school which are responsible for the low performance. These have been discussed in the following paragraphs.

- i) **Inadequate laboratory and library facilities:** As per the responses of the Heads of schools, 50% of the LPS have responded that they have laboratory facilities, but 17% have responded that it is being used regularly. This shows not only inadequacy of lab facilities but also non-utilisation of available resource. With regard to library facilities, 91% of HMs of LPS have reported that they have libraries, but it is not being used by 18% of teachers and students. Though it is used by a large percentage of teachers and students, there is a need to find ways of strengthening the utilization of laboratory and library facilities available in the schools.
- ii) **Time spent on preparation for teaching:** According to the analysis of the responses given by the teachers of LPS, 53.52% of teachers take less than one hour and 39.44% take one to two hours per day for preparing for the class whereas in HPS 15.91% of teachers take less than an hour and 68.18% take one to two hours per day for preparation. This shows that the LPS teachers take less time to prepare for the class when compared with HPS. Therefore, there is a need to orient the teachers towards thorough preparation for the class especially regarding catering to the needs of low achievers.
- iii) **Availability and utilisation of resource materials:** Use of resource materials make learning easy and meaningful. 76.81% of teachers of LPS have stated that they use the teaching learning materials whenever required whereas this percentage is 91.30% with regard to HPS. During the Focus Group Discussion with the teachers of LPS, they have expressed that they need more resource materials and they do not have enough charts and maps. They even requested for a Question Bank to be made available to the schools which

would help students in practicing for the examination. Therefore, some action has to be taken in strengthening the hands of the teachers.

- iv) **Experience in valuation of SSC papers:** Experience in valuation of Secondary School Certificate paper gives an idea to the teachers regarding how the answer scripts are being valued. This helps in guiding the students in answering for the public examination. While 55% and 40% of teachers of HPS have 1–5 years and 5–10 years of experience respectively in valuation of public examination papers, it is 50% and 35% in LPS. Therefore, it is necessary to provide opportunities to all the teachers handling class X in valuation of answer scripts at least for a few years.
- v) **Entry level of the students:** Though 85% of the teachers of LPS feel that they prepare the students to face public examination from class VIII, about 19% of the teachers have expressed that the students have not understood the concepts of lower classes and 28% of the teachers have felt that the students have poor language skills. As these are very important in answering the public examination, school should plan a bridge course to help students to understand the concepts of lower classes and have additional language activities to improve their language skills.
- vi) **Non-academic work:** While responding to the question, whether the teachers have any other responsibilities other than academic, 77% of the teachers of LPS have expressed that they have office work, whereas only 40% of the teachers of HPS have expressed that they have office work. 64% of LPS teachers have said that the other responsibilities affect their teaching work. This necessitates the authorities to look into the matter and make separate arrangements for office work to allow teachers to concentrate on teaching.
- vii) **Feedback from higher authorities:** While responding to the question on academic inspection of the school, 40% of HMs of HPS and 18% of HMs of LPS expressed that inspection was held in the near past but not after 2003. All the HMs of HPS and 91% of HMs of LPS feel that there is a need for regular inspection of the school and their feedback can surely improve the performance of the schools.
- viii) **Inservice programmes for teachers:** One of the suggestions given by the Heads of schools to improve the performance of the schools is to provide inservice programmes to teachers as this would keep the teachers to keep track

of the developments in the field of teaching and keep them professionally growing. During Focus Group Discussion also, teachers expressed their desire to attend inservice programmes to improve their classroom teaching.

- ix) **Monitoring of substitution class:** Whenever the teachers are on leave or on OOD, that class is being handled by another teacher. This is called substitution class/ arrangement class. Academic work is supposed to be done during this class and is required to be monitored by the HM. While all the HMs of HPS responded that they arrange substitution class as well as monitor them, this response was only from 80% to 87% of the HMs of the LPS. This shows that there is a need to advise the HMs to monitor the substitution classes so that right use of the available time is made by the students.
- x) **Quality of Study :** The performance of the students depends on not only the time spent on studies but also the quality of study. The quality of study can be enhanced by proper guidelines and monitoring. Orientation to teachers as to how to provide guidelines to children may be necessary. Even NCF 2005 talks about 'learning to learn'. Teachers' competency has a direct bearing on the performance. Students' perception of teachers' competency also has a positive impact on students' performance. Under such teachers' classes, there is a higher involvement and lesser disciplinary problems. Children are stressed less and fear factor is generally absent. Students' perception is influenced by positive attitude, empathy, polite language and ability to connect with the children and sensitivity to students' needs and problems. The inservice and preservice programmes need to focus on developing these aspects among teachers.
- xi) **School Environment :** At the institution level, quite often academic and intellectual environment is not always encouraging. As a result, complacency sets in, cynicism develops. This can be tackled by the heads of schools and the department by adopting motivational programmes for teachers. Similar recommendation is also made by MHRD in its report. "Heads of schools must be trained preferably through a six months diploma with three months of practice and practical exercise".
- xii) **Community Participation :** The data about community participation in the school activities is far from satisfactory. However, in schools where there was a semblance of positive participation the performance was better. NCF 2005

also notes the need for greater participation of the community in the academic programmes of the school. Schools, therefore, are required to ensure a greater role for parents and members of the community in their activities. This participation will give a better understanding between teachers and local community.

- xiii) **Other responsibilities of HMs :** As per the responses of HMs, 70% of HMs of LPS have other responsibilities. Like heading the school complex, NEPGEL work, clerical work of the school, open schools, etc. They feel that these are coming in the way of working entirely for the school. Therefore, there is a need to examine how far these responsibilities hinder the functioning of HMs.
- xiv) **Subjects handled by the HMs:** About 37% of HMs handle Mathematics, about 28% handle Science and 19% handle English in LPS. Surprisingly many failures are in those subjects in LPS. Many times it is possible that the position of the person instills fear among the students and blocks their understanding of the subject. It is also possible that due to other responsibilities, the HMs were not able to do justice to their subjects. This issue may be raised in HMs meeting and appropriate action may be taken to enhance pass percentage in these subjects.
- xv) **Preparation of Question Papers :** 66.67% of HMs of LPS claim that the question papers are being prepared by the teachers for preparing students for public examination. Teachers also feel that there is a difference in the performance of the students in school exam and public exam. However, it is not a must that the teachers should themselves prepare the question papers for better results what is important is that these question papers should be on the mode of the public examination papers. May be sometimes borrowing papers from HPS or other schools could be of great advantage. If possible teachers may also be trained in preparing question papers and question banks.

Conclusion

The study has revealed several factors for low performance of schools, in X class Public Examination. Many factors are related to school. 'Where there is a will, there is a way'. Therefore, every school should chalk out a programme, which is within the reach of the school and help the students to perform better in the public

examination. The Collector's programme during 2007-08 is said to have made remarkably good progress in the pass percentage of students. This shows that it is possible to enhance the result of the school by providing additional coaching to students. Hope, the findings of the study will show path to the authorities to streamline the input of class X.

References

- Arjun Dev (1995). Secondary Education in India: A status paper. In Towards Quality Secondary Education- Agenda for 21st century. COBSE. New Delhi
- Arjun Singh (1995). Improving Quality of Secondary Education. In Towards Quality Secondary Education, Agenda for 21st century (1995). COBSE, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House.
- Arora, G L (2000). School Education and Staff Development Programme. In Towards Quality Secondary Education, Agenda for 21st century (1995) COBSE, New Delhi. Vikas Publishing House.
- Behera A.K (2002). Intelligence, Academic Motivation in relation to Academic Achievement. Ph.D Thesis, Punjab University.
- Chattopadhyaya (1986). School Education Policy –some concrete suggestions. In Malhotra, Parakh and Misra (1986). School Education in India Present Status and Future Needs, New Delhi, NCERT.
- Dave, R.N (1995). Secondary Education in Twenty first century. In Towards Quality Secondary Education, Agenda for 21st century (1995) COBSE. New Delhi. Vikas Publishing House.
- Gupta, S K (2000). Creative and Non Creative Secondary School Pupil teachers of Madhyapradesh in relation to values, adjustment and attitude towards teaching. Ph.D. Thesis. Baraktullah University.
- Kaur M (2001). 'A Study of Emotional Maturity of Adolescents in relation to Intelligence, Academic Achievement and Environmental Catalysts. Ph.D Thesis. Punjab University.
- Kothari, D.S. (1964-66) Report of Secondary Education Commission, New Delhi Govt of India.
- Kumudavalli, S. (1999). A study on relationship between medium of instruction and academic achievement and adjustment of primary school children. Ph.D Thesis. Mumbai SNDT Women's University.
- Malhotra (1986). School Education: Some issues for consideration. In Malhotra, Parakh and Misra (1986). School Education in India- Present Status and Future Needs. New Delhi, NCERT.
- Mehta, Jagruthi (2000). Cognitive processes, Self-perception, Motivation and Behaviour as factor of Academic Achievement in children. Ph.D Thesis, University of Mumbai.

National Curriculum Framework (2005). New Delhi, NCERT.

National Policy on Education (1986), New Delhi. MHRD.

Prem Kripal (1986). Towards an Education for the 21st century. In Malhotra, Parakh and Misra(1986). School Education in India-Present Status and Future Needs. NCERT. New Delhi. NCERT.

Singh L C (1995). Improving Quality of Secondary Education. In Towards Quality Secondary Education- Agenda for 21st Century. COBSE, New Delhi. Vikas Publishing House.

A. QUESTIONNAIRE - HEADMASTER/ HEADMISTRESS

1. Name :
2. School :
3. Age :
4. Gender: Male/ Female :
5. Educational Qualification :
6. Teaching Experience :
7. Experience as Head of the school :
8. Experience as Head in the present school :
9. How will you rate your school performance ? : Very Good / Good / Satisfactory / Poor

10. Provide information related to teachers in the table below :

No. of sanctioned posts of teachers	No. of teachers presently available	No. of teachers on deputation	No. of vacancies of teachers

11. a) Is the number of teachers adequate to run the school? Yes / No
- b) Do you have sufficient number of qualified trained teachers to handle different subjects to class 10th? Yes / No
- c) If yes, are you satisfied with their teaching competencies? Yes / No
- d) If no, what alternative arrangements have you made ?

12.a) Provide information about the performance of the students from class VIII to class X.
2005-08

Name of the Student	M/F	SC/ST/OBC/Gen	Telugu		English		Hindi		Social Science		Mathe-matics		Science	
			I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam

b) 2006-2009

Name of the Student	M/F	SC/ST/OBC/Gen	Telugu		English		Hindi		Social Science		Mathe-matics		Science	
			I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam	I Term Exam	Annual Exam

13. When did you close admission in your school for class 10th during this academic year?

14. a) Have any teachers gone on long leave for the last three years? Yes / No

b) If yes, what arrangements do you make when teachers proceed on long leave?

15. a) Is it necessary to take permission before availing casual leave? Yes / No

b) If yes, is it executed? Yes/ No

c) Do you have the practice of arranging substitution for the class in the absence of teachers? Yes / No

d) If yes, have you ensured that some academic work goes on during substitution work? Yes / No

16.a) Do you have any other responsibility other than heading the institution? Yes / No

b) If yes, what are they?

17. a) What subject/s do you handle for class 10th?
 b) How many periods do you teach per week?

18. How often do you scrutinize the following?

		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally
a)	Teachers Diary				
b)	Programme of work				
c)	Student notebooks				
d)	Scholastic records				
e)	Attendance register-teachers				
f)	Attendance register - students				
g)	Evaluated answer script				

19. How often do you observe the teaching of your teachers?

- Daily
- Monthly
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- occasional

20. What follow up work have you made after the evaluation of the answer scripts?

21. a) Do you identify the low performers ?

Yes / No

b) If yes, when is it done?

- In the beginning of the year
- After the Mid-term examination
- Just before the annual examination

c) What actions do you take after identifying the lower performers?

d) What type of remedial teaching do you plan for the low performers?

e) What steps do you take to fix the responsibility of low performers to the teachers?

22. How do you ensure that the teachers prepare the question paper for the examination themselves?

23. a) Is progress report given to timely and regularly to the students? Yes / No
b) Have you ensured taking signature from the parents on the Progress Reports immediately? Yes/ No
c) Do you discuss about the performance of the students with the teachers? Yes/ No
d) How do you support the teachers in solving their academic problems?

- 24.a) Do you think in-service programmes are necessary for your teachers? Yes / No
b) Are the teachers getting a chance to attend in-service programme in their subject area? Yes / No
c) Do you like to depute your teachers for the in-service programme? Yes / No
d) Give reasons

e) What measures have you taken to increase the competency of your teachers?

25. How often do you hold meetings of PTA and SMC ?

26. In what ways do they extend help in school development activities?

- 27 a) Do you have a library? Yes / No
b) If yes, do your teachers use the library? Yes / No
c) Do your students use the library? Yes / No
d) What steps have you taken in making the library easily accessible for students?

e) What steps have you taken in making the library easily accessible for teachers?

- 28 a) Is there laboratory facility ? Yes / No
 b) If yes, do the teachers use the laboratory? Yes / No
 c) If yes, how often do they use? Regularly /
 Once in a way
 Whenever necessary
- 29 a) Is additional help arranged for the low performers on
 regular basis? Yes/No
 b) Do you get cooperation from teachers for the
 additional help to be given to the students? Yes / No
30. a) Is Panel Inspection necessary to improve the
 performance of schools in class 10th examination? Yes / No
 b) Give reasons.
- c) Had you any Panel Inspection? Yes / No
 d) If yes, when was it last held?
- 31.a) Is it possible to improve the class 10th performance of
 your school? Yes / No
 b) If yes, what actions would you like to take?
- c) What support do you need?
- d) If No, why do you feel so?

B. QUESTIONNAIRE - TEACHER

1. Name of the Teacher
2. Name of the School
3. Age :
4. Gender : M / F
5. Category : SC/ST/ OBC / Gen
6. Teaching experience in handling class X :
7. Experience of evaluating (SSC) spot answer scripts :
8. Total teaching experience :
9. Subject Specialisation :
10. Subjects taught :
11. Hobbies :
12. Affiliation to any teacher associations/
professional bodies :
- 13 a) What is the distance between your home and school? :
- b) How do you reach the school? :
- c) How much time does it take? :
- d) Are you able to reach the school on time? :
- e) Do you attend the prayer of the school regularly? :
14. What is your workload per week? :
15. What is the strength of each class you teach? :
16. Do you maintain a diary? :
17. Is the time sufficient for you for completing the instruction? : Yes/No

18. How often do you use TLM in the class? : - Everyday
- Once a week
- Whenever required
- Not at all
- 19 a) How much time do you take everyday for preparing for your classes? :
- b) Do you prepare for your classes in advance? : Yes / No
- c) If yes, which of the following do you adopt to prepare for your class? : - Use already prepared notes
- Prepare fresh notes for every class
- Refer to ready made materials
- Discuss with colleagues
- Go to library
- Browse internet
- Any other way
- 20 Do you complete the syllabus as planned? : Yes/ No
- 21 a) Do you encourage students to ask questions? : Yes/ No
- b) Do you get irritated with frequent questions? : Yes/ No
- 22 Do you allow for group work and pair work? : Yes/ No
- 23 a) Have you identified the slow learners in your class ? Yes/ No
- b) If yes, what steps have you planned to help them?
- Additional input after the class
 - Additional work at home fore the students.
 - Talk to the students about their performance.
 - Talk to the parents about their wards performance.
 - Try to identify the reasons for slow learning and rectify it.
- 24 a) Do you feel that the parents are to be informed about the performance of their wards? : Yes / No
- b) If yes, how do you involve the parents?
- 25 a) Are you assigned with any other responsibilities other than teaching work? Yes / No
- b) If yes list the responsibilities.
- c) Do they affect your instructional work? : Yes / No

- 26 a) Do you think low performers can be brought on par with other students? : Yes/ No
- b) Do you take special classes for the low performers? : Yes / No
- c) If yes, how many students attend the class? Are they regular?
- 27 Are you preparing the students to take class X exam from class VIII onwards? : Yes / No
- 28 Children are not able to understand the concepts of X Std. because : - concepts of lower classes are not properly understood.
- concepts are difficult to understand
- students are irregular
- students are distracted by electronic media
- link concepts are not covered
- students have poor language skills
- 29 a) Is your classroom well ventilated? : Yes / No
- b) Is there a good blackboard? : Yes / No
- c) Are the TLM displayed? : Yes / No
- d) Is the furniture comfortable? : Yes / No
30. How do you keep track of the performance of the students? : Unit tests / Exams / Quiz
- 31 a) Do you design your unit test? : Yes / No
- b) If yes, do you follow the Board model? : Yes / No
- c) Do you supervise the class when students are answering the test? : Yes / No
- d) Do you evaluate the answer scripts soon after the test? : Yes / No
- e) Do you give feedback to the students individually or in group? : Individual / Group
- f) Do you find any difference in the performance of the child in the school exam and Board exam? Why? Give reasons. : Yes / No
- g) Do you conduct school examination with the same spirit as Board Examination? : Yes / No

- 32 a) Do you train the students to take board exam? : Yes / No
 b) If yes, how? :
 - repeated exams
 - briefing the students about the exam
 - orienting in time management techniques
 - briefing about how to make evaluators' work easy.
- c) What steps have you taken to remove the fear of examination of the students? :
- d) Do you take the help of your colleagues to help children to improve their performance? : Yes / No
 e) Are your efforts recognized by the school? : Yes / No
33. What do you do when the students do not involve themselves in classroom activities? :
 - punish the students
 - find reason and remedy
 - inform the Headmaster and the parents
 - Ignore them
- 34 What are the special activities to encourage the low performers? :
 - Talks from experts
 - Academic linked CCA
 - Peer group learning
35. Are you happy with the working atmosphere of the school? : Yes / No
36. Do you get adequate academic support from the higher authorities? : Yes / No
37. What support material do you require to transact the textual content? :

C. QUESTIONNAIRE - STUDENT

1. Name of the Student: :
2. School :
3. Gender : Male / Female
4. Category : SC/ST/OBC/Gen
5. Parental Education : Father:
Mother:
6. Occupation of the Parent : Father :
Mother:
7. Annual Income of the family :
8. Birth Order of the child : 1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th / 5th
- 9 a) When did you join this school?
- b) To which class did you join?
10. Do you think you are good in studies? Yes / No / To some extent
- 11 a) Which two subjects do you like the most? i) ii)
- b) Why do you like them the most ?
- 12 a) Which two subjects do you like the least? i) ii)
- b) Why do you like them the least ?
- 13 a) Do you like coming to school? Yes / No
- b) Give reasons for your response.
- 14 a) Have you missed your classes? Yes / No
- b) If yes, how often have you missed your classes? Sometimes / many times
- Give reasons.
15. In which of these are you good at? Sports, Studies, Cultural Activities
16. Are you liked by your teacher? Yes / No

17 a) What does your teacher think about you?

Good / Average / Below average

b) How does it affect your performance in studies?

18 a) Do you like your teachers?

Very much / To some extent/
Not at all

b) Why do you say so?

19 a) Do you want your teacher to ask questions to you?

Very much / To some Extent/
Not at all

b) Do you get chances to answer the questions in the class?

Very much / To some Extent/
Not at all

c) How does the teacher react to your answer/ question?

Ignores / Encourages / Criticizes

d) Do you ask your doubts to your teacher?

Very much / To some Extent/
Not at all

20 a) How many of your classmates are your friends?

Many / Some / None

b) Do you go to your friends for help in studies?

Very much / To some Extent/
Not at all

21 a) Do you understand what is taught in class.
Tick against the subjects.

	Very much	To some extent	Not at all
Telugu			
English			
Hindi			
Science			
Maths			
Social Science			

b) If you don't understand do you go to your teachers for help?

Very much / To some Extent/Not at all

c) Do you get help from the teachers to learn?

Very much / To some Extent/Not at all

d) Do you like the way the lessons are taught in the class?

Very much / To some Extent/Not at all

22. Do you feel comfortable to take your teachers' help when you have difficulty in understanding?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
23. Do you feel comfortable to take help from your classmates when you have difficulty in understanding?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
24 a) Do you often get scolded by your parents?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
b) For what reasons?							
25. Do your parents want you to study well?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
26. Have the parents scolded you when you secured low marks?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
27 a) Do you involve in household work?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
b) Does the household work disturb your studies?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
28. Are you attending extra classes?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
29 a) Are you given homework regularly?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
b) Does the homework help you to answer your tests and exams?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
30 a) If you have any difficulties do you talk to your parents?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
b) Do you get help from your parents in studies?	Very much / To some Extent/Not at all						
31. Subjects which I understand well	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Telugu</td> <td>English</td> <td>Hindi</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>Maths</td> <td>Social Science</td> </tr> </table>	Telugu	English	Hindi	Science	Maths	Social Science
Telugu	English	Hindi					
Science	Maths	Social Science					
32. The subject for which I get more help from the teacher	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Telugu</td> <td>English</td> <td>Hindi</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>Maths</td> <td>Social Science</td> </tr> </table>	Telugu	English	Hindi	Science	Maths	Social Science
Telugu	English	Hindi					
Science	Maths	Social Science					
33. Subject which I find difficult	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Telugu</td> <td>English</td> <td>Hindi</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>Maths</td> <td>Social Science</td> </tr> </table>	Telugu	English	Hindi	Science	Maths	Social Science
Telugu	English	Hindi					
Science	Maths	Social Science					





D. QUESTIONNAIRE - PARENT

1. Name of the Child studying in class X :
2. Name of the School :
3. Name of the Mother :
4. Name of the Father :
5. Category : SC/ST/OBC/Gen
6. Educational Qualification of Mother :
7. Educational Qualification of Father :
8. Occupation :
9. Annual Income of the Family :
10. What do you want your child to become? :

- 11 a) How often do you visit the school? :

- b) How often do you talk to the teachers about the performance of your child? :
- c) Do teachers teach well? Yes / No

12. Which of the following benefits does your child get from the school? : Mid day meal/ Textbook / Uniform / Any other

- 13 a) Does your child study at home? : Yes / No

- b) If yes, how often? : - Daily
- alternate days
- Once a week

- 14 a) Which subject does your child find difficult? :

- b) Which subject does your child find easy? :

15. What facilities do you provide to your child at home for studies? : - Private tuition
: - Providing alarm clock
- Space to study
- Access to additional books
- Freeing from household work
- Supervision from other members of the family.

16. Do you monitor the study of the child? : Yes / No

17. Do you send your child to attend special classes in the morning and in the evening conducted by the school? : Yes/ No

18. Have you gone through the progress report of your ward before signing? : Yes / No
- 19 a) Have you seen the attendance of your ward? : Yes / No
- b) What action have you taken?
- 20 a) Have you seen the progress of your ward in studies? : Yes/ No
- b) What action have you taken? - Discussing with the child
- Meeting the teacher
- Sending the child to tuition
- Asking others to help the child
- 21a) To make your child study, have you spared your child deliberately from household works? : Yes / No
- b) If yes, how long? And when ?
- 22 a) Do you think the child requires special food? : Yes / No
- b) What have you provided as special food? :
- 23 a) Are you happy with the performance of the child? : Yes / No
- b) If yes, tick the reasons.
- School takes care of the needs of the child.
 - Child works hard.
 - Teachers give special attention.
 - Subjects are taught well.
 - Friends are good.
 - Any other:
- c) If no, tick the reasons.
- School does not support my child.
 - Child does not understand what is taught.
 - Teachers don't teach well.
 - Subjects are difficult.
 - Friends are not good at learning.
 - Any other.
24. What do you expect from the school to improve the performance of your child?

E. QUESTIONNAIRE - SMC/(Member / Chairperson) Community Member

1. Name of the Member/Chairperson :
 2. Age :
 3. Sex : M / F
 4. Education : Illiterate Primary
 Secondary College
 5. Occupation : Labourer :Skilled / unskilled
 Cultivator
 Business
 Employee Govt / Pvt
 6. Since how long have you been a member of SMC ?

7. Details of Training Programme attended as an SMC member

Title of the Programme	Duration	Year of Attending	Organiser of the Programme

- 8 a) Have you attended any training programme related to school development : Yes/No

b) If yes, give details

Title of the Training Programme	Title of the Training Programme	Year of attending	Organiser of the programme

9. a) How many school going children do you have now ?

b) In which school are they studying?

- 10 a) How frequently do you visit the school ?

- a) Daily
 b) Weekly
 c) Monthly
 d) Yearly
 e) Never

b) For what purposes do you visit the school ?

- personal grounds
- to discuss school related issues
- to participate in school programme
- to monitor the implementation of different schemes

- c) Have you discussed the problems related to teaching and learning at any point of time?
- d) If yes, please mention the issues that were discussed.

Yes / No

- e) Give details of your participation in school development activities.

- 11 a) How would you rate the performance of the secondary school in your village/ community?

- a)Not satisfactory
- b)Average
- c)Very Good
- d)Excellent

- b) Give reasons for your rating .

- 12. What is your opinion about teacher's attendance?

- a) Regular
- b) Satisfactory
- c) Irregular
- d) Don't know

- 13 a) Are you satisfied with the functioning of the school ?

Very much/To some extent/ Not at all

- b) Give reason.

RESOURCE PERSONS

1. Prof.M.S.Lalithamma
P.G. Dept of Education
University of Mysore
Manasagangotri, Mysore 570 006
2. Dr.Kumara Swamy
DIET, Vasantha Mahal
Nazarbad, Mysore 570 010
3. Dr.T.Vijaya Kumar
Senior Faculty
National Institute of Rural Development
Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad 500 030
4. Smt K.S.Sarasa
Retd. Asst. Headmistress
Demonstration School, Mysore
5. Smt.A. Vanaja
Research Associate
NIRD, Hyderabad
6. Sri G.Subba Rao
AC, Govt. Examinations
Ananthapur
7. Sri Y.V.Chalapathi
Asst. Director, I/c DEO
Ananthapur
8. Sri M,Thippeswamy
Headmaster, Govt. High School (Boys)
New Town, Ananthapur.
9. Sri G.B. Nethikantaiah
School Assistant, Govt. High School (Boys)
New Town, Ananthapur
10. Sri N.S.M. Umamaheshwara
Headmaster, Z.P. Boys High School
Bethalapathi, V.K. Mandal
Ananthapur

11. Sri.Venkata Subba Rao
School Assistant
Z.P. Boys High School
Bethalapalli, V.K.Mandal
Ananthapur
12. Dr.Manjula P Rao
Reader in Education
DE, RIE, Mysore
13. Dr, T, V, Somashekar
Lecturer in Education
DE, RIE, Mysore
14. Shri K.Ganapathi Bhat
PGT in History
DMS, RIE, Mysore
15. Dr,G,Vishwanathappa
Reader in Education
DE, RIE, Mysore
16. Prof.Phalachandra B.
Head, Dept. of Education
RIE, Mysore
17. Dr.Asha K,V. D.Kamath
Lecturer in Education
Regional Institute of Education
Mysore

FIELD INVESTIGATORS

1. Sri Rajendra Kumar Gowrigari
6-21, NMP Road
Basinikonda Post
Madanapalle 517 325
Chittoor
2. Sri K Maruthi
Dodagatta (Post and Village)
Roddam 515123
Ananthapur
3. Sri Narendranatha Reddy
D.No.4/883, Papampet
K.C.D. Road
Ananthapur 515 001
4. Sri M Nagesh
Guntapalli (Vill)
Jakkasamudram (PO)
Gorantla, Ananthapur
5. Sri S Nageshwara Reddy
Shivajinagar
H.B.Colony
Ananthapur
6. Sri B. Sreedhar
Shivajinagar
H.B. Colony
Ananthapur