



**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK (AIDED)
MADRAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
(AUTONOMOUS)
&
NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**



**Study on the 4A's Framework in
RIGHT TO GIRL CHILD EDUCATION
in the Aspirational Districts of South India
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools**



www.shutterstock.com - 2154587813

**Sanctioned and Funded by
NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF INDIA**

MARCH, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	i - ii
DISCLAIMER	iii
ABBREVIATION	iv - v
LIST OF TABLES	vi - xxiv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xxv - xxxiv
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
1.1 Introduction	02
1.2 Significance of the Study	02
1.3 Aspirational Districts	05
1.4 Status of Girl Child Education	07
1.5 National & International Status	08
CHAPTER II – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
2.1 Research Design & Objectives	12
2.2 Field of Study	14
2.3 Sampling Method & Distribution	14
2.4 Tools of Data Collection	16
2.5 Data Analysis	18
2.6 Limitations	20
CHAPTER III - ANDHRA PRADESH - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
3.1 Vishakapatnam	22
3.2 Vizianagaram	46
3.3 YSR (Kadapa)	69
3.4 Comparative Analysis of Vishakapatnam, Vizianagaram and YSR (Kadapa)	91
CHAPTER IV - KERELA - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
4.1 Wayanad	96
CHAPTER V - TAMIL NADU - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
5.1 Ramanathapuram	119
5.2 Virudhunagar	145

5.3 Comparative Analysis of Ramanathapuram and Virudhunagar	172
CHAPTER VI - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION – TELANGANA	
6.1 Asifabad	176
6.2 Bhadradi Kothagudem	203
6.3 Bhupalapally	227
6.4 Comparative Analysis of Asifabad, Bhadradi Kothagudem and Bhupalapally	252
CHAPTER VII – COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STATES	
7.1 Comparative analysis between Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Telangana	256
CHAPTER VIII - QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS & FINDINGS	
8.1 Andhra Pradesh	269
8.2 Kerala	280
8.3 Tamil Nadu	289
8.4 Telangana	299
CHAPTER IX - SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS & DISCUSSION	308
CHAPTER X - RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION	342
REFERENCES	354
ANNEXURES - RESEARCH TOOLS	360

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are thankful to the National Human Rights Commission and its honourable members for sanctioning this study. Our sincere thanks to Shri Sudesh Kumar, Senior Research Officer of NHRC for his constant support and guidance throughout the study.

We are grateful to Dr. P. Wilson, Principal and Secretary of Madras Christian College, and Dr. Miriam Samuel, Head, Department of Social Work, Madras Christian College for their continuous encouragement.

We are also thankful to Thiru Johnny Tom Varghese IAS, District Collector, Ramanathapuram (TN), Thiru J Meghanatha Reddy IAS, Virudhunagar District (TN), Ms A. Geetha, I.A.S. District Collector, Wayanad (Kerala) for their instantaneous support by giving permission to meet the schools in their Aspirational Districts and also for enabling the District coordinators (Aspirational Districts), Chief Educational Offices and District Educational officers to extend their support to our team members at the time of data collection. We would like to place on record the help of other District Collectors and, Aspirational District Officers from the states of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh.

We thank Mr. Jean Paul Boddu, M.S.W. Associate Director – Operations, Mentor Together, Bangalore for coordinating the study in Telangana and Andhra Pradesh. Our sincere thanks to Mr Bibin C.T. M.S.W. (Member, Child Welfare Committee, Wayanad) and his team for coordinating this study in Wayanad, Kerala.

Many thanks to Prof. A. Jabar Ali, Prof. G. Kumarapandiyan and his team, Department of Statistics, Madras Christian College for the statistical and technical inputs in the preparation, validation of tools of data collection, data analysis and data outputs.

Our gratitude to Ms Nikita Ruth D'cruz, Programme Officer- Monitoring and Evaluation, Sanitation First India, Chennai for her qualitative data analysis, report and proofreading.

Mr. Horst Kharis and Mr. Edward Prathap Singh, Research Scholars have immensely contributed to the data analysis part. We sincerely acknowledge their work.

Collecting data in four different States is an uphill task. It is not possible without the support, hard and sincere work of the field workers and student volunteers. We duly acknowledge them.

Team MCC

Prof. Prince Annadurai (Principal Investigator)

Prof. Sudharsan (Co-investigator)

Prof. Johannes Samuel (Co-investigator)

Prof. Joseph Samuel Rajan (Co-investigator)

We would like to acknowledge and thank all the below-mentioned contributors to this study

Ms. Archana M
Mr. Naveen Kumar M
Mr. Jeffrey Samuel J
Ms. Susmitha S
Ms. Rachel Arputha X
Ms. Annapoorani K
Mr. Santhosh Goud
Mr. Blesson Levi D
Mr. John Paul A
Mr. Joshua J
Ms. Tharani T
Ms. Swapna Gudepu
Ms. Sharen J
Ms. Kalyani Gudepu
Mr. Amrish S
Mr. Mahendara Nayak
Mr. Jacob Steyns R
Mr. John Smiles
Mr. Shalomraj Samuel S
Ms. Joy Dilda
Ms. Cheery Dilda
Ms. Angel M
Mr. Shravan Kumar G
Ms. Salomi
Mr. Sudhakar N
Mr. Ravi P
Ms. Hanna Jacob
Mr. Sirisha N
Ms. Keerthi K
Ms. Jemiemol
Ms. Vijayabharathi M
Ms. Vandhana
Mr. Harinad K
Mr. Anish M
Mr. Balaji N
Mr. Dinesh Pulla
Mr. Venkat Rao
Ms. Vimala
Ms. Lakshmi
Mr. Mani Kumari
Ms. Stella Elsa Samuel
Ms. Catherine Tania Bernett
Ms. Anjitha Mary
Ms. Riya M U
Ms. Agnas Augustine
Mr. Arya P J
Ms. Fiona Alex
Ms. Greeshma K B
Mr. Selva Savari Raj J

DISCLAIMER

Madras Christian College, Chennai has received the financial assistance under the Research Scheme of National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), India to prepare this report. While due care has been exercised to prepare the report using the data from various sources, NHRC does not confirm the authenticity of data and accuracy of the methodology to prepare the report. NHRC shall not be held responsible for findings or opinions expressed in the document. This responsibility completely rests with the Madras Christian College, Chennai.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADP	Aspirational Districts Programme
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASER	Annual Status of Education Report
BPL	Below Poverty Line
CBSE	Central Board of Secondary Education
CCE	Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation
CCTV	Closed - Circuit Television
CEO	Chief Education Officer
CM	Chief Minister
CWSN	Children With Special Needs
DEO	District Education Officer
DPO	District Planning Officer
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FLN	Foundational Literacy & Numeracy
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GoI	Government of India
ICPS	Integrated Child protection Scheme
ICSE	Indian Certificate of Secondary Education
IIT	Indian Institute of Technology
KGBV	Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV)
KII	Key Informant Interviews
M	Mean Value
MCQ	Multiple-Choice Question
MEO	Mandal Education Officer, MEO
MHM	Menstrual Health Management (MHM)
NAS	National Assessment Survey (NAS)
NCPCR	National Commission for Protection of Child Rights
NEET	National Eligibility cum Entrance Test

ABBREVIATIONS (Cont'd.)

NEP	National Education Policy
NFHS	National Family Health Survey
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
O & M	Operations and Maintenance.
P	Pearson Correlation Coefficient
PET	Physical Education Teacher
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
RO	Reverse Osmosis
RTE	Rights to Education
SC	Scheduled Castes
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SMC	School Management Committee
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
ST	Scheduled Tribes
STEM	Science, Technology Engineering, and Mathematics
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

LIST OF TABLES

Table. No	Title	Page No
3	ANDHRA PRADESH - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
3.1	VISHAKAPATANAM DISTRICT	22
3.1.1	AVAILABILITY	22
3.1.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	22
3.1.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	22
3.1.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	23
3.1.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	23
3.1.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	24
3.1.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	25
3.1.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	25
3.1.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	26
3.1.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	26
3.1.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	27
3.1.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	27
3.1.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	28
3.1.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	28
3.1.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	29
3.1.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	29
3.1.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	30
3.1.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	30
3.1.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	31
3.1.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	31
3.1.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	32
3.1.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	32
3.1.2	ACCESSIBILITY	33
3.1.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	34
3.1.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	34
3.1.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	35

3.1.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	35
3.1.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	35
3.1.2.2	INCLUSION	36
3.1.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	36
3.1.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	36
3.1.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	37
3.1.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	37
3.1.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	37
3.1.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	38
3.1.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	38
3.1.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	38
3.1.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	38
3.1.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	39
3.1.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	39
3.1.3	ACCEPTABILITY	40
3.1.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	41
3.1.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	41
3.1.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	41
3.1.4	ADAPTABILITY	42
3.1.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	42
3.1.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	42
3.1.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	43
3.1.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	43
3.1.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	43
3.1.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	44
3.1.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	44

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
3	ANDHRA PRADESH - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
3.2	VIZINAGARAM DISTRICT	
3.2.1	AVAILABILITY	46
3.2.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	46
3.2.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	46
3.2.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	47
3.2.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	47
3.2.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	48
3.2.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	49
3.2.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	49
3.2.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	50
3.2.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	50
3.2.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	51
3.2.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	51
3.2.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	52
3.2.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	52
3.2.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	53
3.2.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	53
3.2.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	54
3.2.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	54
3.2.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	55
3.2.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	55
3.2.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	56
3.2.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	56
3.2.2	ACCESSIBILITY	57
3.2.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	58
3.2.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	58
3.2.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	58

3.2.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	59
3.2.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	59
3.2.2.2	INCLUSION	59
3.2.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	60
3.2.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	60
3.2.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	60
3.2.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	60
3.2.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	60
3.2.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	61
3.2.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	61
3.2.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	61
3.2.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	62
3.2.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	62
3.2.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	63
3.2.3	ACCEPTABILITY	63
3.2.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	64
3.2.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	64
3.2.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	65
3.2.4	ADAPTABILITY	65
3.2.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	65
3.2.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	65
3.2.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	66
3.2.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	66
3.2.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	67
3.2.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	67
3.2.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	67

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
3	ANDHRA PRADESH - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
3.3	YSR (KADAPA)	
3.3.1	AVAILABILITY	69
3.3.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	69
3.3.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	69
3.3.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	70
3.3.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	70
3.3.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	71
3.3.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	71
3.3.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	72
3.3.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	72
3.3.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	73
3.3.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	73
3.3.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	73
3.3.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	74
3.3.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	74
3.3.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	75
3.3.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	75
3.3.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	76
3.3.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	76
3.3.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	77
3.3.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	77
3.3.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	78
3.3.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	78
3.3.2	ACCESSIBILITY	79
3.3.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	80
3.3.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	80
3.3.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	81

3.3.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	81
3.3.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	81
3.3.2.2	INCLUSION	82
3.3.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	82
3.3.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	82
3.3.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	82
3.3.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	83
3.3.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	83
3.3.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	84
3.3.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	84
3.3.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	84
3.3.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	84
3.3.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	85
3.3.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	85
3.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY	86
3.3.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	87
3.3.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	87
3.3.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	87
3.3.4	ADAPTABILITY	88
3.3.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	88
3.3.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	88
3.3.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	89
3.3.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	89
3.3.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	89
3.3.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	90
3.3.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	90
3.4	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF VISHAKAPATANAM, VIZINAGARAM AND YSR (KADAPA)	91

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
4	KERALA - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
4.1	WAYANAD DISTRICT	
4.1.1	AVAILABILITY	96
4.1.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	96
4.1.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	96
4.1.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	97
4.1.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	97
4.1.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	98
4.1.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	98
4.1.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	99
4.1.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	99
4.1.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	100
4.1.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	100
4.1.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	100
4.1.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	101
4.1.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	101
4.1.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	101
4.1.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	102
4.1.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	102
4.1.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	103
4.1.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	103
4.1.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	104
4.1.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	104
4.1.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	105
4.1.2	ACCESSIBILITY	106
4.1.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	107
4.1.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	107
4.1.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	107

4.1.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	108
4.1.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	108
4.1.2.2	INCLUSION	108
4.1.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	108
4.1.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	109
4.1.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	109
4.1.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	109
4.1.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	110
4.1.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	110
4.1.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	110
4.1.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	111
4.1.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	111
4.1.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	111
4.1.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	112
4.1.3	ACCEPTABILITY	112
4.1.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	113
4.1.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	114
4.1.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	114
4.1.4	ADAPTABILITY	114
4.1.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	115
4.1.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	115
4.1.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	115
4.1.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	116
4.1.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	116
4.1.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	116
4.1.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	117

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
5	TAMIL NADU - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
5.1	RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT	
5.1.1	AVAILABILITY	119
5.1.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	119
5.1.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	119
5.1.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	120
5.1.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	121
5.1.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	121
5.1.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	122
5.1.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	122
5.1.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	123
5.1.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	124
5.1.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	124
5.1.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	125
5.1.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	125
5.1.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	126
5.1.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	126
5.1.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	127
5.1.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	128
5.1.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	128
5.1.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	129
5.1.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	129
5.1.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	130
5.1.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	131
5.1.2	ACCESSIBILITY	131
5.1.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	133
5.1.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	133
5.1.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	134

5.1.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	134
5.1.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	134
5.1.2.2	INCLUSION	135
5.1.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	135
5.1.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	135
5.1.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	135
5.1.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	136
5.1.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	136
5.1.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	137
5.1.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	137
5.1.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	137
5.1.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	137
5.1.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	138
5.1.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	139
5.1.3	ACCEPTABILITY	139
5.1.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	140
5.1.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	140
5.1.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	141
5.1.4	ADAPTABILITY	141
5.1.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	141
5.1.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	141
5.1.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	142
5.1.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	142
5.1.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	143
5.1.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	143
5.1.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	143

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
5	TAMIL NADU - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
5.2	VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT	
5.2.1	AVAILABILITY	145
5.2.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	145
5.2.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	145
5.2.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	146
5.2.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	146
5.2.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	147
5.2.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	148
5.2.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	149
5.2.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	149
5.2.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	150
5.2.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	150
5.2.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	151
5.2.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	152
5.2.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	153
5.2.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	153
5.2.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	154
5.2.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	155
5.2.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	155
5.2.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	156
5.2.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	157
5.2.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	157
5.2.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	158
5.2.2	ACCESSIBILITY	158
5.2.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	159
5.2.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	160
5.2.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	161

5.2.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	161
5.2.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	161
5.2.2.2	INCLUSION	162
5.2.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	162
5.2.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	162
5.2.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	162
5.2.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	163
5.2.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	163
5.2.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	163
5.2.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	163
5.2.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	164
5.2.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	164
5.2.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	165
5.2.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	165
5.2.3	ACCEPTABILITY	166
5.2.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	167
5.2.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	167
5.2.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	167
5.2.4	ADAPTABILITY	168
5.2.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	168
5.2.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	168
5.2.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	169
5.2.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	169
5.2.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	169
5.2.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	170
5.2.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	170
5.3	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RAMANATHAPURAM AND VIRUDHUNAGAR	172

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
6	TELANGANA - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
6.1	ASIFABAD DISTRICT	
6.1.1	AVAILABILITY	176
6.1.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	176
6.1.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	176
6.1.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	177
6.1.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	178
6.1.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	179
6.1.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	179
6.1.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	180
6.1.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	181
6.1.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	181
6.1.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	182
6.1.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	182
6.1.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	183
6.1.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	183
6.1.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	184
6.1.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	185
6.1.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	185
6.1.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	186
6.1.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	186
6.1.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	187
6.1.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	187
6.1.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	188
6.1.2	ACCESSIBILITY	189
6.1.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	190
6.1.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	190
6.1.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	191

6.1.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	191
6.1.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	191
6.1.2.2	INCLUSION	192
6.1.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	192
6.1.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	193
6.1.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	193
6.1.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	193
6.1.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	193
6.1.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	194
6.1.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	194
6.1.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	195
6.1.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	195
6.1.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	195
6.1.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	196
6.1.3	ACCEPTABILITY	196
6.1.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	197
6.1.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	198
6.1.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	198
6.1.4	ADAPTABILITY	198
6.1.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	199
6.1.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	199
6.1.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	199
6.1.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	200
6.1.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	200
6.1.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	201
6.1.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	201

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
6	TELANGANA - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
6.2	BHADRADRI KOTHAGUEM DISTRICT	
6.2.1	AVAILABILITY	203
6.2.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	203
6.2.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	203
6.2.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	204
6.2.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	204
6.2.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	205
6.2.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	206
6.2.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	206
6.2.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	207
6.2.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	207
6.2.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	208
6.2.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	208
6.2.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	209
6.2.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	209
6.2.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	210
6.2.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	211
6.2.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	211
6.2.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	212
6.2.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	212
6.2.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	213
6.2.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	213
6.2.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	214
6.2.2	ACCESSIBILITY	214
6.2.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	216
6.2.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	216
6.2.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	216

6.2.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	217
6.2.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	217
6.2.2.2	INCLUSION	217
6.2.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	217
6.2.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	217
6.2.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	218
6.2.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	218
6.2.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	218
6.2.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	219
6.2.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	219
6.2.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	219
6.2.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	220
6.2.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	220
6.2.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	221
6.2.3	ACCEPTABILITY	221
6.2.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	223
6.2.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	223
6.2.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	223
6.2.4	ADAPTABILITY	223
6.2.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	224
6.2.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	224
6.3.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	224
6.2.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	225
6.2.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	225
6.2.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	225
6.2.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	226

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
6	TELANGANA - DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
6.3	BHUPALAPALLY DISTRICT	
6.3.1	AVAILABILITY	227
6.3.1.1	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	227
6.3.1.2	SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	227
6.3.1.2.1	SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	228
6.3.1.2.2	SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	228
6.3.1.2.3	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	229
6.3.1.2.4	EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	230
6.3.1.2.5	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	230
6.3.1.3	ACADEMIC RESOURCES	231
6.3.1.3.1	MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	231
6.3.1.3.2	SUPPORTING RESOURCE	232
6.3.1.3.3	FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING	232
6.3.1.3.4	TEACHING STAFF	233
6.3.1.3.5	EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	233
6.3.1.3.6	ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	234
6.3.1.3.7	DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	234
6.3.1.4	TRANSPORT FACILITIES	235
6.3.1.5	SANITATION FACILITIES	235
6.3.1.5.1	SANITATION BUILDINGS	236
6.3.1.5.2	PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	236
6.3.1.5.3	BASIC HYGIENE	237
6.3.1.5.4	MENSTRUAL HYGIENE	237
6.3.2	ACCESSIBILITY	238
6.3.2.1	DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	240
6.3.2.1.1	GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	240
6.3.2.1.2	CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	240

6.3.2.1.3	DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	241
6.3.2.1.4	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT	241
6.3.2.2	INCLUSION	241
6.3.2.2.1	GENDER INCLUSION	242
6.3.2.2.2	CASTE INCLUSION	242
6.3.2.2.3	RELIGION INCLUSION	242
6.3.2.2.4	DISABILITY INCLUSION	242
6.3.2.3	SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	243
6.3.2.4	NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER	243
6.3.2.4.1	DRINKING WATER	243
6.3.2.4.2	SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	244
6.3.2.4.3	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD	244
6.3.2.4.4	ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD	245
6.3.2.4.5	DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	245
6.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY	246
6.3.3.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)	247
6.3.3.2	ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)	247
6.3.3.3	ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)	248
6.3.4	ADAPTABILITY	248
6.3.4.1	CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY	248
6.3.4.1.1	ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION	248
6.3.4.1.2	EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT	249
6.3.4.2	GENDER EQUALITY	249
6.3.4.2.1	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE	250
6.3.4.2.2	INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	250
6.3.5	RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)	250
6.4	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ASIFABAD, BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM AND BHUPALAPALLY	252
7.1	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN ANDHRA PRADESH, KERALA, TAMIL NADU AND TELANGANA	256

LIST OF TABLES (Cont''d.)

Table. No	Title	Page No
9.1	CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE 4 -A INTO A SCHOOL SYSTEM	310
9.2	AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL IN THEIR VILLAGE	312
9.3	DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	313
9.4	CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE - VENTILATION & WINDOWS	314
9.5	ACADEMIC RESOURCES - NOTEBOOKS & TEXTBOOKS	315
9.6	FREEBIES - SUPPORTING ACADEMIC RESOURCE	316
9.7	ACADEMIC RESOURCES - LABS & EQUIPMENTS	317
9.8	AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORT FACILITY IN SCHOOLS	318
9.9	BASIC HYGIENE OF RESTROOMS	319
9.10	GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	321
9.11	CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	322
9.12	RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	323
9.13	DISTANCE TO SCHOOL - LESS THAN 3 KM	324
9.14	QUANTITY OF MID-DAY MEALS	325
9.15	QUALITY OF MID-DAY MEALS	326
9.16	NO DISCRIMINATION IN SERVING FOOD AT MID-DAY MEAL	327
9.17	SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS OF ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS	328
9.18	SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS OF ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS	329
9.19	SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS OF ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (CONTD..)	330
9.20	LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN SCHOOL	331
9.21	LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OF GIRL STUDENTS ON EDUCATION	332
9.22	ADAPTABILITY OF ONLINE MODE AND BLENDED MODE OF EDUCATION	334
9.23	SKILL DEVELOPMENT BASED ON EDUCATION	335
9.24	ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY IN SCHOOLS	336
9.25	ACCEPTABILITY OF THIRD GENDER IN SCHOOL	338
9.26	AWARENESS ABOUT FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE.	339
9.27	AWARENESS OF EDUCATION-RELATED SCHEMES OF THE GOVERNMENT	340

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Report of the High-Level Group on Education for All was commissioned by the Government of India in 2011. The report highlights the challenges faced by the education sector in India, including inadequate infrastructure, poor quality of teaching, and a lack of access to education for disadvantaged groups. Girls in India are still subject to gender-based discrimination, particularly in rural and low-income households, and this limits their access to education. According to the 2019 ASER report, there has been a significant improvement in enrollment rates and learning outcomes in primary education. However, there is still a long way to go to achieve universal access and quality education for all.

The government has brought in the Right To Education (RTE) policy - which ensures that every child, regardless of their gender, socioeconomic background, or any other characteristic, has access to quality education. The Government also started a range of programs to improve education accessibility and quality like Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao (Save the Daughter, Educate the Daughter) program, launched by the Indian government in 2015; Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), a program launched by the Indian government in 2018 to provide universal access to quality education. The government has also started the aspirational district program bringing special attention to the backward districts in the states. The program was launched by the Government of India in January 2018 to improve the socio-economic indicators of 112 districts across the country.

At this junction where a range of initiatives were taken by the central and state governments to improve education availability, accessibility and quality across the country, the current study was focused on examining the Right to Education (RTE) especially for girls using the 4-A framework in the aspirational districts of South Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana Tamil Nadu and Kerala.

The selected field of study is 9 aspirational districts in the south Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, and Kerala.

- Andhra Pradesh has three aspirational districts: Kadapa, Visakhapatnam and Vizianagaram.
- Tamil Nadu has two aspirational districts: Ramanathapuram and Virudhunagar.
- Telangana has three aspirational districts: Asifabad (also known as Kumuram Bheem), Jayashankar Bhupalapally (also known as Bhoopalapally), and Bhadradi-Kothagudem

STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To analyse the resource availability for the education of girl children in terms of availability of schools, safe infrastructure, academic resources, transport and sanitation facilities.
- To identify the measures taken to increase the accessibility of girl child education by providing a discrimination-free environment, inclusive education, nutritious meal and the distance to school.
- To study the extent of acceptability of education among girl children through the quality and relevance of education.
- To investigate the adaptability of the existing educational system of girl children by taking into consideration the changing needs of society and gender equality.
- To examine how far the provisions in the Right To Education Act are implemented and assessed in these schools and how it influences the rights and educational status of girl students in the Aspirational Districts
- To identify gaps in policies and their implementation, and to come out with actionable recommendations on the existing education policies for the promotion of the right to girl child education.

UNDERSTANDING THE 4-As

Katarina Tomasevski said - ‘For education to be meaningful it must be available, accessible, acceptable and adaptable.’ Katarina Tomasevski was former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education and developed the 4-A framework which is one of the best frameworks to understand and assess the situation of education. The framework can be used in a participatory process to enable people to think through what the right to education means to them.

The 4 As can be summarized as follows

- **Availability** – Education is free and government-funded and there is adequate infrastructure and trained teachers able to support education delivery.
- **Accessibility** – The system is non-discriminatory and accessible to all, and positive steps are taken to include the most marginalized.
- **Acceptability** – The content of education is relevant, non-discriminatory and culturally appropriate, and of quality; the school itself is safe and teachers are professional.
- **Adaptability** – Education can evolve with the changing needs of society and contribute to challenging inequalities, such as gender discrimination, and it can be adapted locally to suit specific contexts.

Further, in context to the study, the researchers through secondary research have developed a conceptual framework to examine the 4-As framework in examining the right to girl children's education. Each of the As can be understood at 3 levels - structural, practice and quality.

- At **structural level** - it is all about ensuring that the specific need, facility, and material are present. For example, school buildings, benches, textbooks, playgrounds, etc.
- At **practice level** - it is not just about having the specific need, facility or material but also bringing in certain practices that let all the students avail, access, adapt and accept it.
- At **quality level** - is the most important level, where periodic measures are taken to review the status of the need, facility or material and bring in relevant strategies and mechanisms to improve the same.

METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Methodology

A QUAN – qual mixed method will be used owing to the nature of the study. In the mixed method, Sequential Explanatory Strategy is used. The Sequential Explanatory Strategy is the most straightforward of the major mixed methods approaches. It is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data.

Data Collection

Multi-stage sampling technique is used in this study. Multi-stage sampling is a commonly used sampling method in survey research where a large population is sampled by selecting units in stages. In this method, the population is first divided into smaller groups or clusters, and then a sample of these clusters is selected. Within each selected cluster, a smaller sample is then selected to participate in the study.

Questionnaire / Interview schedule

To gather the quantitative data from the students, we have designed a questionnaire. Questionnaires are a popular and effective quantitative data collection tool that can be used in research, surveys, and evaluations. They typically consist of a set of standardized questions that are administered to a sample of respondents.

Interview Guide

To gather data from officials, principals and teachers who are identified as key informants for the study and hence a key informant interview guide has been selected as a tool for data collection. A key informant interview guide is a tool used in qualitative research to guide a conversation with a person who has specialized knowledge or expertise related to the research topic.

Focus Group Discussion Guide

Similarly, to gather information from teachers, and school management committee members - a focus group discussion guide has been designed. A focus group discussion guide is a tool used in qualitative research to guide a group discussion about a specific topic or issue. Focus groups typically involve a small group of participants who are selected based on their shared characteristics, such as age, gender, occupation, or experience with a particular product or service.

Quantitative Data analysis

The data analysis is broadly done at 3 levels as below:

1. Comparison of government schools vs private schools within the district: In each district, we compared government schools to private schools for different variables under the 4-A framework and indicated if statistically there is a difference on the specific aspect or not.
2. Comparison between the districts in the state: Within each state, we compared how the districts are doing. At this level of analysis, we compared the government schools to government schools among the districts and private schools to private schools among the districts. We used the same 4-A framework to compare the districts and at this level, we tried to present if statistically there is a difference between the districts.
3. Comparison of states: Using the same 4-A framework, we compared the 4 states with each other and indicated if statistically there is a difference between the states.

To do the comparisons, we used T-Test, which is a statistical analysis tool that is used to compare two groups of data, usually with a small sample size. It helps to determine if there is a significant difference between the two groups, based on the mean of the data. To compare more than 2 groups, we used ANOVA (Analysis of Variance), a statistical analysis tool that is used to compare the means of three or more groups of data.

Qualitative Data Analysis

To analyze the qualitative data that has been collected through focus group discussions and key informant interviews, we have used thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a qualitative research method used to analyze data by identifying patterns or themes in the data.

KEY FINDINGS

AVAILABILITY

Availability of School

Telangana has better availability of government schools ($M=3.33$), followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=3.12$). A statistical ANOVA test showed that there is a significant difference, $P = 0$ in terms of the availability of government schools. In comparison, Andhra Pradesh ($M=3.02$) has better availability of private schools followed by Telangana ($M=2.84$). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in terms of the availability of private schools.

Classroom Infrastructure

Kerala has better availability of classroom infrastructure in government schools ($M=25.98$), followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=24.95$). An ANOVA test showed that there is a significant statistical difference, $P = 0$. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=27.44$) has better safety-related infrastructure followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=22.89$). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in the availability of classroom infrastructure in private schools.

Teaching Staff

Tamil Nadu stands first with the highest mean value ($M=13.97$) followed by Kerala ($M=13.88$). Telangana ($M=10.65$) stands last among the four states in the availability of teaching staff. In comparison, with regard to private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=13.66$) once again tops the list immediately followed by Kerala (13.55). Here again, Telangana has taken the last spot in the availability of teaching staff. A separate ANOVA Test done for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$).

Transport Facilities

Andhra Pradesh has better transport facilities ($M=3.81$) followed by Telangana ($M=3.77$). In comparison, with regard to private schools, Andhra Pradesh once again has better transport facilities

(M=3.36) followed by Telangana. A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for government and private school states shows that there is a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

Menstrual Hygiene Related

Kerala stands first with the highest mean value (M=11.13) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=9.31). In comparison on the other hand, with regard to private schools, here again, Kerala (M=8.02) has better availability of menstrual hygiene-related aspects such as menstrual pads, pad dispensers, pad incinerators and pad disposal bins followed by Tamil Nadu (M=7.98). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$).

ACCESSIBILITY

Gender Discrimination-Free Environment

Andhra Pradesh fared better with the highest mean value (M=15.87) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=14.99). In comparison, in private schools, here again, Andhra Pradesh (M=15.84) has better gender discrimination-free environment followed by Tamil Nadu (M=15.43). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, ($P=0$).

Disability Discrimination-Free Environment

Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=8.68) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=6.04). In comparison, with regard to disability-based discrimination-free environments in private schools, here again, Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=5.95) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=4.47). A statistical ANOVA test done separately for government and private schools show that there is a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

Distance To School

Telangana fared better with the highest accessibility i.e. distance to school (M=6.04), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=5.84). In comparison, with respect to distance from home to private schools, Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=5.80) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=5.52). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

ACCEPTABILITY

Quality Of Education

Andhra Pradesh reported better quality with the highest mean value ($M=61.37$), followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=60.08$). In comparison, with respect to the quality of education in private schools, here again, Andhra Pradesh reported better quality of education with the mean value ($M=62.16$) followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=60.93$). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

Relevance Of Education

Tamil Nadu reported better relevance of education with the highest mean value ($M=38.0$), followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=37.47$). In comparison, with respect to the relevance of education in private schools, Tamil Nadu reported better with the mean value ($M=39.12$) followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=38.02$). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

ADAPTABILITY

Online & Digital Mode of Education

Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the highest mean value ($M=4.42$), followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=4.33$). In comparison, with respect to the adaptability of the online mode of education in private schools, Kerala reported better adaptability with the mean value ($M=4.58$) followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=4.39$). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

Skill Development

Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the highest mean value ($M=1.51$), followed by Kerala ($M=1.25$). In comparison, with respect to adaptability to skill development-based education in private schools, here again, Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the mean value ($M=1.55$) followed by Kerala ($M=1.28$). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

Gender Equality

Telangana reported better adaptability to gender equality with the highest mean value ($M=5.92$), followed by Kerala ($M=5.47$). In comparison, in terms of gender equality in private schools, here again, Telangana reported better adaptability with the mean value ($M=5.96$) followed by Kerala

(M=5.73). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

RIGHT TO EDUCATION

Telangana reported better enforcement of RTE with the highest mean value (M=7.78), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=6.52). In comparison, with respect to enforcement of RTE in private schools, here again, Telangana reported better enforcement (M=7.87) followed by Kerala (M=7.07). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools, shows a significant statistical difference, $P=0$.

In Andhra Pradesh, poor knowledge was widely seen among the respondents, irrespective of government or private institute, about the provisions under the act and whether or not the act was being implemented in their school. Unison was noted among all the respondents in favour of imparting RTE act. However, we could see that the goal of the act (compulsory education up to 14 years of age) was achieved as all the respondents stood in agreement. In Tamil Nadu, the need for the upgradation of the RTE Act, 2009 to foster the education system to equip the students to face the future is expressed.

GIRL CHILD EDUCATION

The question of whether we are **moving from equality to equity** comes in as a good number of respondents raised the need for special focus for girls if not at least equal focus for boys and girls. In the Government school of Bhoopapally district, special initiatives are in place for the nutritional needs of a girl child. Likewise, a private school in Kothagudem offer fee concession for girl students.

Well-striving education institutes, both private and government are seen around the three aspirational districts of Andhra Pradesh. One major reason for the improvement in girl child education is attributed to the English medium of education upgraded in government schools serving the immediate need for good communication and language skills. We even witness caste and gender-segregated schools which indefinitely attract the parents if they seek a sense of belonging and feeling of security for their girl child (Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) scheme)

On the whole, we see both strengths and shortcomings in Government and Private schools. Nevertheless, tremendous strides have been made in recent years by the state government to bridge the gap that existed previously between private and government schools with respect to infrastructure, upgradation of the education system and inclusive education.

GROSS ENROLMENT RATIO

GER remains on the rise and is attributed to the home visits carried out by the school, dropout rates continue to be a concern. It is widely accepted that poverty, **distance from school, and parents' attitudes towards their children's education** are major determinants of whether or not children stay in school. Apart from this, it should be noted here, that the dropout rate is the highest among girl students because, in certain tribal communities, the girls are married off at a very young age as they are perceived to be a burden to their families. This **cultural hindrance** though low continues to be still prevalent. Similarly, another issue that plagues these tribal areas is **drug and alcohol abuse among both the parents**, acting as de-motivators, distractions and discouragement for the child. These ancient factors for dropout continue to remain the reasons for dropouts in Wayanad, Kerala.

In Tamil Nadu, Virudhunagar district bagged the first ranking in Niti Aayog but still conceals dark realities of gender inequality. The DEO, Virudhunagar stated '*The girls' ratio of enrolment is lesser than the boys*'. **Poverty, backwardness, child marriage, caring for siblings, child labour to meet household needs and migration** are reasons recorded by the respondents of both private and Government schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation to the Ministry of Education

1. Increase the availability of high schools and higher secondary schools in aspirational districts.
2. Improve transportation facilities for government schools in aspirational districts.
3. Review and ensure mandates on school building infrastructure are followed
4. Promote disability inclusion in schools by improving disabled-friendly infrastructure.
5. Train teachers to effectively use teaching-learning materials for better student engagement.
6. Promote online mode of education and improve infrastructure to support online learning.
7. Ensure 21st-century skill development (especially in STEM) is included in the school curriculum.
8. Review teaching methodologies and assessment frameworks implementation under the RTE Act.

Recommendation to the Ministry of Women & Child Development

1. Improve sanitation facilities in schools by ensuring more usable toilets, especially for girls.
2. Create awareness of bullying among students, teachers, and parents; ensure a grievance policy is in place to handle bullying in schools.
3. Promote and implement peer mentoring in schools to improve students' emotional and school well-being.

4. Develop and promote extracurricular activities and clubs that empower girls and build their leadership skills.

Recommendation to the State Education Department

1. Monitor and review the 25% free seat allocation in private schools to students from low-income families under the RTE Act.
2. Create awareness among students and parents on the Right To Education Act and its provisions.
3. Implement gender-sensitive teacher training programs to address gender biases and stereotypes in the classroom.
4. Encourage community-based initiatives to address cultural and social barriers to girl child education.
5. Establish and promote scholarship programs for girls, especially in STEM fields, to encourage higher education and career opportunities.

Recommendation to the National Human Rights Commission

1. Advocate for the inclusion of human rights education in the school curriculum to foster a culture of respect and understanding.
2. Monitor the implementation of RTE Act provisions and ensure that the rights of girl children are protected and promoted.
3. Encourage research and data collection on the status of girl child education in India to inform policy-making and track progress.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study reveals both strengths and shortcomings in government and private schools and sheds light on the current state of education in Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu. While there have been commendable efforts to enhance infrastructure and promote inclusive education, challenges such as high dropout rates, gender inequality, and cultural barriers persist. The findings emphasize the need for targeted interventions to address these issues and further improve the education system. By focusing on reducing dropout rates, promoting gender equality, and addressing cultural hindrances, these states can create a more inclusive and equitable learning environment for all students. Continued collaboration between government and private institutions, along with strategic policy measures, will be vital in driving positive change and ensuring quality education for every child.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Ensuring that all girls and young women receive a quality education is their human right. Every child has the right to free and compulsory education, as stated in the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009, and it is consequently mandatory for children aged six to fourteen to attend school. The government started the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA, Universal Elementary Education) programme, which aims to reduce dropout rates and increase enrolment. The quality of education delivered in India is quite low, particularly at the basic and secondary levels. (Govindaraju, 2010).“For education to be a meaningful right it must be available, accessible, acceptable and adaptable”. Developed by the former UN Distinct Rapporteur on the Right to Education, Katarina Tomasevski (2004), the 4As is very useful in clarifying the right to education and assessing the perceptible factors. The 4-A framework appears to be the best approach to define state commitments pertaining to the right to education, hence indicators based on it are the most directly associated with international human rights law. In this study, the 4As framework will be taken up in assessing the educational status of Girl children in Aspirational Districts of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala. The Aspirational Districts' programme aims to quickly and effectively transform the most under-developed districts across the country. The districts are encouraged to develop and replicate best practices that drive improvement across the 5 broad socio-economic themes - Health & Nutrition, Education, Agriculture & Water Resources, Financial Inclusion & Skill Development and Infrastructure.

1.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The right to education (RTE) is a fundamental right enshrined in the Constitution of India under Article 21A, which guarantees free and compulsory education to children aged 6 to 14 years. RTE has been recognized by the United Nations, and it is essential for the development and empowerment of individuals and societies. The right to education ensures that every child, regardless of their gender, socioeconomic background, or any other characteristic, has access to quality education. Over the years, there have been many studies and articles on the state of education in India, its implementation, and its impact on society.

One of the most notable studies is the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER), which is published by the non-profit organization, Pratham. The ASER report has been providing data on the status of education in India since 2005 and has become a valuable tool for policymakers, researchers, and

educators. According to the 2019 ASER report¹, there has been a significant improvement in enrollment rates and learning outcomes in primary education, but there is still a long way to go to achieve universal access and quality education for all.

Another important study is the Report of the High-Level Group on Education for All, which was commissioned by the Government of India in 2011². The report highlights the challenges faced by the education sector in India, including inadequate infrastructure, poor quality of teaching, and a lack of access to education for disadvantaged groups. It also provides recommendations for improving the education system, such as increasing public spending on education, improving teacher training, and promoting inclusive education.

In many parts of the world, girls face significant barriers to accessing education. These barriers include poverty, cultural norms and traditions, discrimination, and lack of infrastructure and resources³. Despite progress in recent years, millions of girls still do not have access to quality education, particularly in developing countries. Girls in India are still subject to gender-based discrimination, particularly in rural and low-income households, and this limits their access to education. In addition, there are many cultural and social factors that limit girls' access to educational opportunities, including early marriage, lack of access to transportation, and gender-based violence.

Therefore there is a strong need to examine the quality of education using a framework that covers all the required aspects. Hence the following study has adapted to examine the right to education in a 4-A framework lens.

The 4A framework of education is a model developed by UNESCO that emphasizes four key components of quality education. The framework stands for Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Adaptability. These components are interdependent and essential for providing inclusive and equitable education to all learners⁴.

The first component, Availability, refers to the physical availability of education infrastructure such as schools, classrooms, and learning resources. This includes ensuring that there are enough schools and

¹ Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) 2019, Pratham, https://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/ASER%20Reports/ASER%202019/ASER_2019.pdf

² Report of the High-Level Group on Education for All, Government of India, 2011, https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/EFA%20REPORT.pdf

³ Barriers to Education in India," India Today, 2020, <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/featurephilia/story/barriers-to-education-in-india-1684208-2020-06-18>

⁴ UNESCO Bangkok. (2017). A framework for quality education. Retrieved from <https://bangkok.unesco.org/content/framework-quality-education>

classrooms for all learners, that they are equipped with basic amenities such as clean water and toilets, and that there are adequate learning resources such as textbooks and other teaching materials.

The second component, Accessibility, refers to ensuring that all learners have equal access to education regardless of their background, gender, socio-economic status, or any other characteristic. This includes providing transportation to schools, ensuring that schools are located in accessible locations, and providing support for learners with disabilities.

The third component, Acceptability, refers to ensuring that education is culturally and linguistically appropriate for all learners. This includes recognizing and respecting cultural and linguistic diversity, providing education in the learner's mother tongue when possible, and ensuring that the curriculum and teaching materials are inclusive and relevant to the learners' context.

The fourth component, Adaptability, refers to ensuring that education is flexible and responsive to the changing needs of learners and society. This includes adapting to new technologies and teaching methods, responding to changing economic and social needs, and providing lifelong learning opportunities for all.

The 4A framework provides a useful tool for policymakers, educators, and other stakeholders to evaluate and improve the quality of education. By considering each of these components, it is possible to identify gaps and challenges in the education system and to develop strategies to address them.

Alongside the policies like Right To Education, the government has also started the aspirational district program bringing in special attention to the backward districts in the states. The Aspirational Districts Program is a government initiative aimed at transforming underdeveloped regions in India into dynamic and self-sustaining districts. The program was launched by the Government of India in January 2018 with the objective of improving the socio-economic indicators of 112 districts across the country. Of these, 9 districts are located in the southern states of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, and Kerala⁵. The program is being implemented in collaboration with the state governments, district administrations, and various stakeholders, including civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations, and private sector partners. The focus is on improving the key development indicators of the districts in areas such as health, education, agriculture, and infrastructure.

⁵ The Hindu. (2022). Aspirational Districts Programme yielding positive results: PM. Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/aspirational-districts-programme-yielding-positive-results-pm/article38162025.ece>

At this junction where a range of initiatives were taken by the central and state governments to improve education availability, accessibility and quality across the country, the current study was focused on examining Right to Education (RTE) especially for girls using 4-A framework in the aspirational districts of South Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana Tamil Nadu and Kerala. This research is strategically important to analyze the educational status of girl students in private and public schools. It serves as a baseline for designing interventions and measuring the progress of the implementation of the amended constitutional procedures to eliminate the worst forms of discrimination on girl child access to education. This research acts as an indicator to analyze the girl children's education as a policy issue (Education Policy Issues) within the border context of India. Specifically, this information will help to identify the constitutional safeguards available and accessible to the socio-political development of girl children. Both individuals and countries benefit from girls' education. Better educated women tend to be more informed about nutrition and healthcare, have fewer children, marry at a later age, and their children are usually healthier, should they choose to become mothers. They are more likely to participate in the formal labor market and earn higher incomes. All these factors combined can help lift households, communities, and countries out of poverty.

1.3 ASPIRATIONAL DISTRICTS

The Aspirational Districts Programme (ADP) is an initiative by the Government of India implemented by NITI Aayog with the help of various stakeholders to improve the living standards of people in 112 aspirational districts across India . The programme aims to transform these districts by focusing on six key sectors: health and nutrition, education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development, basic infrastructure, and institutional development . The programme follows a 3C approach of competition, convergence and collaboration among districts, central and state governments, civil society organizations, private sector partners and other development agencies . The programme relies on data-driven governance to monitor progress and rank districts based on their performance on key indicators . The programme has been lauded by various national and international agencies for creating significant improvements in health, nutrition and education outcomes since its inception in 2018 .

Andhra Pradesh has three aspirational districts: Kadapa, Visakhapatnam and Vizianagaram. These districts have been selected based on a composite index of 49 indicators across the five sectors. The ADP aims to provide a platform for convergence of various central and state schemes, facilitate

collaboration among different stakeholders, monitor progress through real-time data, and incentivize performance through awards and recognition. The aspirational districts of Andhra Pradesh have shown significant improvement in various sectors since the launch of the ADP. For instance, Kadapa district has improved its ranking from 108th to 29th among all aspirational districts in terms of health and nutrition outcomes. Similarly, Visakhapatnam district has improved its ranking from 111th to 54th in terms of education outcomes. Vizianagaram district has also made notable progress in terms of agriculture and water resources management.

Tamil Nadu is participating in the ADP with two of its districts: Ramanathapuram and Virudhunagar. These districts were selected based on a composite index of deprivation using socio-economic census data. The state government has appointed nodal officers for each district to coordinate with the central government and other stakeholders. The districts have also formed committees at various levels to monitor and implement the programme activities.

Telangana, out of its 33 districts, three have been identified as aspirational districts: Asifabad (also known as Kumuram Bheem), Jayashankar Bhupalapally (also known as Bhoopalapally), and Bhadradri-Kothagudem. These districts have been chosen based on their low performance in various indicators such as literacy rate, infant mortality rate, maternal mortality rate, access to electricity, sanitation facilities, etc. Asifabad district has improved its performance in health indicators such as institutional deliveries, immunization coverage and antenatal care. The ADP has also helped in enhancing agricultural productivity, promoting digital literacy, improving road connectivity and creating livelihood opportunities for the people of these districts.

Kerala has selected Wayanad for the aspirational district program. Wayanad is a hilly district in north Kerala that is known for its rich biodiversity, scenic beauty, and tribal population. However, it also faces several challenges such as high infant mortality rate, low literacy rate, poor road connectivity, and human-animal conflicts. Under the ADP, Wayanad has made significant progress in various indicators such as institutional deliveries, immunization coverage, bank accounts opened, rural households electrified, and skill training imparted.

The central government has assigned a joint secretary-level officer as a nodal officer for each aspirational district. The nodal officer is responsible for coordinating with the state government, district administration, and other stakeholders to implement various schemes and interventions under the programme. The progress of each district is monitored through a dashboard that tracks 49 indicators across the five thematic areas.

The Aspirational Districts Programme aims to create a positive impact on the lives of millions of people living in these districts by improving their socio-economic conditions and enhancing their human development potential.

1.4 STATUS OF GIRL CHILD EDUCATION

The status of girl child education has been a subject of concern globally. Over the years, many scholars have conducted research on this topic to highlight the challenges faced by girls in accessing education and to suggest solutions to improve their status. In many developing countries, girls face several challenges in accessing education. These challenges include poverty, cultural and social norms, early marriage, and discrimination. According to UNESCO estimates, around the world, 129 million girls are out of school, including 32 million of primary school age, and 97 million of secondary school age. Girls face barriers to education caused by poverty, cultural norms and practices, poor infrastructure, violence and fragility. These barriers are more severe in countries affected by conflict, where girls are more than twice as likely to be out of school than boys (UNESCO, 2020)⁶.

Poverty is one of the primary barriers to education for girls. In many developing countries, families struggle to provide for their basic needs, and education is often not seen as a priority. Girls may be required to work at home or to earn money for the family, which makes it difficult for them to attend school. Studies have shown that girls from poor families are less likely to attend school than boys from similar backgrounds (World Bank, 2020)⁷.

Cultural and social norms also play a significant role in determining whether girls can access education. In many societies, girls are expected to stay at home and take care of their families, while boys are encouraged to go to school. Early marriage is another challenge that prevents girls from completing their education. In many cultures, girls are married off at a young age, often before they reach puberty, which makes it impossible for them to continue their studies. Discrimination is another barrier to girl child education. Girls may face discrimination based on their gender, ethnicity, or social status. They may be denied access to education because of their gender, or they may be discriminated against once they are in school.

⁶ UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/>

⁷ World Bank. (2020). Poverty and Shared Prosperity. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-poverty-education-and-g>

1.5 NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF GIRL CHILD EDUCATION

At least 1.6 million girls in India remain out of school (Bhandary, 2018). A report by NCPCR (2018) suggests that 39.4% of girls between 15-18 years of age are out of school. 57% of girls drop out upon reaching the 11th grade (Kaushik, 2018). There is also a significant gender gap in accessing private schools: More girls are attending government schools at the elementary level (75% at primary level and 77.3% at the upper primary level) and 19.2 % of total girls are attending private school at the primary level and 15.6 at the upper primary level which remains almost the same at the secondary and higher secondary level) (Unified District Information System for Education, 2017). 54% of schools have functional WASH facilities (Toilet, Drinking Water and Handwashing facilities). In India, more girls (3.2%) are out of school than boys (2.7%) even today in the cohort of children below 15 years of age (Unified District Information System for Education, 2018).

According to a report by the NITI Aayog, the percentage of girls who complete secondary education in aspirational districts is significantly lower than the national average⁸. In 2019-20, the national average for girls completing secondary education was 81.32%, while in aspirational districts, it was only 71.32%. The report also highlights that the dropout rate for girls in these districts is higher than boys, with poverty, social norms, and lack of access to schools and transportation being major factors.

One of the initiatives aimed at addressing this issue is the Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao (Save the Daughter, Educate the Daughter) program, launched by the Indian government in 2015. The program aims to improve the status of girls in Indian society and promote their education, as well as increase awareness about gender discrimination and violence against women. However, the program has faced criticism for its slow implementation and lack of significant impact in improving girl child education in aspirational districts.

Another initiative is the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA)⁹, a program launched by the Indian government in 2018 to provide universal access to quality education, with a focus on girls and children from marginalized communities. The SSA has been implemented in aspirational districts and has shown some positive results in improving access to education and reducing dropout rates among girls. However, challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, lack of trained teachers, and social barriers continue to impede progress.

⁸ NITI Aayog. (2021). Aspirational Districts Dashboard 2020-21. Retrieved from https://niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2021-07/Aspirational_Districts_Dashboard_2020-21_0.pdf

⁹ Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2018). Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan. Retrieved from <https://samagra.mhrd.gov.in/>

Research shows that the status of girl child education varies significantly between countries, with some countries achieving high levels of gender parity in education, while others lag behind. A recent World Bank study (2022) estimates that the limited educational opportunities for girls, and barriers to completing 12 years of education, cost countries between US\$15 trillion and \$30 trillion in lost lifetime productivity and earnings. Lee (2002) identified four primary elements as being connected to equity in education in developing nations in Asia in his outstanding analysis: (a) gender-related equity; (b) income-related equity; (c) region-related equity; and (d) sociocultural-related equity. Girls and women, those living in poverty, those in slum regions in urban areas or distant or isolated portions of a nation, and ethnic, racial, and religious minority groups are among those who receive the least education (or no education at all). In Ethiopia, girls are sometimes abducted for marriage when they are no more than eight years. In West Africa, they are recruited from poor rural families to work as domestic servants in coastal cities or even neighboring countries. In Nigeria, it is not very difficult to find a house to help, mostly girls, in virtually every household (Togunde and Carter 2006; Alabi and Alabi 2012). In South Africa, a report by Human Rights Watch (2008) warns that sexual violence and abuse are hampering girls' access to education. In Afghanistan, girls are simply been barred from school under the Taliban regime

In many high-income countries, such as the United States, Canada, and most of Western Europe, girls have achieved near parity with boys in terms of access to education, enrollment rates, and educational attainment¹⁰. However, there are still some disparities in certain subjects and levels of education, such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields and higher education.

In low- and middle-income countries, the situation is more complex. While progress has been made in recent decades, there are still significant disparities in access to education for girls, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. According to UNESCO¹¹, in sub-Saharan Africa, only 68% of girls complete primary school, and only 8% complete secondary school. In South Asia, only 66% of girls complete primary school, and only 32% complete secondary school.

These disparities are often driven by a range of factors, including poverty, cultural norms and practices, child marriage, gender-based violence, conflict, and inadequate infrastructure and

¹⁰ "Gender Parity and Inequality in Education: A Review of the Literature" by Yasmine Belkaid and Elizabeth King: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042816301748>

¹¹ "Education for All and Gender Equality: Progress and Challenges" by UNESCO: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000254209>

resources¹². Girls in rural areas are often the most disadvantaged, facing additional barriers such as a lack of transportation, inadequate sanitation facilities, and unsafe school environments.

Despite these challenges, there are examples of successful initiatives to improve girl child education in low- and middle-income countries. Internationally, there have been notable successes in increasing access to education for girls, particularly at the primary level, and in improving gender parity in education. Initiatives such as the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI)¹³ and the Malala Fund¹⁴ have been working to promote girls' education globally and have contributed to some of the progress made in recent years. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated existing inequalities and disrupted education for many girls, particularly those in low-income countries.

¹² "Gender Equality and Education: An Overview of the Evidence on the Relationship between Gender Equality in Education and Economic Growth" by the Brookings Institution:
<https://www.brookings.edu/research/gender-equality-and-education-an-overview-of-the-evidence-on-the-relationship-between-gender-equality-in-education-and-economic-growth/>

¹³ United Nations Girls' Education Initiative. (n.d.). About UNGEI. Retrieved from
<https://www.ungei.org/about-ungei>

¹⁴ Malala Fund. (n.d.). Our work. Retrieved from <https://malala.org/our-work>

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 RESEARCH DESIGN & OBJECTIVES

Main Objectives of the Study

- To analyse the resource availability for the education of girl children in terms of availability of schools, safe infrastructure, academic resources, transport and sanitation facilities.
- To identify the measures taken to increase the accessibility of girl child education by providing discrimination free environment, inclusive education, nutritious meal and the distance to school.
- To study the extent of acceptability of education among girl children through the quality and relevance of education.
- To investigate the adaptability of the existing educational system of girl children by taking into consideration the changing needs of the society and gender equality.
- To examine how far the provisions in the Right To Education Act is implemented and assessed in these schools and how it influences the rights and educational status of girl students in the Aspirational Districts
- To identify gaps in policies and their implementation, and to come out with actionable recommendations on the existing education policies for promotion of right to girl child education.

Overall Research Design

The research design will primarily be Descriptive as it describes the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the 9 Aspirational Districts of 4 South Indian states (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala) by comparing the Government and Private schools.

As the research is to compare the schools in different districts and different states, a mixed research design has been adapted. While one part of the research design focuses on collecting opinions from the students using a quantitative approach, the other part of the study focuses on getting opinions from the officials, principals and teachers through a qualitative approach that in turn validates and expands on the quantitative data.

A QUAN – qual mixed method will be used owing to the nature of the study. In the mixed method, **Sequential Explanatory Strategy** will be used.

- The Sequential Explanatory Strategy is the most straightforward of the major mixed methods approaches. It is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The priority is typically given to the collection and analysis of quantitative data, and the two methods are integrated during the interpretation phase of the study (Creswell, 2003)

- The implementation of QUAN - qual will be a two-phase study. The researcher will present the results in two phases, First - the quantitative results displaying and discussing based on statistical analysis using SPSS.
- Secondly, the FGDs and KIIs will be presented in terms of themes and sub-themes (Thematic analysis) supported by quotations and axial classification
- The integration of the quantitative results and qualitative findings will occur in the final discussion, in which the researcher will highlight the quantitative results and the complexities that will surface from the qualitative research

Quantitative study design

The study is to examine the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in government and private schools located in 3 states and 9 districts. Hence the quantitative, cross sectional comparative research design has been adapted. Cross-sectional comparative studies are often used in social sciences and public health research to compare the prevalence of a particular health condition, behavior, or risk factor among different groups or populations. A cross-sectional comparative study is a type of comparative research design that involves collecting data from different groups or populations at a single point in time. This type of study is used to compare the characteristics or outcomes of different groups or populations and to identify any significant differences or similarities. In context to the current study, 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education is studied between two different groups of students i.e. one group of students from government school and other groups of students from private schools.

Qualitative study design

The focus of the qualitative study is to gather the perspective and knowledge of the key respondents on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education. A phenomenological qualitative design has been adapted to explore the lived experiences of individuals and how they perceive and make sense of 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education. The phenomenological qualitative design involves collecting in-depth data through methods such as interviews, focus groups, and observations. The data collected is then analyzed to identify the common themes and patterns that emerge across participants' experiences. This type of study design focuses on the lived experiences of participants, this design can provide valuable insights into how individuals understand and interpret their world, which can be useful for developing interventions that are more responsive to the needs of the population.

2.2 FIELD OF STUDY

The selected field of study is 9 aspirational districts in south Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, and Kerala.

- Andhra Pradesh has three aspirational districts: Kadapa, Visakhapatnam and Vizianagaram.
- Tamil Nadu has two aspirational districts: Ramanathapuram and Virudhunagar.
- Telangana has three aspirational districts: Asifabad (also known as Kumuram Bheem), Jayashankar Bhupalapally (also known as Bhoopalapally), and Bhadrachalam-Kothagudem

2.3 SAMPLING METHOD AND DISTRIBUTION

Multi-stage sampling technique will be used in this study. Multi-stage sampling is a commonly used sampling method in survey research where a large population is sampled by selecting units in stages. In this method, the population is first divided into smaller groups or clusters, and then a sample of these clusters is selected. Within each selected cluster, a smaller sample is then selected to participate in the study. Multi-stage sampling can be more efficient and cost-effective than other sampling methods such as simple random sampling, especially when the population is large and dispersed. It can also provide a more representative sample, as it allows for a more diverse selection of units and increases the likelihood of including hard-to-reach populations.

Stage 1	Four states are selected in South India (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala) (Target States were given by the NHRC)
Stage 2	Selection of 9 Aspirational Districts (3 Aspirational Districts from Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, 2 Aspirational Districts from Tamil and 1 Aspirational District from Kerala)
Stage 3	Selection of Taluks from each Aspirational District
Stage 4	Selection of Government and Private Schools from each Taluk
Stage 5	Selection of Respondents from each school using a simple random lottery method.

An Overview of Sampling Technique for both Quantitative and Qualitative phase

State	Name of the Aspirational Districts	Quantitative Phase			Qualitative Phase	
					FGD	KII
Andhra Pradesh	Visakhapatnam	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
	Vizianagaram	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
	YSR	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
Telangana	Asifabad	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
	Bhoopalapally	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
	Bhadradri-Kothagudem	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
TamilNadu	Ramanathapuram	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
	Virudhunagar	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
Kerala	Wayanad	120 Respondents	Govt. Schools	60	1	1
			Private Schools	60	1	1
Total	9 Aspirational Districts	1080 Respondents	18 FGDs	18 KIIs		

2.4 TOOLS OF DATA COLLECTION

Quantitative: Interview schedule

Questionnaire / Interview schedule

To gather the quantitative data from the students, we have designed a questionnaire. Questionnaires are a popular and effective quantitative data collection tool that can be used in research, surveys, and evaluations. They typically consist of a set of standardized questions that are administered to a sample of respondents.

Aligning to the objectives of the study, the questionnaire has been divided into 7 sections:

- **Student Profile:** This included a standard set of questions that helped to gauge the background of the student like gender, class, caste, religion, family constellation, etc.
- **School Profile:** This included a standard set of questions to understand the background of the schools including years of functioning, administration type, student strength, teachers strength and teacher:students ratio.
- **Availability:** This section of the questionnaire consisted of questions on infrastructure and facilities available at the school. The section is focused to understand safe infrastructure, academic resources, transportation facilities, sanitation facilities.
- **Accessibility:** This section consisted of questions on accessibility of school in terms of distance, accessibility based on gender, caste, religion and disability
- **Acceptability:** This section consisted of questions on acceptability of school, friends, teachers and education provided at school.
- **Adaptability:** This section has questions to understand the opinions of girl students on adaptability of school to online mode of education, gender equality, and skill development
- **Right To Education (RTE):** This section has questions to gauge the awareness of students on the right to education.

The data collection field person has administered the questionnaire. The data collectors have read the questions to the students and filled in the responses that were provided by the students. We have preferred to get the questionnaire as an interview schedule rather than as a survey so that if the student have any clarification in responding to the questions can be clarified and also the data collectors made relevant notes from the discussion with the students which were later helped to pick up the qualitative data collection.

Qualitative: Interview Guide and Focus Group Discussion Guide

Interview Guide

To gather data from officials, principals and teachers who are identified as key informants for the study and hence an key informant interview guide has been selected as a tool for data collection. A key informant interview guide is a tool used in qualitative research to guide a conversation with a person who has specialized knowledge or expertise related to the research topic.

Key informants are individuals who have first-hand experience or knowledge of a particular issue, population, or community that is relevant to the research question. To ensure that key informants are at the same level in both the types of schools, in the government schools - we focused on talking to the DEO or MEO/BEOs or principals who are government officials and with regard to private schools we reached to the regional manager, chairman, and principals.

The interview guide is structured in such a way to address the 4As framework, the questions were around the availability, accessibility, adaptability and acceptability. It is also designed to understand the perspectives of the key informants on various government policies both local and state.

Focus Group Discussion Guide

Similarly, to gather information from teachers, school management committee members - a focus group discussion guide has been designed. A focus group discussion guide is a tool used in qualitative research to guide a group discussion about a specific topic or issue. Focus groups typically involve a small group of participants who are selected based on their shared characteristics, such as age, gender, occupation, or experience with a particular product or service.

In the current study, the following were considered as eligible to be FGD respondents.

- A school teacher
- A school management committee member (Local leader)
- A school management committee members (Parent)

The FGD guide is also structured to understand the 4As framework in the schools, the questions were designed to understand - what is made available to promote girl child education, how accessible education is to the girls, how adaptable and acceptable is the education. The FGD also focused on the state level policies and their contribution to girl child education.

2.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is broadly done at 3 levels as below:

1. Comparison of government schools vs private school within district: In each district we compared government schools to private schools for different variables under the 4-A framework and indicated if statistically there is a difference on the specific aspect or not.
2. Comparison between the districts in the state: Within each state, we compared how the districts are doing. At this level of analysis, we compared the government schools to government schools among the districts and private schools to private schools among the districts. We used the same 4-A framework to compare the districts and at this level we tried to present if statistically there is a difference between the districts.
3. Comparison of states: Using the same 4-A framework, we compared the 4 states with each other and indicated if statistically there is a difference between the states.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Depending on the type of the comparison, we have used the relevant statistical test to see the significant difference between the groups i.e. government schools vs private schools, district vs district and state vs state.

Before even going into the statistical test, we have done the basic descriptive statistics. We have generated the frequency tables for all the quantitative data variables to understand the distribution of the sample. For the likert based questions, we have calculated the score to understand the level of agreement on a specific statement and group of statements related to a theme like gender, caste, etc.

Followed by the basic statistics, we have majorly two statistical test to compare the groups. We have used T-Test to compare two independent groups and we have used Anova test to compare three groups.

TTest

T-test is a statistical analysis tool that is used to compare two groups of data, usually with a small sample size. It helps to determine if there is a significant difference between the two groups, based on the mean of the data. The test is based on the t-distribution, which is used to estimate the population mean of a sample when the population standard deviation is not known. There are two types of t-tests: the independent t-test and the paired t-test. The independent t-test is used when the two groups being compared are independent of each other, while the paired t-test is used when the two groups are dependent on each other. The t-test is a powerful tool for data analysis because it allows researchers to determine if the results of their study are

statistically significant. This means that they can determine if the results are due to chance or if they are actually meaningful. To perform a t-test, the researcher needs to calculate the t-value and the degrees of freedom. The t-value is calculated by subtracting the mean of one group from the mean of the other group and dividing by the standard error of the difference. The degrees of freedom are calculated by subtracting one from the total number of observations in the sample. The p-value represents the probability of obtaining the observed results by chance. If the p-value is less than 0.05, the results are considered statistically significant, which means that there is a significant difference between the two groups being compared.

For the data analysis, we have majorly used t-test to compare the government school group vs private school group. In each district to understand if the government school and the private school have differences or not, we have used the t-test. Based on the p-value we have understood the areas and variables that are significantly different between these independent groups - government school and private schools.

Anova Test

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is a statistical analysis tool that is used to compare the means of three or more groups of data. The ANOVA test works by dividing the total variability in the data into two components: the variance between groups and the variance within groups. The variance between groups represents the difference in means between the groups being compared, while the variance within groups represents the variation of scores within each group. ANOVA compares the ratio of the between-group variance to the within-group variance, and if this ratio is large enough, it indicates that there is a significant difference between the means of the groups being compared.

To perform an ANOVA test, the researcher needs to calculate the F-value and the degrees of freedom. The F-value is calculated by dividing the variance between groups by the variance within groups. The degrees of freedom are calculated based on the number of groups being compared and the sample size of each group. Once the F-value and degrees of freedom are calculated, the researcher can use an F-table or statistical software to determine the p-value. If the p-value is less than 0.05, the results are considered statistically significant, which means that there is a significant difference between the means of the groups being compared.

To compare the districts within the states, especially for Andhra Pradesh and Telangana where three districts are to be compared, we have used the Anova test. However, when comparing the districts we compared government schools to government schools among districts and similarly private schools to private schools

among the districts. We have followed this approach as we have already compared government schools vs private schools at each district level analysis.

Qualitative Data Analysis

To analyze the qualitative data that has been collected through focus group discussions and key informant interviews, we have used thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a qualitative research method used to analyze data by identifying patterns or themes in the data. Thematic analysis allows researchers to identify patterns and themes in the data that might not be apparent through other methods. It is also useful for exploring complex or sensitive topics where quantitative analysis may not be appropriate.

Thematic analysis typically involves several steps, including familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing a report. In the first step, the researcher reads and rereads the data to become familiar with it. In the second step, the researcher identifies and labels important information in the data, known as codes. These codes can be descriptive, interpretive, or evaluative, and they capture the essence of the data.

In the next step, the researcher searches for themes by organizing the codes into categories based on similarities and differences. The themes that emerge are then reviewed and refined in the next step, where the researcher checks that each theme accurately reflects the data. The themes are then defined and named, and the data is organized into a report that presents the findings.

2.6 LIMITATIONS

Though the study is a comparison of government and private schools, we have limited the level of comparison done in the study. As explained above, at a district level, we compared the private and government schools and at a state level, we compared government schools among the districts and private schools among the districts. All the t-tests done are two-tailed t-tests which only indicates if there has been a significant difference between the groups but doesn't indicate the direction of the difference. That means, the statistical study findings will indicate if there has been significant difference between the government and private schools, between districts and between states. The study doesn't generalize which schools are doing better or which districts are doing better. We didn't take this approach as the size of the sample is not statistical to generalize for the universe. However, for a specific study population, using the mean scores we can indicate who is doing better with the sample but not to the universe.

The study also limited the review of the girl child education using the 4-A framework and hence a lot of state level policy comparisons has not been done. Even in terms of understanding RTE, the study is limited to gauge the awareness of the students on various aspects of RTE only and has not assessed the implementation of RTE at school in detail.

We also see a potential to examine the quality of education at the state level using the 4-A framework. If we expand the study to a larger population in the district and state, we can analyze the quality of education and its impact in a more detailed way through the 4-A framework. This study has been the first of its kind in reviewing the status of girl child education through the 4-A framework using the sequential explanatory method where the outcome of the quantitative studies determines the direction of qualitative study.

CHAPTER III

ANDHRA PRADESH DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

3.1 VISAKHAPATNAM

3.2 VIZINAGARAM

3.3 YSR (KADAPA)

3.1 VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT

3.1.1 AVAILABILITY

3.1.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	41	19	45	15
	%	34.2	15.8	37.5	12.5
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	32	28	29	31
	%	26.7	23.3	24.2	25.8

Majority of the students reported that the schools are present in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 71.7% (i.e. 34.2% of the students in government and 37.5% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 51% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat. 49% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M=2.78$) compared to private schools ($M=2.77$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p = 0.916$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	15.47	11.55	0	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	12.67	14.50	0.028	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	22.55	22.13	0.331	No
Extra curricular infrastructure	7.57	5.98	0	Yes
Disable friendly infrastructure	4.78	2.87	0	Yes
Average	12.61	11.41		
In Visakhapatnam district, safe infrastructure is better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the classroom infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to safe infrastructure.				

3.1.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	15	12.5	45	37.5	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0
Electricity	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	11	9.2	49	40.8	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	3	5.0	57	95.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

48.3% of the students studying in government schools reported that the safe building standard is good while only 37.5% of the students studying in private school reported as good and 12.5% of the private school students reported that building condition is poor. Among all the different aspects of school building infrastructure, on an average 57.17 (95%) out of 60 children in government school have reported that the school building infrastructure is good. In comparison, on an average 42 (70%) out of 60 children in private schools have reported that school building infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better school building infrastructure (M=15.47) compared to private schools (M=11.55). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to the school building infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

This shows that building infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to take measures to improve their school building standards, especially around making them feel safe with proper flooring and proper roofing.

3.1.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
School Zone Sign Board on the Road	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0

With regard to safety related infrastructure, the government school didn't have CCTVs while all the private schools have CCTVs. Apart from the CCTVs, on the rest of the aspects of the safely related infrastructure government schools reported high. On properly laid roads in the school, 47.5% of the students in government schools reported good compared to 43.3% of the students in private schools reported good and 6.7% students in private schools reported poor while only 2.5% students in government schools reported poor. The government schools reported high on properly laid roads compared to private schools. We see a similar trend with respect to compound walls as well, the government schools have reported high on compound walls compared to private

schools. On an average 50.7 (84.5) out of 60 children in government schools reported good on the safety related infrastructure. In comparison, on an average 57.86 (96.43) out of 60 children in government schools reported good on the safety related infrastructure.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better safety related infrastructure (M=14.50) compared to government schools (M=12.67). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to the safety related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.028$, 95% confidence interval.

The data shows that private schools have better safety related infrastructure. Though the quality of infrastructure is reported lower, the private schools took efforts to have more safety related infrastructure than government schools.

3.1.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Blackboard	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Bench	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0
Fan	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Light	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0
Door	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Window	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	19	15.8	41	34.2	0	0
Ventilation	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0

With regard to classroom infrastructure, government schools reported good quality of blackboard, fan, light, ventilation at 47.5%, 49.2%, 49.2% and 50% respectively compared to private schools which reported at 41.7%, 43.3%, 42.5% and 44.2% respectively. Windows are reported to be poor by more students (15.8%) in private schools compared to 2.5% of the students in government schools. On an average 57.71 (96.19%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the classroom infrastructure is good. In comparison, 49.29 (82.14%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better classroom infrastructure (M=22.55) compared to private schools (M=22.13). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to the safety related infrastructure was statistically not significant, $p = 0.331$, 95% confidence interval.

For the given study population, the classroom infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. However statistically the data doesn't show any significant difference. Within the study population, the private schools need to improve on windows and ventilation of the classroom so that children have a better learning experience.

3.1.1.2.4 EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

Sports equipment are reported as good by 49.2% of students in government schools compared to 46.7% of the students in private schools. The extracurricular activities are reported similarly by both school students.

On an average 59.33 (98.89%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the classroom infrastructure is good. In comparison, 58.57 (97.78%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better extracurricular infrastructure ($M=7.57$) compared to private schools ($M=5.98$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extra curricular infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, government schools are good in extra curricular facilities compared to private schools. The private schools need to ensure that sports equipment is available for the students.

3.1.1.2.5 DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0

The private schools didn't report having ramps for the disabled students to move around the school. On the other hand almost all the government schools have ramps and handrails that are needed for the disabled students to move around easily.

On an average 59.67 (99.44%) out of 60 children in the government school reported their school is disabled friendly. In comparison, 17.33 (28.89%) out of 60 children in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are disabled friendly ($M=4.78$) compared to private schools ($M=2.87$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disabled friendly infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government schools are good with respect to disabled friendly infrastructure compared to private schools. The private schools need to build ramps and stairs with hand-rails so that the disabled students can navigate in the school. Schools with lack of disabled friendly infrastructure is one of the most reported reasons for why disabled students do not continue their education. Disability among girl children is seen as more challenging by the parents and teachers.

3.1.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	5.85	4.27	0	Yes
Supportive academic resources	1.15	.80	0.175	No
Freebies supporting academics	5.93	2.30	0	Yes
Teaching Staff	11.03	11.77	0.003	Yes
Extra Curricular Staff	3.50	4.55	0.001	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	12.25	3.93	0	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	4.70	0.80	0	Yes
Average	6.34	4.06		
In visakhapatnam district, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the supportive academic resources which include extra tuition and scholarships, statistically there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard.				

3.1.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that textbooks and notebooks are available and in good quality. In comparison, 53 (88.3%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that textbooks and notebooks are available and in good quality. 11.67% of students in private schools have reported that their textbooks and notebooks are of poor quality.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have good quality textbooks and notebooks (M=5.85) compared to private schools (M=4.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to availability and standard of textbooks plus notebooks was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government schools are good in providing quality textbooks and notebooks compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on improving the standard of providing the textbooks and notebooks to the students. These are very basic, mandatory and vital for the student's academic learning.

3.1.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

The government school students reported that the school provides them with scholarships. In comparison the private schools do not provide any kind of financial support to the students. A similar number of students from government and private schools reported that the school has extra tuition facilities for them. On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that they have access to supporting resources with good standards. The private schools can think of including subsidies or fee concessions for students from specific economic backgrounds.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better academic supporting resources ($M=1.15$) compared to private schools ($M=0.80$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic supporting resources was statistically not significant, $p = 0.175$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Stationary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bag	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

In comparison, the government school children had better access to the freebies that are provided from various government schemes which were not accessible to the students in private schools. On an average 29.75 (49.58%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the standard of the freebies is good. In comparison, 14.25 (23.75%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard of the freebies is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have access to freebies supporting academic learning ($M=5.93$) compared to private schools ($M=2.30$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies supporting academic learning was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

The government school students have better access to freebies supporting academic learning compared to private school children which is one of the driving factors for more students to enroll in the government school.

3.1.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 59.75 (99.58%) out of 60 children in the government school reported having good teaching staff. In comparison, 58.75 (97.92%) out of 60 children in private schools reported having good teaching staff. 100% students in the government schools reported that their dedicated class teacher is good while only 93.40% of the students in private school children reported that their dedicated class teacher is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better teaching staff (M=11.77) compared to private schools (M=11.03). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to teaching staff was statistically significant, $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.3.5 EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Counselor	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

Students from both the schools have reported similarly on extra-curricular staff. All the students reported their physical education teacher and school counselor are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better extra curricular staff (M=4.55) compared to government schools (M=3.50). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extra curricular staff was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Computers	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0

While all the government schools have reported having labs to practically learn science, all the private schools reported not having a lab at the school. Computer labs reported to be good by 47.5% and 49.2% of children studying in government and private schools respectively. The quality of computers in the computer lab are reported as good by 46.7% of students from government schools and by 42.5% of students from private schools.

On an average 59 (98.33%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the academic infrastructure is good. In comparison, 18.56 (30.93%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that academic infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better academic infrastructure ($M=12.25$) compared to private schools ($M=3.93$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government schools are good in academic infrastructure compared to private schools. There is greater need for the private schools to set up the required labs for practical learning.

3.1.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Device for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Digital learning infrastructure is available in government schools compared to private schools. Only the government school children have reported that they have smart classrooms. Both the schools reported having a projector used as a visual aid for learning.

On an average 30 (50%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the digital learning infrastructure is good. In comparison, 15 (25%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that digital learning infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better digital learning infrastructure (M=4.70) compared to private schools (M=0.80). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to digital learning infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government schools are good in regard to digital learning infrastructure compared to private schools. The private schools need to focus on building the required resources like smartclass that can help the students have a good learning experience.

3.1.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

TRANSPORT FACILITIES	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School Have Its Own Transport Facility	2	1.7	58	48.3	16	13.3	44	36.7
Provided Bus Pass To Travel To School	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	60	50.0

13.3% of students in private schools reported that schools have it own transport facility compared to government schools where only 1.7% of the students reported that the school has its own transport facility. It is understood from the data, that bus passes are not provided to private or government school children.

On an average 1(1.67%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that transportation facilities are available. In comparison, 8 (13.33%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the transportation facilities are available.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better transportation facilities (M=3.97) compared to government schools (M=3.73). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to transportation facilities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	14.73	14.33	0.111	No
Privacy related infra	7.82	4.47	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	10.87	9.92	0.006	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	7.47	3.0	0	Yes
Average	10.22	7.93		

In visakhapatnam district, the government schools have better sanitation facilities compared to private schools. Apart from restrooms, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Bathrooms with privacy related infrastructure like proper latches, slides and privacy walls are better in private schools compare to in government schools.

3.1.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDINGS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Taps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0
Doors	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lights	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0

On an average 58.83 (43.33 %) of 60 children in the government school reported that the sanitation building infrastructure is good. In comparison, 43.33 (72.22%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the sanitation building infrastructure is good. On other hand, only 1.94% of the students in government schools reported the sanitation infrastructure as low compared to 11.11% of children in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better sanitation building infrastructure (M=14.73) compared to private schools (M=14.33). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to sanitation building infrastructure was statistically not significant, $p = 0.111$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While the government school children have reported that the bathrooms have windows with blinds, the private school children reported having no windows with blinds. On an average 58.33 (97.22%) of 60 children in the government school reported the restrooms have good privacy. In comparison, 39.33(65.56%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the restrooms have good privacy.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better bathrooms with privacy (M=7.82) compared to private schools (M=4.47). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to restrooms with privacy was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	17	14.2	43	35.8	0	0
Buckets	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0
Jugs	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 57.25 (95.42%) of 60 children in the government school reported that restrooms have good basic hygiene. In comparison, 50.50 (84.17%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the restrooms have good basic hygiene. 14.2% of the students in private schools have reported that running water quality is poor in their restrooms. The same students (10.8%) have reported that the buckets in restrooms are poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are better with regard to ensuring basic hygiene infrastructure is made available in the restrooms (M=10.87) compared to private schools (M=9.92). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene related facilities was statistically significant , $p = 0.006$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

The private schools didn't report on students having access to menstrual pads and also do not have facilities required to dispose of the used sanitary napkins.

On an average 59.50 (99.17%) of 60 children in the government school reported that menstrual hygiene related infrastructure is good in their schools. In comparison, 15.00 (25.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported menstrual hygiene related infrastructure is good in their schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better menstrual hygiene related infrastructure (M=7.47) compared to private schools (M=3.0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to menstrual hygiene related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government school is doing good with respect to menstrual hygiene related infrastructure compared to private schools. The private schools need to take measures to provide menstrual pads.

3.1.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	3.17	2.70
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	3.73	2.83
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	3.33	2.83
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	9.53	9.53
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	3.67	3.57
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	9.00	7.97
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.10	8.77
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.77	8.60
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	9.27	8.63
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	9.20	8.80
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	9.50	9.67
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	8.50	8.30
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.03	9.10
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.90	8.87
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	8.50	8.30
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	9.03	9.10
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	8.07	8.03
A135	Lower caste students study well	4.80	3.50
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	7.73	8.67
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	9.53	9.83
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	8.67	8.87
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	8.57	8.73
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.93	8.77
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	6.63	5.90
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	6.30	7.00

	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	6.83	2.00
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	9.60	9.00
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.00	9.00
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	9.73	8.00
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	8.00	8.00
A150	Differently Abled students study well	7.97	6.00
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	9.60	9.00

3.1.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	15.57	14.45	0.002	Yes
Caste discrimination free environment	30.60	30.77	0.789	No
Disability discrimination free environment	1.80	0.67	0.077	No
Religion discrimination free environment	13.08	13.18	0.734	No
Average	15.26	14.77		
In visakhapatnam district, the discrimination free environment is higher in the government school compared to the private schools. A significant difference has been observed in the gender discrimination free environment between the government and private schools. All the other measures under discrimination free environment have no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

3.1.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement ‘Girls are discriminated against based on gender’ is lower at 3.67 and 3.57 respectively which means that girls feel that there is no discrimination based on gender in their schools. Though the students reported that they are not discriminated against based on gender, it is observed that private school students reported lower on access to sports equipment and class leadership roles compared to government school students. The girls feel that the environment is free of gender discrimination, however, they also reported not having equal access to opportunities like boys.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better gender discrimination free environment (M=15.57) compared to private schools (M=14.45). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported similarly. The level of agreement is at 8.90 by government school students and at 8.87 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported lower at 9.03 compared to students from private schools at 9.10. On the treatment of lower caste students by the teachers, the students from private schools rated lower at 8.30 compared to government schools at 8.50. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment ($M=30.77$) compared to government schools ($M=30.60$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.789$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was higher in private schools at 9.00 compared to government schools 8.00. However, access to school facilities have been reported higher by the government schools students at 9.60 compared to private schools at 9.00.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment ($M=1.80$) compared to private schools ($M=0.67$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination-free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.077$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination-free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported higher at 8.9 by government school students compared to 8.77 by private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination-free environment ($M=13.18$) compared to government schools ($M=13.08$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination-free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.734$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	29.57	27.93	0.002	Yes
Caste Inclusion	36.87	36.85	0.984	No
Religion Inclusion	24.32	24.55	0.645	No
Disability Inclusion	7.30	4.67	0.084	No
Average	24.52	23.50		
In visakhapatnam district, among the study population government school students reported that their schools are more inclusive compared to the private schools students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on gender inclusion. With respect to the other measures under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

3.1.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement ‘My school is a safe place for a girl to study’ is similar among both the schools at 9.53. The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 9.27) compared to private school students (Score = 8.63). The government school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score = 9.20) compared to private school students (score = 8.80). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion (M=29.57) compared to private schools (M=27.93). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement ‘Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles’ while the government school students rated 9.03, the private school students rated 9.10. A similar number of the students from both the schools feel that the disabled students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=36.87) compared to private schools (M=36.85). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.984$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement ‘Freedom to follow any religion’ was reported higher by government school at 8.93 compared to private school which reported at 8.77. The private school children reported more on children treated without religious discrimination (score = 8.73) compared to government school children (score = 8.57).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=24.55) compared to government schools (M=24.32). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.645$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The government schools rate higher on the statement ‘Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers’ at 9.73 compared to private school children at 8.00. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students study well (score = 7.97) and disabled students can complete school education (Score - 9.60). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion (M=7.30) compared to private schools (M=4.67). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.084$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		GOVERNMENT					PRIVATE				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	14	26	8	4		2	6	33	19	
	%	11.7	21.7	6.7	3.3		1.7	5	27.5	15.8	
Distance to Higher education school	N	12	22	11	11	4	12	19	26	1	2
	%	10	18.3	9.2	9.2	3.3	10	15.8	21.7	0.8	1.7

Majority of the students (21.7%) of the students in the government school come from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometers. In comparison, a majority of the students (27.5%) in private schools come from a distance of 4 - 6 kilometers. The next great part of the students in government schools (11.7%) of them comes from a distance of less than 1 kilometer and with regard to private schools, 15.8% of the students comes from a distance of 7 - 9 kilometers. The private schools have reported having transportation facilities which are a contributing factor for students from long distances to access them. With regard to higher education, the majority of the students (18.3%) of them reported that higher education school is accessible from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometers. In comparison, the majority of the students (21.7%) in the private schools reported that higher education school is accessible within a distance of 4 - 6 kilometers. From the data above, the schools for current education (8th class) and higher education (Intermediate) are accessible to the students at similar distances.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are more accessible (M=5.52) compared to government schools (M=4.98). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to physical accessibility was statistically not significant, $p = 0.099$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

3.1.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Clean Drinking Water	N	58	2	60	0
	%	48.3	1.7	50	0
Provide Tumbler/ Glass To Drink	N	36	22	16	44
	%	30.5	18.6	13.6	37.3

48.3% of the students in government schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water and 50% (i.e. all the students) in the private schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water. Only 1.7% of the students in government schools have reported that they do not have access to clean drinking water. Even though the water is provided at the school, the private reported lower (13.6%) in providing a tumbler or glass for the students to drink water whereas in government schools 30.5% of the students reported having a tumbler or glass to drink water.

3.1.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	0	0	60	50.9
RO Water	51	43.2	0	0
Water Can	7	5.9	0	0
Water Dispenser	0	0	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

Majority of the students (43.2%) in government schools reported that source of drinking water is RO water while all the students (50%) in private schools reported the source of water as Tap Water. About 5.9% of the students in the government school have reported the water sources as Water Cans.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better drinking water facilities ($M=4.42$) compared to private schools ($M=3.73$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to drinking water facility was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	0	33	27
	%	0	55	45

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	7	3	50
	%	11.7	5	83.3

55% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal and 45% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (83.3%) of the students reported that the number of servings are unlimited.

3.1.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	0	0	2	23	35
	%	0	0	3.3	38.3	58.3

Food quality is reported as very good by the majority of the students (58.3%) followed by 38.3% of the students reporting the quality of food as good. None of the students reported that the good quality is bad.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	60	0
	%	100	0
Hygienic kitchen	N	54	6
	%	90	10
Cooked hygienically	N	57	3
	%	95	5

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 100% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 90% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 95% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

3.1.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	1	59
	%	1.7	98.3
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	0	60
	%	0	100
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	60
	%	0	100
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	60
	%	0	100

All the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food.

3.1.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	9.50	9.67
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	8.47	8.23
A154	I feel secured when in school	9.27	8.57
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	9.23	9.20
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.70	7.33
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.93	9.10
A158	I feel lonely in school	4.97	3.57
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.73	8.97
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.43	8.77
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	7.87	8.23
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.83	8.73
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	5.57	6.47
A164	I can talk to boys	8.27	8.30
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	9.10	9.43
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.37	8.47
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	9.30	9.07
A168	I accept my teachers	9.27	9.10
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.97	8.73
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their menstruation days	8.53	7.37
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	9.30	8.37
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	9.13	8.87
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.43	8.50
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.97	8.30
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	7.23	5.17
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	8.30	8.20
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	7.93	9.00
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	7.57	8.17
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	9.83	9.93
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.50	9.00
A181	Education empowers me	9.77	9.53

A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.60	9.37
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	9.53	8.63
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.40	9.53
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.57	9.57
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.70	9.20

3.1.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel proud to study in this school' is reported higher by government school students (score = 8.70) compared to private schools students (score = 7.33). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 4.97 and 3.87 by government and private school students respectively. Looking at the scores there is a certain population of students who feel lonely in the school. Bullying at school is also reported higher by private schools (score = 6.47) compared to government schools students (score = 5.57)

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=53.38) compared to private schools (M=53.23). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was not statistically significant, $p = 0.886$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to the usage of teaching aids, government school students reported higher (Score = 7.23) compared to private schools (score = 5.17). On the availability of teachers to support and clarify student doubts, the government school students reported higher scores (score = 9.13) compared to private schools (score = 8.87). The government schools students reported lower on regular parent meetings (score = 7.93) compared to private schools (score = 9.00).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have a better quality of education (M=60.20) compared to private schools (M=58.37). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 0.130$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the government schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score =9.53) compared to private schools (score = 8.63). The government school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 9.70) compared to private school students (9.20).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel education is relevant (M=38.45) compared to private schools (M=37.38). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.17	4.28	0.396	No
Skill Development	1.78	1.48	0.001	Yes
Gender equality	5.0	5.07	0.397	No
Inclusion of third gender	1.90	1.55	0	Yes
Average	3.21	3.09		
In visakhapatnam district, among the study population government school students reported that the education system is adaptable to the changing needs of the society and inclusive. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private in aspects of skill development and inclusion of third gender, whereas there were no statistical significance in the areas of online education and gender equality.				

3.1.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

3.1.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & Digital Mode of Education		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	21	39	12	48
	%	17.5	32.5	10	40
Blended modes of education	N	30	30	48	12
	%	25	25	40	10
Digital classrooms teaching	N	35	25	11	49
	%	29.2	20.8	9.2	40.8

Majority of the students (32.5%) in government schools mentioned that online mode of education is not adaptable for their school and a similar response was also noted with private school students (40%). While the private school students (40%) feel blended mode of education is adaptable, on other hand the government school students only 25% of them feel that blended mode of education is adaptable. In government schools, the majority of the students (29.2%) feel the digital classroom teaching is adaptable, the private schools students feel the opposite of it and 40.8% of the students reported that digital classroom teaching is not adaptable.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students feel an online and digital mode of teaching is adaptable (M=4.28) compared to government schools (M=4.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically not significant, $p = 0.396$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	31	29	13	47
	%	25.8	24.2	10.8	39.2

The government school students have reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics (25.8%), while only 10.8% of the private school students reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported skills development is incorporated in their academics ($M=1.78$) compared to private schools ($M=1.48$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	52	8	56	4
	%	43.3	6.7	46.7	3.3
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same-Sex School Adaptable	N	60	0	59	1
	%	50	0	49.2	0.8
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	58	2	59	1
	%	48.3	1.7	49.2	0.8

Majority of the students (43.3%) in the government school have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. A similar trend has been observed in the private school as well, 46.7% of the private school students reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. Both the school students reported that having opposite teachers is adaptable with government school. Similarly, both the school students strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students reported gender equality is adaptable ($M= 5.07$) compared to government schools ($M= 5.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically not significant, $p = 0.397$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

In Which Type Of School, Gender Equality Is Adaptability	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	13	10.8	2	1.7
Co- Ed School	44	36.7	58	48.3
Both	3	2.5	0	0
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 48.3% of students in private schools reported on this and 36.7% of the students in government schools reported on this. 10.8% of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in same sex schools (girls schools).

3.1.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER BE ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	27	33	6	54
	%	22.5	27.5	5	45

While the government students reported mixed responses on the inclusion of third gender and about 22.5% of the students indicated that third gender should be included while 45% of the students in private schools reported that third gender should not be included.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported that third gender can be included in their schools ($M=1.90$) compared to private schools ($M=1.55$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to inclusion of third gender was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.1.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	40	20	31	29
	%	33.3	16.7	25.8	24.2
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	40	20	38	22
	%	33.3	16.7	31.7	18.3
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	45	15	5	55
	%	37.5	12.5	4.2	45.8
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	13	47	49	11
	%	10.8	39.2	40.8	9.2
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	37	23	45	15
	%	30.8	19.2	37.5	12.5
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	12	48	18	42
	%	10	40	15	35
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	8	52	13	47
	%	6.7	43.3	10.8	39.2
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	1	59	0	60
	%	0.8	49.2	0	50
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	7	53	0	60
	%	5.8	44.2	0	50

Majority of the government students (33.3%) reported that RTE is enforced in their school compared to private schools (25.8%). Majority of the students (33.3% in government schools and 31.7% private schools) in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality. From the data, it looks like only government school children (37.5%) are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE while only 4.2% of the students in the private schools are aware of this. It looks like private school students (40.8%) are aware of capitation fees during admission. Students in both the schools have reported that they are aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 30.8% in government school and 37.5% in private school. Majority of students from both the schools (40% in government schools and 35% private schools) are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE. A similar trend of being unaware on the physical punishment, mental harassment and 25% admission reservation through RTE in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students are more aware of RTE ($M=6.52$) compared to government schools ($M=6.07$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to RTE was statistically significant, $p=0.035$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2 VIZINAGARAM DISTRICT

3.2.1 AVAILABILITY

3.2.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	9	51	50	10
	%	7.5	42.5	41.7	8.3
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	8	52	5	55
	%	6.7	43.3	4.2	45.8

Majority of the students reported that the schools are not available in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 50.8% (i.e. 42.5% of the students in government and 8.3% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools are not in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 89.1% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education while 10.9% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M = 2.70$) compared to private schools ($M = 2.65$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p = 0.681$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	17.0	14.30	0	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	13.17	18.23	0	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	23.82	23.33	0.011	Yes
Extra curricular infra	8.37	9.0	0	Yes
Disable friendly infra	8.37	2.57	0	Yes
Average	14.15	13.49		
In Vizianagaram district, safe infrastructure is better available and maintained in the government schools compared to the private schools. In all the aspects measured under safe infrastructure, there is a significant difference between the government and private schools.				

3.2.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	12	10.0	48	40.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Electricity	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	3	5.0	57	95.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

While all the students in private schools have reported safe buildings, 10% of the students in government schools have reported that their school does not have safe buildings. Students from both the schools have reported that the school building has proper flooring and proper roofing. 48.3% of the students in government schools reported that they have good electricity in their schools, a little lower than that i.e. 47.5% of them in private school reported that they have good electricity. On an average 57 (95 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported the school building infrastructure is good. In comparison, 49.5 (82.5 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that school building infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better school building infrastructure (M=17.0) compared to private schools (M=14.30). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school building infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

All the students from the schools have reported that fire extinguishers, first aid boxes, CCTVs are in good condition. On an average 59.71 (99.52%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the safety related infrastructure is good. In comparison, 59.86 (99.76%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that safety related infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better safety related infrastructure (M=18.23) compared to government schools (M=13.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to safety related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Blackboard	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Bench	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Fan	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Light	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Door	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Window	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Ventilation	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

Students from government schools (1.7%) of them have reported that classrooms are poor while all the students in private schools reported that classrooms are good. Among all the other classroom infrastructure, the blackboard is reported as poor by government school students (3.3%). On an average 58.63 (97.71%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the classroom infrastructure is good. In comparison, 59.13 (98.54%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better classroom infrastructure (M=23.82) compared to private s schools (M=23.33). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to classroom infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.011$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.2.4 EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

The playground standard was reported similar by both the school students. The sports equipment is reported as poor by 1.7% of the students in government school while all the students in private schools have reported good. On an average 59.33 (98.89%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the extracurricular infrastructure is good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that extracurricular infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better extracurricular infrastructure (M= 9.0) compared to government schools (M= 8.37). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extracurricular infrastructure was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.2.5 DISABLED FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hand Rails	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	30	25.0	30	25.0	0	0
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While all the government schools have reported that they have good condition ramps at school, the private school didn't report any ramps. 25% of the students in the private schools didn't report having handrails while all the government school children reported handrails are present in good condition. On an average 59.33 (98.89%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the disabled friendly infrastructure at school is good. In comparison, 30.00 (50.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that disabled friendly infrastructure at school is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Disable friendly infra (M=8.37) compared to private schools (M= 2.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Disable friendly infra was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval

3.2.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	5.90	6.0	0.156	No
Supportive academic resources	4.17	0	0	Yes
Freebies supporting academics	7.78	3.80	0	Yes
Teaching Staff	11.32	11.45	0.544	No
Extra Curricular Staff	2.40	4.78	0	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	11.77	12.50	0.749	No
Digital learning infrastructure	2.15	3.80	0	Yes
Average	6.50	6.05		
In Vizianagaram district, the availability of academic resources is better in government schools compared to private schools. Especially, government is especially strong in providing supporting academic resources like scholarships and other freebies like meals, uniforms, textbooks, notebooks and bags which is helping the students to study better. There was significant difference between government and private schools with regard to supporting academic resources, freebies supporting academics, and digital learning infrastructure.				

3.2.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

Students from both government schools have reported that basic and mandatory academic resources like textbooks and notebooks are provided by the school and are in good condition.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better mandatory academic resources (M=6.0) compared to government schools (M=5.90). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Mandatory was statistically not significant, $p = 0.156$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.2 SUPPORTIVE ACADEMIC RESOURCES\

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

While all the government school children have reported that they have supportive academic resources like scholarship and extra tuition at the school, none of the private school students have reported on the supportive academic resources. On an average 59.00 (98.33%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that academic supporting resources are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better supportive academic resources ($M=4.17$) compared to private schools ($M=0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Supporting resources was statistically significant, $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMICS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Stationary	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Bag	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

All the students from both the schools have reported that uniform is provided by the school and it is in good condition. While all the government school students reported that their school provides bags as well, none of the private school students reported on the provision of bags. All the students from both the schools reported that bicycles are not provided to them as part of the freebies. On an average 44.75 (74.58%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the freebies supporting academics are good. In comparison, 30.00 (50.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that freebies supporting academics are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better freebies supporting academics ($M=7.78$) compared to private schools ($M=3.80$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies supporting academics was statistically significant, $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

3.9% of the students in government schools have reported that teaching staff are poor. i.e. 2.5% of the students reported that while there is a subject wise teacher at school, they are poor at teaching and 1.7% reported that male teachers are poor. On an average 58.75 (97.92%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the teaching staff are good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the teaching staff are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Teaching staff (M= 11.45) compared to government schools (M=11.32). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Teaching staff was statistically not significant, $p = 0.544$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.5 EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
School Counselor	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

All the students in government school have reported that they have a good Physical Education Teacher (PET) and a school counselor. We have a similar trend in the private school as well, however ~1% of the students in private school reported that their PET teacher is poor. On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the extracurricular staff at the school are good. In comparison, 59.50 (99.17%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that extracurricular staff at the school are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Extra-curricular staff (M=4.78) compared to government schools (M=2.40). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra-curricular staff was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Library	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Computers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While all the students(50%) in the private schools have reported that physics instruments are good. Only 47.5% of the students in government schools have reported that physics instruments are good. About 2.5% of the students in government schools reported physics instruments are poor. Similarly, the library is reported good by all the students in private schools and ~1% of the students in government schools reported that the library is poor. On an average 59.30 (98.83%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the academic infrastructure like labs, library, etc. is good. In comparison, 59.80 (99.67%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that academic infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better academic infrastructure (M=12.50) compared to government schools (M=11.77). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Academic infra was statistically not significant, $p=0.749$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.3.7 USAGE OF DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	30	25.0	30	25.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Device for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

All the students in both the schools have reported that classrooms are present in the school and they are in good condition. While everyone in the private school has reported that the projector is in good condition, 25% of the students in government schools have reported that the projector is in poor condition. On an average 22.50 (37.50%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the usage of digital infrastructure for learning is good. In comparison, 30.00 (50.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that usage of digital infrastructure for learning is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better usage of digital infrastructure for learning (M=3.80) compared to government schools (M=2.15). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to usage of digital infrastructure for learning was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	6	5	54	45	57	47.5	3	2.5
PROVIDED BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	0	0	60	50	0	0	60	50

47.5% of the students in private schools have reported that the school has their own transport facility, only 5% students in the government schools have reported that the school has its own transport facility. Students from both the schools have reported that they are not provided with bus passes.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better transport facilities (M=3.47) compared to private schools (M=3.05). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to transport facilities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	16.72	16.18	0.189	No
Privacy related infra	8.20	7.68	0.155	No
Basic hygiene	10.48	8.17	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	9.55	0.55	0	Yes
Average	11.24	8.15		
In Vizianagaram district, the government schools have better sanitation facilities compared to private schools. Apart from restrooms and privacy related infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Menstrual related hygiene is better in government schools compared to private schools.				

3.2.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDINGS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Taps	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Doors	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Lights	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

All the students have reported that they have gender specific restrooms and they are in good condition. While proper flooring is reported as good by all the students in both the schools, the taps and doors were reported poor by ~2% of the students from each school. While lights in the restrooms are reported to be in good condition by the private school students (50%), the government school students (1.7%) of them reported that lights are in poor condition. On an average 59.1 (98.6%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the restroom buildings are good. In comparison, 59.3 (98.8%) out of 60 children in private schools reported restroom buildings are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better restroom buildings $M=16.72$) compared to Private schools ($M= 16.18$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Sanitation facilities Building was statistically not significant, $p = 0.189$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While all the students in private schools have reported that their restrooms have windows with blinds and privacy walls in front of restrooms, ~ 3.5 % of the students in the private schools reported the same as poor. Compared to the government schools, more private school students reported that doors have latches. On an average 58.00 (96.67%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the restrooms have good privacy. In comparison, 59.67 (99.44%) out of 60 children in private schools reported restrooms have good privacy.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that schools have better government school privacy related infra ($M= 8.20$) compared to privacy schools ($M= 7.68$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Privacy related infra was statistically not significant , $p = 0.155$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Buckets	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Jugs	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

With relation to basic hygiene of restrooms all together 10.8% of the government school students have reported that all hygiene related things are poor in condition, while only 1.6% of the private students have reported the hygiene related materials are poor. On an average 56.75 (94.58%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the restrooms have good hygiene. In comparison, 59.50 (99.17%) out of 60 children in private schools reported restrooms have good hygiene.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better basic hygiene (M=10.48) compared to private schools (M= 8.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	2	3.3	58	96.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	1	1.7	59	98.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

None of the students in the private school have reported having a pad incinerator or pad dispenser. The menstrual pads are provided only at the government school and not provided at the private school. On an average 59.25 (98.75%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the restroom buildings are good. In comparison, 15.00 (25.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported restroom buildings are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better menstrual hygiene related infrastructure (M=9.55) compared to private schools (M= 0.55). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to menstrual hygiene related was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data, the private schools need to improve in setting up the infrastructure like pad dispensers and pad incinerators at school.

3.2.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	3.37	2.80
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	4.13	3.10
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	3.60	2.87
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	9.57	9.87
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	5.63	4.67
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	9.33	9.80
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.10	9.43
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.80	9.37
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	9.43	9.37
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	9.47	9.50
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	9.17	9.53
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	9.10	9.00
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.13	9.40
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.00	9.37
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	9.10	9.00
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	9.13	9.40
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	8.93	9.07
A135	Lower caste students study well	7.07	4.13
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.57	8.77
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	9.37	9.33
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	9.10	9.40
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	9.30	9.43
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	9.17	9.33
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	8.37	8.63
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	8.57	8.43
	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	3.27	2.27

A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	9.80	8.13
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.07	8.03
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	9.80	8.00
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	9.67	9.77
A150	Differently Abled students study well	9.73	6.20
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	9.70	6.23

3.2.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	16.43	16.63	0.649	No
Caste discrimination free environment	31.73	32.37	0.349	No
Disability discrimination free environment	6.12	1.57	0	Yes
Religion discrimination free environment	13.78	14.08	0.215	No
Average	17.02	16.16		
In Vizianagaram district, the discrimination on gender, caste and religion are lower in private schools compared to government schools. The private schools have a better disability discrimination free environment than government schools. Apart from the disability free environment, there was no significant difference between the government and private schools in discrimination free environment.				

3.2.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The level of agreement for the statement 'Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles' is higher in private schools (score = 9.43) compared to government schools (score = 9.10). Similar trend has been seen with regard to access to sport requirement where private schools reported at 9.80 and government schools have reported at 9.33

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better gender discrimination free environment (M=16.63) compared to government schools (M=16.43). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was not statistically significant, $p = 0.649$, 95% confidence interval

3.2.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The level of agreement for the statement 'Lower caste students are treated well by other students' is higher in private schools (score = 9.40) compared to government schools (score = 9.13). The private school students reported that lower caste students can related with other students without any discrimination higher at 9.37 compared to government school students at 9.00. Similar private school students only reported higher on equal access to leadership roles to lower caste students (score = 9.40) compared to government school students (score = 9.13).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment (M=32.37) compared to government schools (M=31.73). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p=0.349$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The level of agreement for the statement ‘Differently Abled students have access to school facilities’ is higher in government schools (score = 9.60) compared to private schools (score = 8.13). Students from both the schools reported similarly on ‘disabled students can relate with others without discrimination’.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment (M=6.12) compared to private schools (M=1.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

Freedom to follow any religion was reported higher by the private schools students (score = 9.33) compared to government schools (score = 9.17). We have seen a similar trend on the statement ‘Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion’ higher in private schools (score = 9.40) compared to government schools (score = 9.10)

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment (M=14.08) compared to government schools (M=13.78). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.215$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	30.67	31.0	0.545	No
Caste Inclusion	39.55	38.82	0.391	No
Religion Inclusion	26.93	27.28	0.581	No
Disability Inclusion	19.02	6.77	0	Yes
Average	29.04	25.97		

In Vizinagaram District, among the study population both government school students and Private School Students have reported that their schools are more inclusive. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Disability Inclusion. With respect to the other measures under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.

3.2.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement for the statement ‘My school is a safe place for a girl to study’ is higher in private schools (score = 9.87) compared to the government schools (score = 9.57). While the government school teachers have reported that they are treated well by the teachers (score = 9.43), the private school students reported a little higher than government school on accessibility of teachers to share their problems (score = 9.50).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools with higher gender inclusion (M=31.0) compared to government schools (M=30.67). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was not statistically significant, $p = 0.545$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

Lower case students study well and seem to be more agreed by the government school students (score = 7.07) compared to the private school students (score = 4.13). However, lower castes students can complete education, which seems to be more agreed by the private school students (score = 8.77) compared to the government school students (score = 8.57).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=39.55) compared to private schools (M=38.82). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.391$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

While private schools reported higher on the freedom to follow religious customs at school (score = 8.63), the government school students reported higher on the religious tolerance level of the teachers (score = 8.57). The freedom to follow any religion is reported higher by the private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=27.28) compared to government schools (M=26.93). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.581$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

Differently abled students can study well is more agreed by the government school students (score = 9.73) compared to the private school students (score = 6.20). Similarly, the government school students (score = 9.70) agree more that disabled students can complete school education compared to the private school students (score = 6.23).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion (M=19.02) compared to private schools (M=6.77). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL FROM HOME

		Government					Private				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	6	5	3	10	36	6	5	8	9	32
	%	5	4.2	2.5	8.3	30	5	4.2	6.7	7.5	26.7
Distance to Higher education school	N	16	0	11	22	11	5	45	5	5	0
	%	13.3	0	9.2	18.3	9.2	4.2	37.5	4.2	4.2	0

Majority of the students (30%) of the students in the government school come from a distance of Above 10 kilometers. The students (26.7%) in private schools come from above 10 kilometers. The next great part of the students in government schools (8.3%) of them comes from a distance of 7 to 9 kilometer and with regard to private schools 7.5% of the students comes from a distance of 7.5 % kilometers. The private schools have reported having transportation facilities which are a contributing factor for students from long distances to access them. Significantly with regard to higher education, the majority of the students (37.5%) of private schools reported that higher education school is accessible from a distance of 1-3 kilometers.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better distance to school ($M=8.02$) compared to private schools ($M= 5.37$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to better distance to school was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval

3.2.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

3.2.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CLEAN DRINKING WATER	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
PROVIDE TUMBLER/ GLASS TO DRINK	N	60	0	59	1
	%	50.0	0	49.2	0.8

About 42.5% of the students in government schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water and 50% (i.e. all the students) in the private schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water and no student in the government schools have reported that they do not have access to clean drinking water. With regard to providing a Tumbler / Glass both the Government School Students and Private School students have reported 50 % and 49.2 % respectively.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government Schools have better drinking water facilities ($M= 3.33$) compared to Private schools ($M= 3.20$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to drinking water was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95 % confidence interval.

3.2.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	40	33.3	49	40.8
RO Water	20	16.7	11	9.2
Water Can	0	0	0	0
Water Dispenser	0	0	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

Many of the students (33.3%) in government schools reported that the source of drinking water is Tap water and the majority of the students (49%) in private schools reported the source of water as Tap Water. About 16.7 % of the students in the government school have reported the water sources as RO Water and 9.2% of the students from the Private Schools have reported that they use RO water..

3.2.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	0	22	36
	%	0	37.9	62.1

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	3	29	26
	%	5.2	50.0	44.8

About 62.1% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more and 37.9% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is Ideal. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (50.0%) of the students reported that the number of servings are Twice and 44.8% reported that the number of servings are Unlimited.

The results of the descriptive statistics show the mean in government schools as $M=4.85$. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to access to nutritious meal was statistically significant, $p = 0.0\%$ confidence interval.

3.2.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	2	1	0	41	14
	%	3.4	1.7	0	70.7	24.1

Food quality is reported as neutral by the majority of the students (70.7%) followed by 24.1% of the students reporting the quality of food is Very Good.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	58	0
	%	100	0
Hygienic kitchen	N	51	7
	%	87.9	12.1
Cooked hygienically	N	55	3
	%	94.8	5.17

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 100% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 87.9% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 94.8% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

3.2.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	7	51
	%	12.1	87.9
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	6	52
	%	10.3	89.7
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	6	52
	%	10.3	89.7
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	3	55
	%	5.2	94.8

Most of the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food. 12.1% of students reported Caste discrimination in serving food, 10.3 % of students reported Gender discrimination in Quantity of food, 5.2% of students reported Caste discrimination in quantity of food.

3.2.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	9.70	9.90
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	9.23	9.50
A154	I feel secured when in school	9.47	9.47
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	9.60	9.70
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	9.23	9.63
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	9.13	9.50
A158	I feel lonely in school	5.50	4.30
A159	I like to go to school everyday	9.07	9.43
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	9.43	9.27
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	9.07	9.07
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	9.40	9.30
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	8.47	8.50
A164	I can talk to boys	9.17	9.27
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	9.20	9.63
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	9.37	9.37
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	9.70	9.33
A168	I accept my teachers	9.63	9.43

A169	My teachers inspire me	9.60	9.33
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	9.30	9.23
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	9.70	9.50
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	9.73	9.53
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	9.07	9.40
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.77	8.83
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	7.53	7.00
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	9.37	9.50
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	9.57	9.47
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.53	9.50
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	9.97	10.00
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.93	9.93
A181	Education empowers me	9.90	9.80
A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.80	9.90
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	9.80	9.77
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.90	9.67
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.70	9.77
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.87	9.87

3.2.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

Both the school students have reported that they feel secure when in the school (score = 9.47). The level of agreement for the statement 'I feel proud to study in this school' is higher in private school students (score = 9.63) compared to the government school students (score =9.23). With regard, going to school everyday, private schools reported higher scores (score = 9.43) compared to private schools (score =9.07).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=58.42) compared to government schools (M=58.23). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was not statistically significant, $p = 0.863$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

The level of agreement for the statement 'My teachers are concerned and enquire about my wellbeing' has similar scores from both the types of schools (score = 9.37). Regular parent - teacher meetings were reported higher by the government schools (score = 9.57) compared to the private schools (score = 9.47). Access to progress reports was reported higher by the private schools (score =9.50) compared to the government schools (score = 8.53).

The mean scores of both the independent groups (Mean = 64.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 1.0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students from both the colleges have similar beliefs that girls should go to jobs after education (score = 9.93) and education helps girls to face challenges (score = 9.87). Girls from government school believe that education helps them to become creative (score = 9.90) compared to the private school students (score = 9.67).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel education is relevant (M=39.43) compared to private schools (M=39.35). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.741$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.78	4.32	0.002	Yes
Skill Development	1.70	0.462	1.0	No
Gender equality	4.58	4.45	0.297	No
Inclusion of third gender	1.67	1.87	0.061	No
Average	3.182	2.775		
In Vizianagaram District, among the study population both government school students and Private School from the report in Online Education there was statistical significance; but in the other areas such as Skill Development, Gender Equality and Inclusion of Third Gender there was no significance.				

3.2.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

3.2.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & Digital Mode of Education		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	19	41	29	31
	%	15.8	34.2	24.2	25.8
Blended mode of education	N	9	51	26	34
	%	7.5	42.5	21.7	28.3
Digital classroom teaching	N	17	43	26	34
	%	14.2	35.8	21.7	28.3

About 41 (34.2%) out of 60 students in government schools mentioned that they are unable to adapt to online mode of education and in private school students with 31 (25.8%) have responded that they are unable to adapt to online mode of education. While 51 (42.5%) out of 60 government school students feel the blended mode of education is not adaptable, on other hand the private school students 34 (28.3%) out of 60 feel that blended mode of education is not adaptable. In government schools 34 (28.3) and private schools students 43 (35.8%) out of 60 students feel that the Digital Classroom Teaching is not adaptable.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government Schools have better Online & Digital Mode Of Education ($M = 4.78$) compared to Private schools ($M = 4.32$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Online & Digital Mode Of Education was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	18	42	18	42
	%	15.0	35.0	15.0	35.0

In government school and private school students 18 (100%) out of 60 reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government and private schools have better education for skill development ($M = 1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples show there is no significance on between Government and Private Schools.

3.2.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	58	2	60	0
	%	48.3	1.7	50.0	0
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same Sex School Adaptable	N	56	4	57	3
	%	46.7	3.3	47.5	2.5
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50.0	0

The government schools and private schools students 60 (100%) out of 60 students have reported that gender equality is adaptable in the schools. In private school students with 50 (87%) students reported that having opposite teachers is adaptable. Similarly, both the school students 60 (100%) out of 60 strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better gender equality ($M = 1.82$) compared to private schools ($M = 1.67$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender equality was statistically no significant, $p = 0.061$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

IN WHICH TYPE OF SCHOOL, GENDER EQUALITY IS ADAPTABILITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	34	28.3	38	31.7
Co- Ed School	24	20.0	20	16.7
Both	2	1.7	2	1.7
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 60 (93%) out of 66 of students in private schools reported they are adaptable in co-ed schools and 60 (68.3%) out of 41 of the students in government schools reported they are adaptable in co-ed schools. In 60 (31.6%) out of 60 of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in both schools. In 60 (6.6%) out of 4 of the students in private schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in both schools.(girls schools).

3.2.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER BE ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	20	40	11	49
	%	16.7	33.3	9.2	40.8

While the government students reported mixed responses on the inclusion of third gender and about 20 (16.7%) out of 60 of the students indicated that third gender should be included and in 11 (9.2%) out of 60 students in private schools reported that third gender should be included. While 40 (33.3%) out of 60 students in Government schools reported that third gender should not be included 49 (40.8%) out of 60 students from Private Schools reported that third gender should not be included..

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better inclusion of third gender (M= 1.82) compared to government schools (M= 1.67). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to inclusion of third gender there was statistically no significant, $p = 0.061$, 95% confidence interval.

3.2.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	50	10	8	52
	%	41.7	8.3	6.7	43.3
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	49	11	8	52
	%	40.8	9.2	6.7	43.3
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	49	11	3	57
	%	40.8	9.2	2.5	47.5
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	32	28	5	55

	%	26.7	23.3	4.2	45.8
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	50	10	8	53
	%	41.7	8.3	6.7	6.7
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	30	30	2	58
	%	25.0	25.0	1.7	48.3
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	13	47	6	54
	%	10.8	39.2	5.0	45.0
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	3	57	0	60
	%	2.5	47.5	0	50.0
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	31	29	2	58
	%	25.8	24.2	1.7	48.3

The government and private schools students 50 (100%) out of 60 of the students have reported that RTE is enforced in their schools. The students 49 (40.8%) out of 60 of the government schools and private schools in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality and about 52 (43.3 %) out of 60 have reported that RTE does not promote Gender Equality. From the data, it looks like only government school are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE. It looks like about half the government school students 32 (26.7%) out of 60 are aware of capitation fees during admission while in private school students 55 (45.8%) out of 60 are aware of capitation fees during admission. Government School Students have reported that they are aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 50 (41.7%) out of 60.

Majority of students from the Private School Students 58 (48.3%) out of 60 of the students are aware that admission can not be denied under RTE and in Government schools students about 30 (25%) out of 60 are aware that admission cant be denied under RTE and similarly among the Government School Students 30 (25%) out of 60 of the students are not aware that admission cant be denied under RTE. About 54 (45%) out of 60 students in Private schools are unaware of the physical punishment, mental harassment 58 (48.3%) and about 25% of the admission reservation through RTE.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Right to education ($M= 7.03$) compared to private schools ($M= 6.03$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to right to education there was a statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3 YSR (KADAPA) DISTRICT

3.3.1 AVAILABILITY

3.3.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	41	19	35	25
	%	34.2	15.8	29.2	20.8
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	27	33	12	48
	%	22.5	27.5	10.0	40.0

Majority of the students reported that the schools are not available in their village or panchayat itself. A total of % (i.e. 15.8% of the students in government and 20.8 % of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools are not in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 27.5 % of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education while 40.0 % of the students reported th at the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools are more available (M= 3.22) compared to government schools (M= 2.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically significant, $p = 0.018$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	17.95	15.20	0	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	13.83	15.33	0.011	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	24.0	23.22	0	Yes
Extra curricular infra	8.65	8.17	0.102	No
Disable friendly infra	7.50	6.60	0.059	No
Average	14.386	13.704		
In kadapa district, safe infrastructure is better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the extra curricular and disable friendly infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to safe infrastructure.				

3.3.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Electricity	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

The government school students reported all the variables measured under school infrastructure are of good standard. the private schools reported school building infrastructure is poor (5.00% of them). From the data it looks like the private schools flooring, roofing and electricity are not up to the standard. On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the school building infrastructure is good. In comparison, 58 (97%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the school building infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better building infrastructure (M=17.95) compared to private schools (M=15.20). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to building infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the school building infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the proper roofing, flooring, electricity and auditorium for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0

With regard to safety related infrastructure, the government school students reported that their schools do not have CCTV and also rated poor on first aid box (11.7%) and properly laid road (11.7%). Other safety related infrastructure like signboards, speedreaders are reported similarly by both school students. On an average 47.4 (79 %) of 60 children in the government school reported that Safety related infrastructure is good. In comparison, 58.6 (97.6%) out of 60 children in private schools reported Safety related infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Safety related infrastructure (M=15.33) compared to government schools (M=13.83). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Safety related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.011$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Safety related infrastructure is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on providing first aid boxes, CCTV and properly laid roads for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Blackboard	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Bench	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Fan	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Light	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Door	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Window	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Ventilation	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While all the government school children reported that the classroom infrastructure is good, the private schools students on an average 4% of them reported that the classroom infrastructure is poor. On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Classroom infrastructure is good. In comparison, 57.5 (95.8%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Classroom infrastructure (M=24.0) compared to private schools (M=23.22). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Classroom infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Classroom infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on providing proper infra like benches, fans, lights and windows for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.2.4 EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0

There is not much of a difference in extracurricular infrastructure between the government and private schools. The private school students (1.7%) of them reported that their sports equipment is of poor standard. On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children

in the government school reported the Extra curricular infra is good. In comparison, 59.3 (98.9%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Extra curricular infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Extra curricular infra (M=8.65) compared to private schools (M=8.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra curricular infra was statistically not significant, $p = 0.102$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Extra curricular infra is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the sports equipment for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.2.5 DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Handrails	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0

While all government school students reported that their school had good disabled friendly infrastructure. About 19% of the students in private schools reported that their school has poor disabled friendly infrastructure. On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Disable friendly infra is good. In comparison, 52 (86.7%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Disable friendly infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Disable friendly infra (M=7.50) compared to private schools (M=6.60). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Disable friendly infra was statistically not significant, $p = 0.059$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Disable friendly infra is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the ramps , hand rails and hand rails for stairs for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	6.0	6.0	-	
Supportive academic resources	6.0	6.0	-	
Freebies supporting academics	8.92	7.15	0	Yes
Teaching Staff	6.0	6.0	-	
Extra Curricular Staff	6.0	6.0	-	
Academic learning infrastructure	7.57	8.97	0.149	No
Digital learning infrastructure	0	2.60	0	Yes
Average	5.78	6.10		

In kadapa district, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in private schools compared to government schools. Apart from the freebie supporting academic resources and academic learning infrastructure there is no significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard.

3.3.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60(100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Academic resources are good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported Academic resources are good. The P test is not applicable as the responses from the two independent groups are the same.

3.3.1.3.2 SUPPORTIVE RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60(100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Supporting resource is good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Supporting resource is good. The P test is not applicable as the responses from the two independent groups are the same.

3.3.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Stationary	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bag	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 44.5(74.2 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Freebies is good. In comparison, 30(100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Freebies is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools provide better freebies (M=8.92) compared to private schools (M=7.15). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies supporting academics was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

Though some of the government school children reported that freebies are of poor standard, given the range of freebies provided by the government school are more compared to private school.

3.3.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) of 60 children in the government school reported that the teaching staff are good. A similar number of students i.e. 60 (100 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the teaching staff are good. The P test is not applicable as the responses from the two independent groups are the same.

3.3.1.3.5 EXTRA CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Counselor	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) of 60 children in the government school reported that the teaching staff are good. A similar number of students i.e. 60 (100 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the teaching staff are good. The P test is not applicable as the responses from the two independent groups are the same.

3.3.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Library	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Computers	0	0	35	29.2	25	20.8	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0

On an average 15.4 (25.7 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the academic infrastructure at school is good. In comparison, 58.8 (98%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the academic infrastructure at school is good. Only the private schools reported having labs while none of the government schools reported it

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better academic infrastructure (M=8.97) compared to government schools (M=7.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic infrastructure was statistically not significant, $p = 0.149$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Academic infra is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Biology Lab, Biological Specimens, Physics Lab, Physics Instruments, Chemistry Lab, Chemicals & Equipments, Library, Computer Lab and Computers for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	15.0	51	85.0	0	0
Device for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

None of the students in government schools reported having digital learning infrastructure. In comparison, on an average 27.8 (46.3%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the digital learning infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Digital learning infra (M=2.60) compared to government schools (M=0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Digital learning infra was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private school is good in digital learning infrastructure compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Projector, Smart Classroom, Device for Online Learning and Internet Access for Online Learning for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	Government School				Private Schools			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	0	0	60	50.0	42	35.0	18	15.0
PROVIDED BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	60	50.0

All the government school children have reported that there is no transportation facility or bus pass provided to them. While the private school students have reported that schools have transportation facilities (70%) and about 30% of them reported that there are no transportation facilities. The government provides free bus passes for students who are coming from far distances. Among the students who responded to the study, there are no students using the bus pass.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Transport facilities (M=4.00) compared to government schools (M=3.30). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Transport facilities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, private schools are good in Transport facilities compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on providing transport for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	15.38	14.70	0.057	No
Privacy related infrastructure	8.15	6.83	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	11.93	10.30	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	10.90	3.50	0	Yes
Average	11.59	8.8325		

In kadapa district, the government schools have better sanitation facilities compared to private schools. Apart from restrooms, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Bathrooms with privacy related infrastructure like proper latches, slides, privacy walls and mensural hygiene related resources are better in government schools compare to private schools.

3.3.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDINGS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Taps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Doors	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Lights	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0

While all the students in the government schools reported all the restroom related infrastructure is in good condition, about 5% of the private schools students have reported that the restroom building related infrastructure is in poor condition. Similar to school buildings, the flooring of the restroom is reported lower in private schools (46.7%) compared to government schools (50.0%). On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported that restroom buildings are in good condition. In comparison, 58.8 (98.1%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that restroom buildings are in good condition.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Sanitation facilities, building (M=15.38) compared to private schools (M=14.70). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Sanitation facilities, building was statistically not significant, $p = 0.057$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Sanitation facilities, building is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the Proper Flooring, Taps and Lights for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

While all the students in government school reported that restrooms have good privacy compared to private schools where about 3.3% of the students reported the restrooms do have proper windows with blinds. On an average 60(100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported the Privacy related infra is good. In comparison, 58.7 (97.8%) out of 60 children in private schools reported the Privacy related infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Privacy related infra (M=8.15) compared to private schools (M=6.83). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Privacy related infra was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data

above, the Privacy related infra is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the Windows with Privacy blinds for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.1.5 .3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Buckets	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Jugs	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

In relation to basic hygiene of the restrooms, the private schools reported not having wash basins. Both the schools reported the same on running water, buckets and jugs. On an average 59 (98.3 %) of 60 children in the government school reported that basic hygiene is good. In comparison, 45 (75.00%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Basic hygiene (M= 11.93) compared to private schools (M=10.30). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Basic hygiene was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.1.5 .4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

In comparison to private schools, the government schools have all infrastructure related to menstrual hygiene and they can dispose of the menstrual pads in a proper way than a private school. On an average 60 (100 %) of 60 children in the government school reported that Menstrual hygiene is good. In comparison, 30 (50%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Menstrual hygiene is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Menstrual hygiene related (M=10.90) compared to private schools (M=3.50). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Menstrual hygiene related was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above, the Menstrual hygiene related is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the Pad Dispenser and Pad Incinerator for students to have a better learning experience.

3.3.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	4.67	4.37
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	5.00	3.67
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	4.97	4.43
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.13	9.20
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	5.30	6.03
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	8.70	8.73
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.57	9.03
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.63	9.10
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	8.40	9.33
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	8.70	8.93
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	8.50	8.73
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	7.80	8.63
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.60	8.97
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.40	8.90
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	7.80	8.63
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	8.60	8.97
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	7.93	8.97
A135	Lower caste students study well	6.90	6.93
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.40	8.30
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	8.07	8.93
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	8.23	9.10
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	8.70	8.93
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.13	8.73
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	8.37	8.87
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	7.93	8.43

	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	4.63	3.73
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	7.93	8.50
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.63	9.37
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	8.87	9.60
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	9.07	9.80
A150	Differently Abled students study well	9.10	9.70
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	8.90	9.87

3.3.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	15.60	16.45	0.037	Yes
Caste discrimination free environment	27.85	30.20	0.003	Yes
Disability discrimination free environment	6.93	6.03	0.348	No
Religion discrimination free environment	12.53	13.38	0.014	Yes
Average	15.7275	16.515		
In kadapa district, the discrimination free environment is higher in the private school compared to the government schools. A significant difference has been observed in the gender, caste and religious discrimination free environment between the government and private schools.				

3.3.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement 'Girls are discriminated against based on gender' is reported higher by the private school students 6.03 while the government schools reported at 5.30. This indicates that girls feel that there is gender discrimination in their schools. However, it is observed the private schools students have reported higher (score = 9.03) on taking classroom leadership roles compared to government school students (score = 8.57)

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better gender discrimination free environment (M=16.45) compared to government schools (M=15.60). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.037$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported higher by the private school students (score = 8.90) compared to government school students (score = 8.40). The private schools also reported higher (score = 8.63) on teachers treating the lower caste students well compared to government schools (score = 7.80). Even leadership roles for lower caste students are reported higher (score = 8.97) in the private school compared to government school (score = 8.60).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment (M=30.20) compared to government schools (M=27.85). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' is reported higher (score = 9.37) by the private school students compared to government school (score = 8.00). With regard to access to school facilities by the disabled students is reported higher (score = 9.60) by government school students compared to private school students (score = 8.50).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment (M=6.93) compared to private schools (M=6.03). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.348$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The private school students reported higher (score = 9.10) on healthy relationships among classmates based on religion compared to government school students (Score = 8.23). The private schools students reported higher (score = 8.93) on tearement of students without discrimination based on gender compared to government schools (score = 8.70)

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment (M=13.38) compared to government schools (M=12.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.014$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	28.22	30.18	0.011	Yes
Caste Inclusion	35.50	37.82	0.014	Yes
Religion Inclusion	24.72	26.50	0.007	Yes
Disability Inclusion	19.60	20.68	0.661	No
Average	27.01	28.795		
In kadapa district, among the study population private school students reported that their schools are more inclusive compared to the government schools students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on gender, caste and religious inclusion . With respect to the disability under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

3.3.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement 'My school is a safe place for a girl to study' is reported higher (score = 9.20) by private school students compared to government school students (score = 8.13). On treatment by teachers based on gender, the private school students reported higher scores (score = 9.33) compared to government school students (score = 8.40). Similar trend has been seen in the ability to share problems and seek help from teachers is reported higher (score = 8.93) by private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have higher gender inclusion (M=30.18) compared to government schools (M=28.22). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.011$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

Private schools students have reported higher (score = 8.63) on good treatment of lower caste students by teachers compared to government school (score = 7.80). The private school students reported higher (score =8.63) on easy access to school facilities irrespective of caste compared to government school students (score = 7.80).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher caste inclusion (M=37.82) compared to government schools (M=35.50). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.014$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The private school students feel that their teachers have higher tolerance towards religion (score = 8.43) whereas the government schools students reported the same at 7.93. It is also the private school who feel that they have more freedom to follow any religion (score = 8.73) compared to government school students (8.13).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=26.50) compared to government schools (M=24.72). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.007$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The private school students reported that disabled students have better access to the facilities at the school (score = 8.50) compared to government schools (score = 7.93). The private school students feel that the disabled students can study well (score = 9.70) and can complete school education (score = 9.87), whereas the government school students reported lower at 9.10 and 8.90 respectively.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher disability inclusion (M=20.68) compared to government schools (M=19.60). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.661$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL FROM HOME

		GOVERNMENT					PRIVATE				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	20	16	10	1	13	2	18	18	4	18
	%	16.7	13.3	8.3	0.8	10.8	1.7	15	15	3.3	15
Distance to Higher education school	N	25	12	21	1	1	23	17	5	4	11
	%	20.8	10	17.5	0.8	0.8	19.2	14.2	4.2	3.3	9.2

Majority (38.3) of the government students come from distances of less than 6 kilometers while only 31.7% of the students in private schools come from distance of less than 6 kilometers. 15% of the students in the private schools come from distances more than 10 kilometers which is reported as 10.8% in government schools.

Majority of the students in government schools (20.8) have their higher education schools at distances less than 1 kilometer. Similarly, the majority of the students in private schools (19.2%) have their higher education schools at distances less than 1 kilometer and 14.2% have their higher education schools at distances of 1 to 3 kilometers. About 17.5% of the government school students have their higher education schools at distances of 4 to 6 kilometers. About 9.2% of the students in private schools have their higher education schools at distances more than 10 kilometers. About ~25% of the students need to travel more than 3 kilometers to access a higher education school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are more accessible (M=5.68) compared to government schools (M=4.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.005$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL AND DRINKING WATER

3.3.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CLEAN DRINKING WATER	N	54	6	58	2
	%	45	5	48.3	1.7
PROVIDE TUMBLER/ GLASS TO DRINK	N	50	4	51	7
	%	44.6	3.6	45.6	6.2

45% of the students in government schools have reported that the school provides clean drinking water. 48.3% of private school students reported that the schools provide safe drinking water. A similar percentage of students in both the schools have reported that the schools provide a tumbler or a glass to drink.

3.3.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	44	39.3	13	11.6
RO Water	10	8.9	22	19.6
Water Can	0	0	23	20.5
Water Dispenser	0	0	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

In government schools tap water and RO water is defined as the sources of the water with 39.3% and 8.9% respectively. In private schools tap water, RO water and water can were reported as sources of water with 11.6%, 19.6%, and 20.5% respectively. Majority of the students in the private schools reported water can as drinking water source whereas the government school students (39.3%) reported tap water as drinking water source.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are better drinking water facilities (M=4.22) compared to government schools (M=3.13). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.2.4.3 .ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL : QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	4	38	18
	%	6.7	63.3	30

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	7	43	10
	%	11.7	71.7	16.6

63.3% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal and 30% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (71.7%) of the students reported that the number of servings is twice and 16.6 reported the number of serving is unlimited.

3.3.2.4.4 .ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL : QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	3	1	1	49	6
	%	5	1.7	1.7	81.6	10

Food quality is reported as good by the majority of the students (81.6%) followed by 10% of the students reporting the quality of food as very good. 5% of the students reported that the good quality is bad.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	59	1
	%	98.3	1.7
Hygienic kitchen	N	51	9
	%	85	15
Cooked hygienically	N	57	3
	%	95	5

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 98.3% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 85% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 95% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

3.3.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	16	44
	%	26.7	73.3
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	10	50
	%	16.7	83.3
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	16	44
	%	26.7	73.3
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	8	52
	%	13.3	86.7

Majority of the students reported that there is no discrimination in meal accessibility. 26.7% of the students have seen gender discrimination in serving the food and in the quantity of the food.

3.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.53	9.20
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	8.57	9.27
A154	I feel secured when in school	8.77	9.17
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	8.37	9.20
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.33	9.30
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.43	9.20
A158	I feel lonely in school	6.33	5.27
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.50	9.10
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.67	9.10
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	5.93	6.17
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.30	8.50
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	5.87	6.70
A164	I can talk to boys	8.50	9.07
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.43	8.73
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.67	9.30
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	8.63	9.30
A168	I accept my teachers	8.83	9.33
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.77	9.27
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	8.57	9.10
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	8.67	9.17
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	8.80	9.30
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.37	9.37
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.50	9.23
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	7.93	8.27
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	7.87	8.63
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.10	8.80
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.60	9.33
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	8.47	9.37

A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	8.97	9.37
A181	Education empowers me	8.63	9.43
A182	Education helps develop my personality	8.87	9.30
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	8.50	9.40
A184	Education helps me become creative	8.53	9.40
A185	Education improves quality of life	8.47	9.27
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	8.60	9.13

3.3.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

The level of agreement of the statement 'I feel happy to study in this school' is reported higher by the private schools (score = 9.20 compared to the government schools (score = 8.53). Private school students feel more proud to be in school (score = 9.30) compared to government school students (score = 8.33). Private school students also mentioned that their classmates respect them for who they are (score = 9.20) compared to government school students (score = 8.43).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=54.62) compared to government schools (M=51.55). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was statistically significant, $p = 0.019$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

Private school students agreed more to the statement 'My teachers are concerned and enquire about my wellbeing' (score = 9.30) compared to government school students (score = 8.67). The private school students also mentioned that their teacher inspires them (score = 9.27) compared to government school students (score = 8.77). With regard to teachers supporting beyond class hours, the private school students have reported higher (score = 9.37) compared to government school students (score = 8.37).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools have a better quality of education (M=63.57) compared to government schools (M=59.37). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.013$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

The level of agreement on the statement 'Girls should be educated' is scored higher by private school students (score = 9.37) compared to government school (score = 8.47). Private school students strongly believe that education helps them develop new skills (score = 9.40) and become creative (score = 9.40) compared to the government who scored 8.50, 8.53 respectively.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students feel education is relevant (M=37.33) compared to government schools (M=34.52). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.008$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.30	4.17	0.312	No
Skill Development	1.35	1.17	0.022	Yes
Gender equality	5.90	6.18	0.114	No
Inclusion of third gender	1.27	1.27	1.0	No
Average	3.20	3.19		
In Kadapa district, among the study population government school students reported that the education system is adaptable to the changing needs of the society and inclusive. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private in aspects of skill development, whereas there were no statistical significance in the areas of online education, gender equality and inclusion of third gender.				

3.3.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

3.3.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & digital mode of education		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	15	45	17	43
	%	12.5	37.5	14.2	35.8
Blended mode of education	N	17	43	17	43
	%	14.2	35.8	14.2	35.8
Digital classroom teaching	N	26	34	34	26
	%	21.7	28.3	28.3	21.7

Majority of the students in private school (35.8%) and government school (37.5%) reported that online mode of education is not adaptable. Similarly the students reported that blended mode of education is also not adaptable with 35.8% of students from each type of school. Private schools students indicated digital classroom teaching is adaptable in their school (28.3%) compared to government school (21.7%).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools are more adaptable to online & digital modes of education (M=4.30) compared to private schools (M=4.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to online & digital mode of education was statistically not significant, $p = 0.312$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	39	21	50	10
	%	32.5	17.5	41.7	8.3

41.7% of the private school students reported that education at their school is also helping them for skill development while only 32.5% of the government schools students reported.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools are more adaptable to online & digital modes of education (M=1.35) compared to private schools (M=1.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically significant, $p = 0.022$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	49	11	53	7
	%	40.8	9.2	44.2	5.8
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same Sex School Adaptable	N	34	26	13	47
	%	28.3	21.7	10.8	39.2
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	48	12	47	13
	%	40	10	39.2	10.8

44.2% of the students in the private school have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. In comparison, 40.8% of the students in government schools reported gender equality is adaptable in their school. Majority of the students in the private school (39.2%) feel that teachers of the opposite gender are not adaptable. A similar percentage of students in government school and private school feels that gender equality contributes to societal development.

3.3.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOL TYPE

IN WHICH TYPE OF SCHOOL, GENDER EQUALITY IS ADAPTABILITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	15	12.5	9	7.5
Co- Ed School	26	21.7	38	31.7
Both	18	15.0	13	10.8
None	1	0.8	0	0

Students reported that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools while 31.7% of the students in private schools reported this, only 21.7% of the students in government schools reported on this. 15% of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in any type of school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are more adaptable to gender equality (M=6.18) compared to private schools (M=5.90). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to gender equality was statistically not significant, $p = 0.114$, 95% confidence interval.

3.3.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER BE ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	44	16	44	16
	%	36.7	13.3	36.7	13.3

A similar percentage of students in government and private schools feel that third gender should be included. As the responses are the same in this case indicating that there is no difference between government school and private schools, there is no need to do a P test.

3.3.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	44	16	41	19
	%	36.7	13.3	34.2	15.8
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	52	8	59	1
	%	43.3	6.7	49.2	0.8
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	60	0	49	11
	%	50	0	40.8	9.2
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	9	51	53	7
	%	7.5	42.5	44.2	5.8
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	39	21	52	8
	%	32.5	17.5	43.3	6.7
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	25	35	21	39
	%	20.8	29.2	17.5	32.5
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	17	43	13	47
	%	14.2	35.8	10.8	39.2
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	3	57	2	58
	%	2.5	47.5	1.7	48.3
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	30	30	24	36
	%	25	25	20	30

Students in both the schools reported that RTE is enforced in their schools (government - 36.7% and private - 34.2%). Students feel that RTE promotes gender equality. Private school students are aware of the capitation fees during admission (44.2%). Most of the students are not aware of the denial of admission under RTE (government - 29.2% and private - 32.5%). Even on the mental harassment and physical punishment most of the students are not aware.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students are more aware of RTE (M=6.90) compared to government schools (M=6.45). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to RTE was statistically significant, $p = 0.012$, 95% confidence interval.

3.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN VISAKHAPATNAM, VIZIANAGARAM AND KADAPA DISTRICTS

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant
AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	2.78	3.72	2.87	0	Yes		2.77	3.08	3.22	0.002	Yes
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	15.47	17.0	17.95	0	Yes		11.55	14.30	15.20	0	Yes
SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	12.67	13.17	13.83	0.257	No		14.50	18.23	15.33	0	Yes
CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	22.55	23.82	24.0	0	Yes		22.13	23.33	23.22	0	Yes
EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRA	7.57	8.37	8.65	0	Yes		5.98	9.0	8.17	0	Yes
DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRA	4.78	8.37	7.50	0	Yes		2.87	2.57	6.60	0	Yes
MANDATORY	5.85	5.90	6.0	0.240	No		4.27	6.0	6.0	0	Yes
SUPPORTING RESOURCE	1.15	4.17	4.20	0	Yes		0.80	0	2.55	0	Yes
FREEBIES	5.93	7.78	8.92	0	Yes		2.30	3.80	7.15	0	Yes
TEACHING STAFF	11.03	11.32	11.30	0.471	No		11.77	11.45	12.0	0.001	Yes

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant
EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	3.50	2.40	5.95	0	Yes		4.55	4.78	4.35	0.426	No
ACADEMIC INFRA	12.25	11.77	7.57	0.012	Yes		3.93	12.50	8.97	0	Yes
DIGITAL LEARNING INFRA	4.70	2.15	0	0	Yes		0.80	3.80	2.60	0	Yes
TRANSPORT FACILITIES	3.97	3.47	4.0	0	Yes		3.73	3.05	3.30	0	Yes
BUILDING	14.73	16.72	14.70	0	Yes		14.33	16.18	15.38	0	Yes
PRIVACY RELATED INFRA	7.82	8.20	8.15	0.288	No		4.47	7.68	6.83	0	Yes
BASIC HYGIENE	10.87	10.48	11.93	0	Yes		9.92	8.17	10.30	0	Yes
MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED	7.47	9.55	10.90	0	Yes		3.0	0.55	3.50	0	Yes
GENDER	15.57	16.43	15.60	0.059	No		14.45	16.63	16.45	0	Yes
CASTE	30.60	31.73	27.85	0	Yes		30.77	32.37	30.20	0.003	Yes
DISABILITY	1.80	6.12	6.93	0	Yes		0.67	1.57	6.03	0	Yes
RELIGION	13.08	13.78	12.53	0.001	Yes		13.18	14.08	13.38	0.002	Yes
GENDER	29.57	30.67	28.22	0.001	Yes		27.93	31.0	30.18	0	Yes

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant
CASTE	36.87	39.55	35.50	0	Yes		36.85	38.82	37.82	0.059	No
RELIGION	24.32	26.93	24.72	0	Yes		24.55	27.28	26.50	0	Yes
DISABILITY	7.30	19.02	20.68	0	Yes		4.67	6.77	19.60	0	Yes
DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	4.98	8.02	4.53	0	Yes		5.52	5.37	5.68	0.579	No
QUANTITY OF FOOD	5.17	4.85	4.28	0	Yes		0	0	0	NA	NA
QUALITY OF FOOD	7.70	7.03	7.12	0	Yes		0	0	0	NA	NA
DRINKING WATER	4.42	3.33	3.13	0	Yes		3.73	3.20	4.22	0	Yes
CANTEEN	2.0	2.0	2.0	NA	NA		2.90	2.0	2.0	0	Yes
DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	7.98	7.37	7.17	0.001	Yes		0	0	0	NA	NA
GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY	53.38	58.23	51.55	0	Yes		53.23	58.42	54.62	0	Yes
QUALITY OF EDUCATION	60.20	64.53	59.37	0	Yes		58.37	64.53	63.57	0	Yes
RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION	38.45	39.43	34.52	0	Yes		37.38	39.35	37.33	0.001	Yes
ONLINE	4.17	4.78	4.30	0	Yes		4.28	4.32	4.17	0.555	No

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Visakhapatnam (Mean)	Vizianagaram (Mean)	Kadapa (Mean)	P Value	Significant

SKILL DEVELOPMENT	1.48	1.70	1.35	0	Yes		1.78	1.70	1.17	0	Yes
GENDER EQUALITY	5.0	4.58	5.90	0	Yes		5.07	4.45	6.18	0	Yes
INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	1.55	1.67	1.27	0	Yes		1.90	1.82	1.27	0	Yes
RTE	6.07	7.03	6.45	0	Yes		6.52	6.03	6.90	0	Yes

CHAPTER IV

KERELA

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 WAYANAD

4.1 WAYANAD DISTRICT

4.1.1 AVAILABILITY

4.1.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	33	27	27	33
	%	27.5	22.5	22.5	27.5
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	45	15	54	6
	%	37.5	12.5	45.0	15.0

Majority of the students reported that the schools are present in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 50% (i.e. 27.5% of the students in government and 22.5% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 82% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat. 27% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools are more available ($M = 2.70$) compared to private schools ($M = 2.65$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p = 0.681$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	20.37	15.40	0	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	19.27	18.17	0.264	No
Classroom infrastructure	25.98	22.10	0	Yes
Extra curricular infrastructure	9.60	8.48	0.024	Yes
Disable friendly infrastructure	9.67	7.27	0	Yes
Average	16.97	14.28		
In Wayanad District, safe infrastructure is better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the Safety related infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to safe infrastructure.				

4.1.1.2.1 BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	33.3	20	16.7	0	0.0	4	3.3	38	31.7	18	15.0
Proper Roofing	1	0.8	2	1.7	33	27.5	24	20.0	0	0.0	2	1.7	35	29.2	23	19.2
Proper Flooring	0	0.0	1	0.8	33	27.5	26	21.7	0	0.0	2	1.7	24	20.0	34	28.3
Electricity	0	0.0	0	0.0	28	23.3	32	26.7	5	4.2	18	15.0	25	20.8	12	10.0
Auditorium	0	0.0	2	1.7	28	23.3	30	25.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	15	12.5	44	36.7
Kitchen	0	0.0	3	2.5	29	24.2	28	23.3	1	0.8	5	4.2	45	37.5	9	7.5

On an average, 31.8 (53%) out of 60 students in Government schools reported that the Building infrastructure is good, and 30.3 (50%) of students in Private schools have reported that the building infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools ($M=2.70$) and Private Schools schools ($M=2.65$) are better in building infrastructure. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school building infrastructure was statistically insignificant, $p = 0.68$.

From the above data, the Building Infrastructure is good for both Government schools and Private schools. It is recommended to have continuous maintenance of the provided facilities.

4.1.1.2.2 SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	2	1.7	4	3.3	37	30.8	17	14.2	0	0.0	11	9.2	19	15.8	30	25.0
Fire Extinguisher	1	0.8	3	2.5	14	11.7	42	35.0	1	0.8	2	1.7	36	30.0	21	17.5
First Aid Box	1	0.8	2	1.7	31	25.8	26	21.7	0	0.0	4	3.3	20	16.7	36	30.0
Properly Laid Road	0	0.0	3	2.5	34	28.3	23	19.2	2	1.7	7	5.8	34	28.3	17	14.2
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	34.2	19	15.8	1	0.8	4	3.3	44	36.7	11	9.2
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	21.7	34	28.3	1	0.8	4	3.3	44	36.7	11	9.2
CCTV	2	1.7	3	2.5	22	18.3	33	27.5	2	1.7	4	3.3	19	15.8	35	29.2

On an average 30.8 (51)% out of 60 children in the private schools reported the Safety infrastructure is good. In comparison 27.7 (46%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the safety infrastructure is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Private Schools ($M=15.40$) are better in safe infrastructure compared to Government schools ($M=20.37$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school safety infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, it shows that private schools have good safety infrastructure compared to government schools. Thus, Government schools can take effective measures in bringing up better safety infrastructure.

4.1.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	0	0.0	1	0.8	26	21.7	33	27.5	0	0.0	11	9.2	27	22.5	22	18.3
Blackboard	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	24.2	31	25.8	4	3.3	11	9.2	24	20.0	21	17.5
Bench	0	0.0	1	0.8	33	27.5	26	21.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	31	25.8	13	10.8
Fan	0	0.0	2	1.7	42	35.0	16	13.3	11	9.2	9	7.5	28	23.3	12	10.0
Light	1	0.8	1	0.8	27	22.5	31	25.8	3	2.5	8	6.7	34	28.3	15	12.5
Door	0	0.0	1	0.8	34	28.3	25	20.8	5	4.2	7	5.8	31	25.8	17	14.2
Window	0	0.0	4	3.3	35	29.2	21	17.5	2	1.7	10	8.3	22	18.3	26	21.7
Ventilation	0	0.0	1	0.8	26	21.7	33	27.5	1	0.8	6	5.0	13	10.8	40	33.3

On an average, 31.5 (53%) out of 60 students in Government schools reported that the classroom infrastructure is good. Whereas, 26.25 (44%) out of 60 students in Private schools have reported that the classroom infrastructure is Good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better (M=25.98) compared to Private Schools (M=22.10). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school Classroom infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Classroom infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to take necessary measures to improve the standard and quality of the classroom infrastructure.

4.1.1.2.4 EXTRA-CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	1	0.8	0	0.0	28	23.3	31	25.8	2	1.7	4	3.3	31	25.8	23	19.2
Sports Equipments	2	1.7	1	0.8	29	24.2	28	23.3	7	5.8	7	5.8	29	24.2	17	14.2
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0.0	3	2.5	42	35.0	15	12.5	2	1.7	3	2.5	11	9.2	44	36.7

Sports equipment are reported as good by 24.2% of students in government schools and 24.2% of the students in private schools. The extracurricular activities are reported very good by private schools 36.7% of students.

On average (25.8%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the playground is very good. In comparison, (19.2%) out of 60 children in private schools have reported the playground is very good.

From the data above, government schools are good in extracurricular facilities (Mean = 9.60) compared to private schools (Mean = 8.48). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to Extra-Curricular Infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.024$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.1.2.5 DISABLE FRIENDLY

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	15.8	41	34.2	0	0.0	1	0.8	25	20.8	34	28.3
Ramps	0	0.0	0	0.0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0.0	2	1.7	56	46.7	2	1.7
Hand Rails	0	0.0	0	0.0	42	35.0	18	15.0	1	0.8		2.5	36	30.0	20	16.7

On average, 30.1% of students in private schools reported that the facilities provided for Disabled are good, and 26.7% of students in government schools reported that the facilities provided for Disabled are very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Government schools have better (M=9.67) compared to Private Schools schools (M=7.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Disable Friendly infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Disabled Friendly Infrastructure is good in both government and private. However, both the Private and government schools can take adequate measures to improve the Disabled Friendly Infrastructure.

4.1.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	3.97	5.62	0.001	Yes
Supportive academic resources	3.87	4.45	0.159	No
Freebies supporting academics	4.13	4.85	0.351	No
Teaching Staff	13.80	13.55	0.537	No
Extra Curricular Staff	5.62	4.52	0.002	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	29.52	22.12	0	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	9.52	6.08	0	Yes
Average	10.06	8.74		
In Wayanad District, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the Supportive academic resources, Freebies supporting academics and Teaching Staff, which include extra tuition and scholarships, statistically there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard.				

4.1.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	1	0.8	0	0.0	11	9.2	48	40.0	1	0.8	3	2.5	10	8.3	46	38.3
Notebooks	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.8	53	44.2

On an average 49.5 (83%) out of 60 children, both in the government school and private school have reported that the mandatory academic resources for students are very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government schools (M=3.97) and private schools (M=2.82) have better academic resources. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic resources was statistically significant, $p = 0.01$, 95% confidence interval

From the data above, the mandatory academic resources are good in both government and private schools.

4.1.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	18.3	38	31.7	0	0.0	5	4.2	17	14.2	38	31.7
Extra Tuition	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	6.7	52	43.3	1	0.8	2	1.7	8	6.7	49	40.8

On an average 45 (75%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the supporting resources for students are very good. In comparison, only 12.5 (21%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the supporting resources for students are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better supporting resources (M=3.87) compared to private schools (M=4.45). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to supporting resources was statistically significant, $p = 0.15$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the supporting resources for students are good in government schools compared to private schools. Private schools can improve the scholarships for students.

4.1.1.3.3 FREEBIES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0.0	6	5.0	7	5.8	47	39.2	0	0.0	3	2.5	25	20.8	32	26.7
Stationary	0	0.0	1	0.8	4	3.3	55	45.8	3	2.5	0	0.0	3	2.5	54	45.0
Bag	0	0.0	0	0.0	52	43.3	8	6.7	1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	58	48.3
Bicycle	3	2.5	3	2.5	53	44.2	1	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	49.2

On an average 50.75 (85%) out of 60 children in the private school rated that the freebies provided are very good. In comparison, only 27.75 (46%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that freebies provided are very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools are better in providing freebies (M=4.85) compared to government schools (M= 4.13). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies was statistically significant, $p = 0.35$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, private schools are good at providing freebies for students compared to government schools. The government schools can initiate steps to provide freebies for students, which is also a form of a motivation.

4.1.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	26.7	28	23.3	2	1.7	1	0.8	25	20.8	32	26.7
Teacher for each Subject	0	0.0	1	0.8	30	25.0	29	24.2	3	2.5	3	2.5	19	15.8	35	29.2
Male Teachers	0	0.0	1	0.8	33	27.5	26	21.7	1	0.8	9	7.5	14	11.7	36	30.0
Female Teachers	0	0.0	1	0.8	31	25.8	28	23.3	4	3.3	4	3.3	21	17.5	31	25.8

4.1.1.3.5 EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0.0	4	3.3	26	21.7	30	25.0	4	3.3	1	0.8	16	13.3	39	32.5
School Counsellor	1	0.8	0	0.0	18	15.0	41	34.2	1	0.8	2	1.7	7	5.8	50	41.7

On an average 44.5 (74%) out of 60 children in the private school reported that the staff for extra-curricular is very good. In comparison, only 35.5 (59%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the extra curricular staff is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better staff for extra curricular ($M = 4.52$) compared to government schools ($M = 5.62$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extra-curricular staff was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the extra-curricular staff is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to take initiatives in bringing up the Extra-curricular staff.

4.1.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	3	2.5	11	9.2	24	20.0	22	18.3	4	3.3	3	2.5	40	33.3	13	10.8
Biological Specimens	3	2.5	2	1.7	32	26.7	23	19.2	5	4.2	7	5.8	37	30.8	11	9.2
Physics Lab	3	2.5	6	5.0	31	25.8	20	16.7	8	6.7	9	7.5	31	25.8	12	10.0
Physics Instruments	0	0.0	3	2.5	35	29.2	22	18.3	3	2.5	6	5.0	36	30.0	15	12.5
Chemistry Lab	4	3.3	1	0.8	33	27.5	22	18.3	3	2.5	4	3.3	40	33.3	13	10.8

Chemicals & Equipments	3	2.5	1	0.8	36	30.0	20	16.7	1	0.8	0	0.0	20	16.7	39	32.5
Library	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	25.8	29	24.2	1	0.8	13	10.8	18	15.0	28	23.3
Computer Lab	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	20.0	36	30.0	4	3.3	11	9.2	15	12.5	30	25.0
Computers	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	24.2	31	25.8	0	0.0	16	13.3	17	14.2	27	22.5

On an average 35.5 (51%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the academic infrastructure is good. In comparison, 28.2 (47%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the infrastructure for academics is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better infrastructure for academics (M=29.52) compared to private schools (M=22.12). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the academic infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to improve the standard of the academic infrastructure and also government schools need to make sure to maintain the facilities properly.

4.1.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0.0	1	0.8	31	25.8	28	23.3	12	10.0	4	3.3	25	20.8	19	15.8
Smart Classroom	0	0.0	1	0.8	39	32.5	20	16.7	19	15.8	2	1.7	11	9.2	28	23.3

On an average, 35 (58%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the infrastructure for Digital learning is good. In comparison, 30.5 (50%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the Digital learning facilities are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Digital Learning facilities (M=9.52) compared to private schools (M=6.08). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to digital learning infra was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the digital learning infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to take effective measures in bringing up and also to maintain the standard of Digital learning infrastructure, which can enhance the education system of the students.

4.1.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	37	30.8	23	19.2	59	49.2	1	0.8
PROVIDED BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	17	14.2	43	35.8	19	15.8	41	34.2

49.2 % of students in private schools reported that schools have it own transport facility compared to government schools. It is understood from the data, that bus passes are not provided to private or government school children.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better transportation facilities (M=2.87) compared to private schools (M=3.73). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to transportation facilities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	15.95	12.02	0	Yes
Privacy related infra	8.20	5.55	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	12.15	9.48	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	11.13	8.02	0	Yes
Average	11.85	8.76		
In Wayanad District, the government schools have better sanitation facilities compared to private schools. There is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Bathrooms with privacy related infrastructure like proper latches, slides and privacy walls are better in private schools compare to in government schools.				

4.1.1.5.1 BUILDING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0.0	3	2.5	32	26.7	25	20.8	5	4.2	9	7.5	32	26.7	14	11.7
Proper Flooring	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	28.3	26	21.7	2	1.7	19	15.8	14	11.7	25	20.8
Taps	0	0.0	2	1.7	36	30.0	22	18.3	5	4.2	12	10.0	25	20.8	18	15.0
Doors	0	0.0	9	7.5	32	26.7	19	15.8	12	10.0	16	13.3	12	10.0	20	16.7
Exhaust Fan	0	0.0	1	0.8	53	44.2	6	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	60	50.0
Lights	1	0.8	1	0.8	45	37.5	13	10.8	10	8.3	7	5.8	4	3.3	39	32.5

On an average, 38.6 (64%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the building provided for sanitation is good. In comparison, only 14.5 (24%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the building for sanitation is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better infrastructure for sanitation (M= 15.95) compared to private schools (M= 12.02). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to facilities provided for sanitation was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the facilities provided for sanitation are good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the measures to bring up the necessary facilities for sanitation purposes and also both private and government schools need to maintain the required standard of the facilities.

4.1.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	1	0.8	14	11.7	40	33.3	5	4.2	9	7.5	10	8.3	6	5.0	35	29.2
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0.0	6	5.0	36	30.0	18	15.0	4	3.3	7	5.8	9	7.5	40	33.3
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	1	0.8	2	1.7	36	30.0	21	17.5	1	0.8	7	5.8	4	3.3	48	40.0

On an average, 41 (68%) out of 60 children in the private school reported that the Infrastructure provided for privacy is very good. Whereas, 37.3 (62%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the Infrastructure provided for privacy is good. However, 8 (13%) out of 60 private school students report that the facilities related to privacy are poor whereas 4.6 (8%) out of 60 private school students report that the facilities related to Privacy are very poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better facilities provided for Privacy purposes (M= 8.20) compared to private schools (M= 5.55). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to infrastructure related to privacy was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, Privacy related infrastructure is very good in private schools. The government schools need to work on the measures to bring up the necessary infrastructure related to privacy and also to maintain the required standard of the facilities.

4.1.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Doors	0	0.0	9	7.5	32	26.7	19	15.8	12	10.0	16	13.3	12	10.0	20	16.7
Buckets	0	0.0	5	4.2	37	30.8	18	15.0	9	7.5	25	20.8	10	8.3	16	13.3
Jugs	3	2.5	2	1.7	36	30.0	19	15.8	4	3.3	18	15.0	8	6.7	30	25.0
Wash Basin	0	0.0	3	2.5	36	30.0	21	17.5	0	0.0	9	7.5	13	10.8	38	31.7

On an average 35.25 (59%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the facilities for Basic Hygiene are good. In comparison, 26 (43.3%) out of 60 children in private schools said that the facilities for Basic Hygiene are very good. 10.75 (18%) out of 60 children in private schools said that the facilities for Basic Hygiene are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that the government schools have better facilities for basic hygiene (M= 12.15) compared to private schools (M= 9.48). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to facilities related to basic hygiene was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the facilities provided for the basic hygiene of the children are good in Government schools compared to Private schools. The Private schools need to work on the measures to bring up the necessary basic hygiene related facilities and also to maintain the required standard of the facilities.

4.1.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0.0	4	3.3	38	31.7	18	15.0	3	2.5	4	3.3	4	3.3	49	40.8
Pad Dispenser	2	1.7	7	5.8	28	23.3	23	19.2	5	4.2	6	5.0	5	4.2	44	36.7
Pad Incinerator	3	2.5	8	6.7	32	26.7	17	14.2	5	4.2	4	3.3	6	5.0	45	37.5
Pad Disposal Bin	1	0.8	3	2.5	39	32.5	17	14.2	6	5.0	4	3.3	6	5.0	44	36.7

On an average 45.5 (75.8%) out of 60 private school students report that the facilities related to Menstrual Hygiene are very good whereas, 34.25 (57%) out of 60 children in the government school said that the facilities related to Menstrual Hygiene are good. However, 5.5 (9%) out of 60 government school students report that the facilities related to Menstrual Hygiene are poor whereas 4.75 (8%) out of 60 private school students report that the facilities related to Menstrual Hygiene are very poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better facilities for Menstrual Hygiene (M= 11.13) compared to private schools (M= 8.02). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to facilities related to Menstrual Hygiene was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the facilities provided for Menstrual Hygiene are very good in Private schools compared to government schools. But, private schools need to maintain the quality of the infrastructure which can benefit the health and hygiene of girl children. Likewise, government schools need to take adequate measures in bringing up the necessary menstrual hygiene-related facilities.

4.1.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	5.00	5.53
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	2.60	3.00
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.67	2.73
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.80	9.23
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	4.60	4.27
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	8.93	8.07
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.87	9.20
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	7.97	8.33
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	8.77	7.97
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	9.07	8.43
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		

A130	School accepts students from all castes	9.43	9.60
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	9.37	8.40
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.73	9.40
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.37	9.10
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	9.37	8.40
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	8.73	9.40
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	4.17	3.07
A135	Lower caste students study well	6.67	6.93
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	7.27	8.20
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	9.17	9.43
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	9.10	9.37
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	9.00	8.97
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.83	9.23
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	9.27	8.97
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	7.60	6.00
	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	3.93	2.93
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	9.23	8.27
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.20	8.47
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	9.33	9.50
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	8.07	8.20
A150	Differently Abled students study well	6.90	6.73
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	8.03	6.87

4.1.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination-free environment	14.77	14.85	0.864	No
Caste discrimination-free environment	28.52	28.28	0.741	No
Disability discrimination-free environment	8.68	5.95	0.004	Yes
Religion discrimination-free environment	13.22	13.78	0.155	No
Average	16.29	15.71		
In Wayanad District, the discrimination-free environment is higher in the government schools compared to private schools. A significant difference has been observed in the disability discrimination-free environment between the government and private schools. All the other measures under discrimination-free environment have no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

4.1.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement ‘Girls are discriminated against based on gender’ is lower at 4.60 and 4.27 respectively which means that girls feel that there is no discrimination based on gender in their schools. Though the students reported that they are not discriminated against based on gender, it is observed that access to sports equipment is equal among both private school students and government schools. class leadership roles are lower in government school students compared to the private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both the government schools (M=14.77) and private schools (M=14.85) almost have an equal gender discrimination free environment. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically insignificant, $p = 0.864$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement ‘Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination’ was reported higher in private school students than government school. The level of agreement is at 8.37 by government school students and at 9.10 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported lower at 9.03 compared to students from private schools at 9.10. On the treatment of lower caste students by the teachers, the students from private schools rated higher at 9.40 compared to government schools at 8.73. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools and government schools have a equal caste discrimination free environment (M=28.22) compared to government schools (M=28.52). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.741$, 95% confidence interval

4.1.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was almost equal in private schools at 8.47 compared to government schools 8.20. However, access to school facilities have been reported higher by the government schools students at 9.23 compared to private schools at 8.27.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment (M=8.68) compared to private schools (M=5.29). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.004$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and in treatment of students based on religion, government schools are higher than private schools. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported higher at 9.23 by private school students compared to 8.83 by government school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment (M=13.78) compared to government schools (M=13.22). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that there is no difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.115$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	27.83	27.58	0.742	No
Caste Inclusion	35.35	35.85	0.581	No
Religion Inclusion	25.98	25.97	0.982	No
Disability Inclusion	23.98	17.87	0.006	Yes
Average	28.29	26.81		

In Wayanad District, among the study population, government school students reported that their schools are more inclusive compared to the private schools students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Disability inclusion. With respect to the other measures under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.

4.1.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement 'My school is a safe place for a girl to study' is higher in private schools at 9.23 than government school 8.80. The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 8.77) compared to private school students (Score = 7.97). The government school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score =9.07) compared to private school students (score = 8.43). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion ($M=27.83$.) compared to private schools ($M=27.58$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that there is no significant difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.742$, 95% confidence interval

4.1.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A different level of agreement is reported in the statement 'Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles' while the government school students rated 8.73, the private school students rated 9.40. A similar number of the students from both the schools feel that the disabled students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion ($M=35.35$) compared to private schools ($M=35.85$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.581$, 95% confidence interval

4.1.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' was reported higher by private schools at 9.23 compared to government schools which reported at 8.83. Both the school children reported similar children treated without religious discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher religious inclusion ($M=25.98$) compared to private schools ($M=24.32$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.982$, 95% confidence interval

4.1.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The private schools rate higher on the statement 'Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers' at 9.50 compared to government school children at 9.33. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students study well (score = 6.90) and disabled students can complete school education (Score - 8.03). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion ($M=23.98$) compared to private schools ($M=17.87$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.006$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.3 DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		Government					Private				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	12	25	8	5	10	7	25	9	11	8
	%	10.0	20.8	8	5	10	5.8	20.8	7.5	9.2	6.7
Distance to Higher education school	N	8	19	11	8	14	4	20	14	8	14
	%	6.7	15.8	9.2	6.7	11.7	3.3	16.7	11.7	6.7	11.7

Majority of the students (20.8%) both in the government school and 20.8% private schools come from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometers. The next great part of the students in government schools (10%) of them comes from a distance of less than 1 kilometre and with regard to private schools, (9.2%) of the students come from a distance of 7 - 9 kilometres. With regard to higher education, the majority of the students (15.8%) reported that higher education is accessible from a distance of 1-3 kilometres. Whereas, the majority (16.7%) of the students in private schools reported that higher education school is accessible within a distance of 1-3 kilometres. From the data above, it is understood that the schools for current education and higher education (Intermediate) are accessible to students at similar distances.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that both Government schools (M=5.54) and private schools (M=5.80) are more accessible. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to physical accessibility was statistically not significant, $p = 0.399$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

4.1.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CLEAN DRINKING WATER	N	56	4	47	13
	%	46.7	3.3	39.2	10.8
PROVIDE TUMBLER/ GLASS TO DRINK	N	50	10	53	7
	%	41.7	8.3	44.2	5.8

46.7% of the students in government schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water and 39.2% (i.e. all the students) in the private schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water. Only 3.3% of the students in government schools have reported that they do not have access to clean drinking water. Even though the water is provided at the school, the private reported lower (44.2%) in providing a tumbler or glass for the students to drink water whereas in government school 41.7% of the students reported having a tumbler or glass to drink water.

4.1.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	28	23.3	9	7.5
RO Water	3	2.5	15	12.5
Water Can	26	21.7	33	27.5
Water Dispenser	3	2.5	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	3	2.5

Majority of the students (23.3%) in government schools reported that the source of drinking water is tap water while all the students (27.5%) in private schools reported the source of water as water can. About 21.7% of the students in the government school have reported the water sources as Water Cans.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better drinking water facilities ($M=4.30$) compared to private schools ($M=4.23$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to drinking water facility was statistically not significant, $p = 0.731$ 95% confidence interval.

4.1.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	1	39	16
	%	1.8	69.6	28.6

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	0	1	54
	%	0	1.8	98.2

69.6% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal and 28.6 % of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (98.2%) of the students reported that the number of servings are unlimited

4.1.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	0	0	15	28	13
	%	0	0	26.8	50.0	23.2

Food quality is reported as good by the majority of the students (50.0%) followed by 26.8% of the students reporting the quality of food as Neutral. None of the students reported that the good quality is bad.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	47	4
	%	92.2	7.8
Hygienic kitchen	N	57	0
	%	100	0
Cooked hygienically	N	56	1
	%	98.2	1.8

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 92.2% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 100% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 98.2% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

4.1.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	0	55
	%	0	100
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	0	57
	%	0	100
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	57
	%	0	100
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	57
	%	0	100

All the students have reported that there is no discrimination based on gender or caste in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food.

4.1.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.17	8.43
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	6.87	5.60
A154	I feel secured when in school	8.93	9.27
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	9.10	9.27
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.33	7.73
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.10	7.00

A158	I feel lonely in school	3.43	3.70
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.63	7.40
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.87	7.53
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	8.83	8.50
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	9.20	8.60
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	3.77	3.87
A164	I can talk to boys	7.83	5.30
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.50	8.33
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.20	7.47
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	7.87	7.17
A168	I accept my teachers	8.63	7.40
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.33	7.17
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	8.20	7.93
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	8.83	7.57
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	8.97	8.47
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.30	8.57
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.83	5.77
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	9.00	6.30
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	9.07	8.67
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	9.27	7.87
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.97	8.60
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	9.67	9.90
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.67	9.80
A181	Education empowers me	9.47	9.47
A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.50	9.50
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	9.47	9.27
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.17	9.03
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.40	9.33
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.23	9.00

4.1.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel proud to study in this school' is reported higher by government school students (score = 8.33) compared to private schools students (score = 7.73). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 3.43 and 3.70 by government and private school students respectively. Looking at the scores there is a

certain population of students who feel lonely in the school. Bullying at school is also reported higher by private schools (score = 3.87) compared to government schools students (score = 3.77)

4.1.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to usage of teaching aids, the government school students reported higher (Score = 9) compared to private schools (score = 6.30). On availability of teachers to support and clarify student doubts, the government school students reported higher scores (score = 8.97) compared to private schools (score = 8.47). The government schools students reported higher on regular parent meetings (score = 9.27) compared to private schools (score = 7.87). The government school students have more textbooks available in regional language (score = 8.83) than private schools (score 5.77)

4.1.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the government schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children and private schools feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score = 9.47 and score = 9.27 respectively). The government school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 9.23) compared to private school students (9.00).

4.1.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.05	4.58	0	Yes
Skill Development	1.25	1.28	0.706	No
Gender equality	5.47	5.73	0.120	No
Inclusion of third gender	0.95	0.87	0.311	No
Average	2.93	3.11		
In Wayanad district, among the study population compared to government school students, private school students reported that the education system is adaptable to the changing needs of the society and inclusive. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private in aspects of Online education. There was no statistical significance in the areas of Skill Development, Gender Equality and Inclusion of the Third Gender.				

4.1.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

4.1.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & digital mode of education		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	11	49	15	45
	%	9.2	40.8	12.5	37.5
Blended mode of education	N	7	53	30	30
	%	5.8	44.2	25.0	25.0
Digital classroom teaching	N	60	0	46	14
	%	50.0	0	38.4	11.7

With regard to the online and digital mode of education, 9.2% of the students from the Government school agreed that they had an online mode of education and 12.5% of the students of the private schools agreed on the same. 25% of the students from the private school agreed on having the blended mode of education while 5.8% from the government school agreed to have a blended mode of education. 50% i.e, all the respondents who are students from the government school agreed about having digital classroom teaching while only 38.4% of students in the private school agreed to digital classroom teaching in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students feel an online and digital mode of teaching is adaptable ($M=4.58$) compared to government schools ($M= 4.05$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	44	16	42	18
	%	36.7	13.3	35.0	15.0

Government school students claimed that they receive education for skill development in their schools in 36.7% of cases, whereas students in private schools agreed in 35% of cases.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students reported skills development is incorporated in their academics ($M= 1.28$) compared to government schools ($M=1.25$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically not significant, $p = 0.706$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	51	9	48	12
	%	42.5	7.5	40.0	10.0
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same Sex School Adaptable	N	44	16	47	13
	%	36.7	13.3	39.2	10.8
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	55	5	59	1
	%	45.8	4.2	49.2	0.8

Majority of the students (42.5%) in the government school have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. A similar trend has been observed in the private school as well, 40% of the private school students reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. 36.7% of the government school students agreed that their government school is adaptable in having teachers of the opposite gender in a same sex school and 10.8% of the respondents of the private school disagreed with the adaptability of teachers of opposite genders in same sex school. Similarly, both the school students strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students reported gender equality is adaptable ($M = 5.73$) compared to government schools ($M = 5.47$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically not significant, $p = 0.120$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

TYPE OF SCHOOL & GENDER EQUALITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	0	0	0	0
Co- Ed School	44	36.7	41	34.2
Both	14	11.7	19	15.8
None	2	1.7	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 36.7% of students in government schools and 34.2% of the students in private schools agreeing on the same. No students in government schools and private schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in same-sex schools (Girls' schools).

4.1.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	56	4	57	3
	%	46.7	3.3	47.5	2.5

About 46.7% of the government school students indicated that third gender should be included and 47.5% of the students in private schools reported the same.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported that third gender can be included in their schools ($M = 0.95$) compared to private schools ($M = 0.87$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference

between government schools and private schools with respect to the inclusion of third gender y was statistically significant, $p = 0.311$, 95% confidence interval.

4.1.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	53	7	42	18
	%	44.2	5.8	35.0	15.0
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	50	10	51	9
	%	41.7	8.3	42.5	7.5
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	58	2	25	35
	%	48.3	1.7	20.8	29.2
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	14	46	48	12
	%	11.7	38.3	40.0	10.0
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	14	46	39	21
	%	11.7	38.3	32.5	17.5
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	5	55	11	49
	%	4.2	45.8	9.2	40.8
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	10	50	42	18
	%	8.3	41.7	35.0	15.0
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	10	50	23	37
	%	8.3	41.7	19.2	30.8
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	40	20	18	42
	%	33.3	16.7	15.0	35.0

Majority of the government students (44.2%) reported that RTE is enforced in their school compared to private schools (35%). Majority of the students (41.7% in government schools and 42.5% in private schools) in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality. From the data, it looks like only government school children (48.3%) are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE while only 20.8% of the students in the private schools are aware of this. It looks like private school students (40%) are aware of capitation fees during admission and are also more aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 32.5% in private schools while only 11.7% know in government school. Majority of students from both schools (45.8% in government schools and 40.8% private schools) are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE. A similar trend of being unaware of physical punishment and mental harassment is seen in government schools. 35% are aware of physical punishment in private schools and 33% of government school students know about 25% admission reservation through RTE.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students are more aware of RTE ($M = 7.07$) compared to government schools ($M = 6.10$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to RTE was statistically significant, $p = 0.005$, 95% confidence interval.

CHAPTER V

TAMIL NADU

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 RAMANATHAPURAM

5.2 VIRUDHUNAGAR

5.1 RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT

5.1.1 AVAILABILITY

5.1.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	37	23	37	23
	%	30.8	19.2	30.8	19.2
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	40	20	43	17
	%	33.3	16.7	35.8	14.2

Majority of the students reported that the schools are available in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 61.6% (i.e. 30.8% of the students in government and 30.8 % of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools are in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 30.9% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education while 69.1% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M= 2.67$) compared to private schools ($M=2.62$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p = 0.759$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

Safe Infrastructure	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	15.75	16.33	0.415	No
Safety related infrastructure	16.10	21.72	0	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	23.88	27.10	0.001	Yes
Extra-curricular infrastructure	6.80	8.73	0	Yes
Disabled friendly infrastructure	7.18	7.55	0.549	No
Average	13.942	16.286		
In Ramanathapuram district, as per the above data, safe infrastructure is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. In terms of safety-related infrastructure, classroom infrastructure and extra-curricular infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools.				

5.1.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	4	3.3	2	1.7	29	24.2	25	20.8	0	0.0	4	3.3	15	12.5	41	34.2
Proper Roofing	2	1.7	3	2.5	26	21.7	29	24.2	0	0.0	5	4.2	17	14.2	38	31.7
Proper Flooring	1	0.8	3	2.5	31	25.8	25	20.8	1	0.8	6	5.0	16	13.3	37	30.8
Electricity	8	6.7	4	3.3	26	21.7	22	18.3	0	0.0	7	5.8	22	18.3	31	25.8
Auditorium	2	1.7	3	2.5	51	42.5	4	3.3	1	0.8	5	4.2	11	9.2	43	35.8
Kitchen	0	0.0	14	10.8	39	30.0	17	13.1	0	0.0	54	41.5	3	2.3	3	2.3

Among the respondents interviewed in Ramanathapuram district, 21 % respondents studying in government schools reported that safe buildings standard is very good while 34 % respondents in private schools reported likewise. Further 24 % respondents from government schools and 12 % in private schools reported that the safe building standard is good. A minimal 2 % respondents from government and 3 % from private schools reported that the safe building standard is poor and similarly 3 % from government schools reported that the standard was very poor.

Among all the other different aspects of school building infrastructure, on an average 19 (32 %) out of 60 respondents in government schools reported that the school building infrastructure is very good. In comparison, on an average, 30 (50 %) out of 60 respondents in private schools reported that school building infrastructure is very good. However a considerable 3 % in government and 6 % in private schools stated that the other aspects of school building infrastructure is poor.

The above findings show that the safe buildings standard is relatively very good in private schools when compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to undertake measures to improve the safe building standard. However in terms of other aspects of building infrastructure, private schools fared only a little well in comparison to government schools and both government and private schools need to take steps to improve the other aspects of infrastructure.

The results of descriptive statistics reinforce the above findings and show that private schools fare a little better in terms of school building infrastructure ($M=16.33$) in comparison to government schools ($M=15.75$). However this is very nominal.

A two-tailed t-test revealed that there is no significant difference between government and private schools in terms of school building infrastructure ($P=0.415>0.05$).

5.1.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	4	3.3	1 3	10.8	28	23.3	15	12.5	0	0.0	4	3.3	13	10.8	43	35.8
Fire Extinguisher	3	2.5	1	0.8	40	33.3	16	13.3	0	0.0	2	1.7	21	17.5	37	30.8
First Aid Box	3	2.5	1	0.8	31	25.8	25	20.8	0	0.0	3	2.5	19	15.8	38	31.7
Properly Laid Road	7	5.8	1	0.8	44	36.7	8	6.7	1	0.8	5	4.2	20	16.7	34	28.3
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	7	5.8	1	0.8	39	32.5	13	10.8	0	0.0	4	3.3	15	12.5	41	34.2
School Zone Signboard on the Road	4	3.3	1	0.8	44	36.7	11	9.2	0	0.0	1	0.8	14	11.7	45	37.5
CCTV	5	4.2	3	2.5	43	35.8	9	7.5	0	0.0	2	1.7	13	10.8	45	37.5

In terms of safety related infrastructure a physical compound wall is highly significant to ensure the safety of students and in this regard, the majority 36 % respondents from private schools reported that the standard of compound wall is very good, while only 13 % respondents from government schools reported that the standard of compound wall is very good. Further a considerable 11 % respondents from government schools reported that the standard of compound wall is poor. Among the other important criterions of safety related infrastructure, on an average 14 (23 %) out of 60 respondents in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison on an average the majority 40 (67 %) out of 60 respondents in private schools reported that the other aspects of safety related infrastructure is very good. The above data shows that, the safety related infrastructure is very good in private schools when compared to government schools. Therefore efforts need to be undertaken in government schools to improve safety related infrastructure.

The results of descriptive statistics substantiates the above data whereby, private schools have better safety related infrastructure (M=21.72) compared to government schools (M=16.10). A two-tailed t-test showed that, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools in terms of safety related infrastructure.

5.1.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	2	1.7	4	3.3	34	28.3	20	16.7	1	0.8	0	0.0	19	15.8	40	33.3
Blackboard	3	2.5	4	3.3	35	29.2	18	15.0	0	0.0	2	1.7	13	10.8	45	37.5
Bench	2	1.7	13	10.8	25	20.8	20	16.7	1	0.8	4	3.3	23	19.2	32	26.7
Fan	11	9.2	2	1.7	28	23.3	19	15.8	2	1.7	2	1.7	20	16.7	36	30.0
Light	3	2.5	1	0.8	37	30.8	19	15.8	2	1.7	1	0.8	19	15.8	38	31.7
Door	1	0.8	4	3.3	35	29.2	20	16.7	1	0.8	2	1.7	14	11.7	43	35.8
Window	2	1.7	11	9.2	29	24.2	18	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	18.3	38	31.7
Ventilation	1	0.8	1	0.8	23	19.2	35	29.2	0	0.0	1	0.8	19	15.8	40	33.3

With respect to classroom infrastructure, only 17 % of students in government schools reported that the standard of classrooms was very good, while private schools fared a lot better with 33 % of students reporting that the standard of classrooms was very good.

Further in relation to the other aspects of classroom infrastructure such as availability of blackboard, bench, fan, light, door, window and ventilation in classrooms, on an average 21 (35 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 39 (65 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better classroom infrastructure (M=27.10) compared to government schools (M=23.88). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to classroom infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the classroom infrastructure is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. Therefore government schools need to take initiatives to improve classroom infrastructure.

5.1.1.2.4 EXTRA-CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Extra-Curricular Activities	2	1.7	1	0.8	54	45.0	3	2.5	0	0.0	2	1.7	15	12.5	43	35.8
Playground	0	0.0	6	5.0	28	23.3	26	21.7	1	0.8	4	3.3	17	14.2	38	31.7
Sports Equipment	4	3.3	2	1.7	41	34.2	13	10.8	2	1.7	1	0.8	18	15.0	39	32.5

With respect to extra-curricular activities in schools, only 3 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while the majority 36 % students in private schools reported that it is very good.

Subsequently in terms of other aspects of extra-curricular infrastructure, on an average 14 (23 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the extra-curricular infrastructure is very good. In comparison, 40 (67 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the extra-curricular infrastructure is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better extra-curricular infrastructure (M=8.73) compared to government schools (M=6.80). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extra-curricular infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, extra-curricular infrastructure is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve the extra-curricular infrastructure.

5.1.1.2.5 DISABLED FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0.0	4	3.3	46	38.3	10	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	13.3	44	36.7
Hand Rails	0	0.0	3	2.5	53	44.2	4	3.3	1	0.8	0	0.0	45	37.5	14	11.7
Hand Rails for Stairs	1	0.8	6	5.0	18	15.0	35	29.2	0	0.0	1	0.8	19	15.8	40	33.3

With respect to availability of ramps as a good standard for disabled friendly infrastructure, only 38 % of students in government schools reported that it is good, while 37% of students in private schools reported that it is very good. A considerable 3 % students in government schools reported that it is poor.

In terms of the other aspects of disabled friendly infrastructure, on an average only 16 (27 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that disabled friendly infrastructure is very good. In comparison, 33 (55 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that disabled friendly infrastructure is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a slightly better disabled friendly infrastructure (M=7.18) compared to government schools (M=7.55). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disabled friendly infrastructure was statistically not significant, $p = 0.549$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the disabled friendly infrastructure is comparatively good in private schools when compared to government schools. However irrespective of government and private schools both do not yet have the complete aspects of disabled friendly infrastructure and therefore both government and private schools need to take urgent steps to improve disabled friendly infrastructure in the schools.

5.1.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	6.68	6.95	0.406	No
Supportive academic resources	4.27	5.12	0.081	No
Freebies supporting academics	8.12	5.87	0.007	Yes
Teaching Staff	13.80	13.47	0.497	No
Extra-curricular Staff	3.37	3.47	0.827	No
Academic learning infrastructure	21.77	24.92	0.078	No
Digital learning infrastructure	6.07	7.58	0.082	No
Average	9.15	9.62		
In Ramanathapuram district, the availability of academic resources is better in private schools when compared to government schools. With respect to freebies supporting academics there is a significant difference between government and private schools.				

5.1.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	1	0.8	25	20.8	34	28.3	0	0	0	0	18	15.0	42	35.0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	20	16.7	40	33.3	0	0	2	1.7	17	14.2	41	34.2

With respect to availability standard of mandatory academic resources such as textbooks, 28 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, and 35 % of students in private schools reported that it was very good.

Further in terms of other aspects of academic resources, on an average 37 (62 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 42 (70 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that academic resources is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have slightly better academic resources ($M=6.95$) compared to government schools ($M=6.68$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to mandatory academic resources was statistically not significant, $p=0.406$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the mandatory academic resources is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. However the difference between government and private schools is very nominal and both need to undertake initiatives to improve availability of mandatory of academic resources such as textbooks and notebooks.

5.1.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	1	0.8	2	1.7	20	16.7	37	30.8	1	0.8	4	3.3	18	15.0	37	30.8
Extra Tuition	2	1.7	1	0.8	15	12.5	42	35.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	12.5	45	37.5

With respect to scholarship as a supporting academic resource, 31 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, and similarly 31 % of students in private schools too reported that it was very good. However a nominal 3 % students in private schools reported that it was poor.

On an average 40 (67 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that supporting academic resources in their school is very good. In comparison, 41 out of 60 children in private schools reported that supporting resource is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better supporting resources ($M=5.12$) compared to government schools ($M=4.27$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to supporting resource was statistically not significant, $p = 0.081$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the supporting resources is slightly good in private schools compared to government schools. However the difference is nominal and both government and private schools need to take steps to improve the supporting resources such as scholarship and extra tuition.

5.1.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	2	1.7	1	0.8	18	15.0	39	32.5	2	1.7	0	0.0	15	12.5	43	35.8
Stationary	3	2.5	3	2.5	14	11.7	40	33.3	1	0.8	0	0.0	9	7.5	50	41.7
Bag	3	2.5	3	2.5	20	16.7	34	28.3	3	2.5	0	0.0	7	5.8	50	41.7
Bicycle	0	0.0	2	1.7	9	7.5	49	40.8	3	2.5	0	0.0	1	0.8	56	46.7

With respect to the availability standard of uniform as part of freebies, 15 % of students in government schools reported that availability of uniform is good, while only 13 % students in private schools reported that it is good. .

On an average 15 (25 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the availability standard of all freebies is good. In comparison, 8 (13 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the availability standard is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better availability of freebies ($M=8.12$) compared to private schools ($M=5.87$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies was statistically significant, $p = 0.007$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the availability standard of freebies is relatively good in government schools when compared to private schools. The private schools need to improve the availability of freebies as an academic resource.

5.1.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0.0	2	1.7	22	18.3	36	30.0	0	0.0	3	2.5	16	13.3	41	34.2
Teacher for each Subject	0	0.0	2	1.7	27	22.5	31	25.8	0	0.0	3	2.5	22	18.3	35	29.2
Male Teachers	0	0.0	4	3.3	31	25.8	25	20.8	1	0.8	3	2.5	24	20.0	32	26.7
Female Teachers	0	0.0	1	0.8	25	20.8	34	28.3	0	0.0	1	0.8	18	15.0	41	34.2

With respect to teacher for each class, 30 % of students in government schools reported that the availability standard was very good, while 34 % of students in private schools reported that the availability standard was very good and a considerable 3 % students in private schools reported as poor.

In terms of availability of teacher for each subject, male teachers and female teachers, on an average 32 (53 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported the availability standard is very good. In comparison, 37 (62 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard is very good.

The overall results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have slightly better availability of teaching staff ($M=13.80$) compared to private schools ($M=13.47$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference

between government school and private schools with respect to availability of teaching staff was statistically not significant, $p = 0.497$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the availability of teaching staff is good in government schools compared to private schools. However the difference is very nominal. Therefore both government and private schools need to undertake initiatives to improve the availability standard of teaching staff.

5.1.1.3.5. EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	17.5	39	32.5	2	1.7	0	0.0	14	11.7	44	36.7
School Counsellor	2	1.7	3	2.5	54	45.0	1	0.8	2	1.7	0	0.0	7	5.8	51	42.5

With respect to availability standard of extra-curricular staff, 33 % of students in government schools reported that the standard was very good, and 37 % of students in private schools reported likewise.

On an average 20 (33 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that availability standard of extra-curricular staff is very good. In comparison, 47 (78 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that availability is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better availability standard of extra-curricular staff ($M=3.47$) compared to government schools ($M=3.37$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to availability standard of extra-curricular staff was statistically not significant, $p = 0.827$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the availability standard of extra-curricular staff is slightly better in private schools in comparison to government schools. However the difference is very minimal. Therefore government schools need to improve the availability of extra-curricular staff.

5.1.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	1	0.8	4	3.3	46	38.3	9	7.5	0	0	2	1.7	21	17.5	37	30.8
Biological Specimens	1	0.8	3	2.5	51	42.5	5	4.2	0	0	4	3.3	16	13.3	40	33.3
Physics Lab	1	0.8	3	2.5	46	38.3	10	8.3	0	0	3	2.5	20	16.7	37	30.8
Physics Instruments	1	0.8	4	3.3	47	39.2	8	6.7	0	0	2	1.7	19	15.8	39	32.5
Chemistry Lab	1	0.8	3	2.5	48	40	8	6.7	0	0	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7
Chemicals & Equipment	1	0.8	4	3.3	52	43.3	3	2.5	0	0	0	0	17	14.2	43	35.8

Library	1	0.8	5	4.2	41	34.2	13	10.8	0	0	4	3.3	21	17.5	35	29.2
Computer Lab	0	0	0	0	43	35.8	17	14.2	0	0	0	0	23	19.2	37	30.8
Computers	0	0	0	0	47	39.2	13	10.8	0	0	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3

With respect to availability standard of library in Academic infrastructure, only 11 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 29 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 3 % students in government schools reported it as poor.

Among the different aspects of academic infrastructure, on an average 10 (%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the academic infrastructure is good. In comparison, 38 (%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the academic infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better academic infrastructure (M=24.92) compared to government schools (M=21.77). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic infrastructure is statistically not significant, $p = 0.078$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the academic infrastructure is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. Therefore government schools need to undertake steps to improve academic infrastructure.

5.1.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	4	3.3	38	31.7	18	15	2	1.7	6	5	12	10	40	33.3
Smart Classroom	1	0.8	2	1.7	45	37.5	12	10	1	0.8	6	5	10	8.3	43	35.8
Device for Online Learning	2	1.7	0	0	52	43.3	6	5	2	1.7	2	1.7	52	43.3	4	3.3
Internet Access for Online Learning	1	0.8	0	0	7	5.8	52	43.3	3	2.5	2	1.7	50	41.7	5	4.2

With respect to availability standard of smart classroom as part of digital learning infrastructure, only 10 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 36 % of students in private schools reported it is very good and 5 % students in private schools reported that it is poor.

Further in terms of the different aspects of digital learning infrastructure such as projector, device for online learning and internet access for online learning, on an average 22 (37 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 23 (38 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better digital learning infrastructure (M=7.58) compared to government schools (M=6.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to digital learning infrastructure was statistically not significant, $p = 0.082$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the digital learning infrastructure is good in private schools when compared to government schools. However the t-test shows that there is not much statistical significance between government and private schools meaning that both government and private schools need to undertake steps to improve the digital learning infrastructure.

5.1.1.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Own transport facility in your school	6	5.0	54	45.0	54	45.0	6	5.0
Provided bus pass to travel to school	15	25.0	20	33.3	7	11.7	18	30.0

With respect to their own transport facility in schools, 45 % students in private schools reported that it is available. In comparison, only 5 % of students in government schools reported that it is available and 45 % students in government schools reported that own transport facility is not available in their school.

Further in terms of bus pass to travel to school, 25 % students in government schools reported that they were provided bus passes, while only 12 % in private schools reported that they were provided bus passes and the majority 30 % students in private schools reported that they were not provided any bus passes.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government (M=2.42) and private schools (M=1.65) are moderate in terms of transport facility with the exception that private schools have their own transport facility. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government and private schools with respect to transport facility is statistically significant $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the transport facility is comparatively good in private schools when compared to government schools. However the provision of bus passes to travel using public transport places students from government schools in a better position than students from private schools. Therefore efforts have to be undertaken by both government and private schools to improve the transport facilities.

5.1.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

Sanitation facilities	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	13.53	16.88	0	Yes
Privacy related infra	6.98	8.33	0.033	Yes
Basic hygiene	9.70	12.18	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	8.22	8.20	0.987	No
Average	9.60	11.39		
In Ramanathapuram district, private schools have better sanitation facilities than government schools. Further there is a significance between government and private schools in terms of restroom buildings, privacy related infrastructure and basic hygiene.				

5.1.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	5	4.2	11	9.2	35	29.2	9	7.5	2	1.7	6	5	22	18.3	30	25
Proper Flooring	0	0	10	8.3	31	25.8	19	15.8	1	0.8	5	4.2	24	20	30	25
Taps	0	0	7	5.8	43	35.8	10	8.3	1	0.8	8	6.7	23	19.2	28	23.3
Doors	3	2.5	12	10	30	25	15	12.5	3	2.5	7	5.8	24	20	26	21.7

With respect to sanitation facilities, the building standard of gender specific restrooms is an important criterion, in this regard only 8 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 25 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 9 % students in government schools reported that it is poor.

Similarly in terms of other aspects of sanitation facilities such as proper flooring, taps and doors in restrooms, on an average 13 (22 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the standard is very good. In comparison, 29 (48 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better sanitation facilities (M=16.88) compared to government schools (M=13.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities is statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, it is evident that the sanitation facilities is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve all aspects of sanitation facilities.

5.1.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	2	1.7	13	10.8	31	25.8	14	11.7	5	4.2	5	4.2	31	25.8	19	15.8
Windows with Privacy blinds	3	2.5	2	1.7	44	36.7	11	9.2	0	0	6	5	20	16.7	34	28.3
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	2	1.7	0	0	45	37.5	13	10.8	1	0.8	0	0	19	15.8	40	33.3

With respect to privacy related infrastructure standard, availability of privacy wall in front of restrooms is an essential component, and in this regard only 11 % of students in government schools reported that the privacy wall standard is very good, while the majority 33 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good.

In terms of the different aspects of privacy related infrastructure, on an average only 13 (22 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that the privacy related infrastructure is very good. In comparison, the majority 31 (52 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better privacy related infrastructure (M=8.33) compared to government schools (M=6.98). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to privacy related infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.033$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the privacy related infrastructure is relatively good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve privacy related infrastructure for girl students.

5.1.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	1	0.8	12	10.0	32	26.7	15	12.5	0	0	1	0.8	20	16.7	30	25.0
Buckets	5	4.2	1	0.8	39	32.5	15	12.5	0	0	7	5.8	22	18.3	31	25.8
Jugs	5	4.2	4	3.3	36	30.0	15	12.5	1	0.8	4	3.3	20	16.7	35	29.2
Wash Basin	2	1.7	7	5.8	41	34.2	10	8.3	1	0.8	2	1.7	14	11.7	43	35.8

With respect to the standard of basic hygiene, running water in taps is highly essential and in this regard, 25 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 30 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 10 % students in government schools reported that basic hygiene standard is poor.

Similarly in terms of other aspects of basic hygiene such as buckets, jugs and wash basin, on average 37 (61.6%) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that basic hygiene standard is good. In comparison, 19 (31.6%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is good. However, 34.75 (57.91%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better basic hygiene standard (M=12.18) compared to government schools (M=9.70). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene standards is statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the basic hygiene standard is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to undertake steps to improve the basic hygiene standard.

5.1.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	1	0.8	1	0.8	42	35	16	13.3	1	0.8	2	1.7	18	15	39	32.5
Pad Dispenser	4	3.3	4	3.3	11	9.2	41	34.2	0	0	2	1.7	13	10.8	45	37.5
Pad Incinerator	4	3.3	4	3.3	8	6.7	44	36.7	1	0.8	0	0	49	40.8	10	8.3
Pad Disposal Bin	2	1.7	6	5	35	29.2	17	14.2	1	0.8	2	1.7	14	11.7	43	35.8

With respect to menstrual hygiene related aspects, the availability of menstrual pads is an important standard and in this regard, only 13 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while the majority 33 % of students in private school reported that it is very good and 2 % students in private schools reported that it is poor.

Further in relation to other aspects of menstrual hygiene such as pad dispenser, pad incinerator and pad disposal bins, on an average 30 (50 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 34 (%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government schools (M=8.22) and private schools (M=8.20) have menstrual hygiene related aspects. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to menstrual hygiene related aspects is statistically not significant, $p = 0.987$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the menstrual hygiene related aspects is good in private schools compared to government schools. However the difference is very nominal. Therefore both government and private schools should undertake efforts to improve menstrual hygiene related infrastructure.

5.1.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	3.17	3.53
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	3.03	2.57
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.90	2.73
	EQUAL ACCESS – GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.43	9.70

A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	4.47	4.10
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipment	8.10	8.60
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.40	8.53
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.93	8.73
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	9.17	9.50
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	9.23	9.23
	EQUAL ACCESS – CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	9.67	9.57
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	9.33	9.10
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.40	9.33
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.03	9.30
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	9.27	9.50
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	9.43	9.40
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	4.73	4.30
A135	Lower caste students study well	7.80	8.53
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.50	8.73
	EQUAL ACCESS – RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	9.63	9.73
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	9.10	9.60
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	9.27	9.60
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	9.07	9.27
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	7.70	7.23
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	7.60	7.50
	EQUAL ACCESS – DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	3.00	2.60
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	9.37	9.63
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.57	9.93

A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	9.70	9.83
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	9.70	9.90
A150	Differently Abled students study well	8.83	9.77
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	9.13	9.67

5.1.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

Discrimination free environment	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	15.42	14.72	0.152	No
Caste discrimination free environment	29.13	28.18	0.471	No
Disability discrimination free environment	5.63	3.02	0.01	Yes
Religion discrimination free environment	13.38	13.32	0.908	No
Average	15.89	14.81		
In Ramanathapuram district, government schools fared better in comparison to private schools in ensuring a discrimination free environment. Further there was a significant difference in terms of disability discrimination free environment between government schools and private schools.				

5.1.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126 and A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level to the statement 'Girls are discriminated against based on gender' is moderate at 4.47 and 4.10 respectively which means that girls studying in government schools feel that there is gender discrimination based on gender in their schools.

It is observed that government school students reported lower on access to sports equipment and the way they are treated by teachers compared to private school students. The girls feel that the environment is free of gender discrimination, however, they also reported not having equal access to opportunities like boys.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better gender discrimination free environment (M=15.42) compared to private schools (M=14.72). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.152$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134.

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported similarly. The level of agreement is at 8.90 by government school students and at 8.87 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported lower at 9.03 compared to students from private schools at 9.10. On the treatment of lower caste students by the teachers, the students from private schools rated lower at 8.30 compared to government schools at 8.90. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment ($M=29.13$) compared to government schools ($M=28.18$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.471$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was higher in private schools at 9.00 compared to government schools 8.00. However, access to school facilities have been reported higher by the government schools students at 9.60 compared to private schools at 9.00.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment ($M=5.63$) compared to private schools ($M=3.02$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.01$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported higher at 8.9 by government school students compared to 8.77 by private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment ($M=13.38$) compared to government schools ($M=13.32$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.908$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	28.75	28.93	0.759	No
Caste Inclusion	37.03	36.15	0.603	No
Religion Inclusion	25.35	24.47	0.424	No
Disability Inclusion	17.07	10.57	0.01	Yes
Average	27.05	25.03		
In Ramanathapuram district, students from both government and private schools reported that their schools were inclusive in terms of gender, caste and religion. However, when it came to disability inclusion government schools were more inclusive compared to private schools. On an average government schools were more inclusive on the other aspects too. With respect to disability inclusion, there is a significant variance between government and private schools.				

5.1.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement ‘My school is a safe place for a girl to study’ is similar among both the schools at 9.53. The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 9.27) compared to private school students (Score = 8.63). The government school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score = 9.20) compared to private school students (score = 8.80). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion (M=28.75) compared to private schools (M=28.93). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.759$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement ‘Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles’ while the government school students rated 9.03, the private school students rated 9.10. A similar number of the students from both the schools feel that the disabled students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=37.03) compared to private schools (M=36.15). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.984$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement ‘Freedom to follow any religion’ was reported higher by government school at 8.93 compared to private school which reported at 8.77. The private school children reported more on children treated without religious discrimination (score = 8.73) compared to government school children (score = 8.57).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=24.35) compared to government schools (M=24.47). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.424$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The government schools rate higher on the statement ‘Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers’ at 9.73 compared to private school children at 8.00. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students study well (score = 7.97) and disabled students can complete school education (Score - 9.60). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion (M=17.07) compared to private schools (M=10.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.01$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY : DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		Government					Private				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	27	17	9	3	4	24	16	12	3	5
	%	22.5	14.2	7.5	2.5	3.3	20.0	13.3	10.0	2.5	4.2
Distance to Higher education school	N	31	11	11	3	4	16	26	9	3	6
	%	25.8	9.2	9.2	2.5	3.3	13.3	21.7	7.5	2.5	5.0

In terms of distance to school from home, the majority of respondents 23 % from government schools come from less than 1 Km and in comparison only 20 % students from private schools come from less than 1 Km. Further 14 % from government schools and 13 % from private schools had to travel a distance of 1 to 3 Km to come to school, 8 % students from government schools and 10 % from private schools had to travel between 4 to 6 km distance to school. Lastly, a very nominal 3 % from the government and 4 % from private schools had to travel more than 10 Km to reach their school. With regard to distance to school for higher education, the majority 26 % students from government schools had to travel a distance of less than 1 Km, while in comparison the majority 22 % students from private schools had to travel a distance of 1 to 3 Km to reach school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools are more accessible (M=3.67) compared to private schools (M=4.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to physical accessibility was statistically not significant, $p = 0.379$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

5.1.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Clean Drinking Water	N	48	12	54	6
	%	40.0	10.0	45.0	5.0
Provide Tumbler/ Glass To Drink	N	46	14	52	8
	%	38.3	11.7	43.3	6.7

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 48 (40.0%) out of 60 have informed “Yes” saying that the School provides clean water. About 12 (10.0%) out of 60 have informed “No” saying that the School is not providing clean water.

In Private Schools 54 (45.0 %) out of 60 have informed “that the School provides clean water.

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 46 (38.3%) out of 60 provides Tumblers/Glass to Drink Water. Similarly in Private Schools also 52 (43.3%) out of 60 provides Tumblers/Glass to Drink Water. Thus it is inferred that both in Government and Private Schools Tumblers / Glasses are provided.

5.1.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	15	14.7	12	11.8
RO Water	19	18.6	30	29.4
Water Can	11	10.8	12	11.8
Water Dispenser	3	2.9	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 15 (14.7%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides Tap Water. In Private Schools 12 (11.8%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides Tap Water.

In Government schools about 19 (18.6%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides RO water and in Private Schools 30 (29.4) out of 60% have informed that the schools provides RO water..

It is inferred that both Government Schools and Private Schools have drinking water facilities which includes Tap Water, RO Water Can and Water Dispenser(Government Schools only).

5.1.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	4	28	22
	%	7.1	50.0	39.3

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	9	1	38
	%	17.6	1.9	74.5

28(50%) feel that the Quantity of the food is ideal, about 22 (39.3%) of the students feel that the quantity is more and about 4(7.1%) of the students have informed that the quantity is more.38 (74.5%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served Unlimited. About 9 (17.6%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served only once and 1 (1.9%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served Twice.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have more food served (M=4.18) compared to Private Schools (M=0.25). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to food served was statistically Significant , $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	7	2	10	24	11
	%	12.3	3.5	17.5	42.1	19.2

About 47(78.3%) out of 60 feel that the Quantity of the food is ideal, about 13 (21.7%) of the students feel that the quantity is less.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools only have food served 20 (33.33) (M=7.83) compared to Private Schools 0 (0 %) (M=0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to food served was statistically Significant , $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

36 (60.0%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served only once. About 7 (11.7%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served twice and 17 (28.3%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served unlimited.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	53	0
	%	100.0	0
Hygienic kitchen	N	40	12
	%	72.7	21.8
Cooked hygienically	N	45	8
	%	80.3	14.3

About 53 (100%) out of 60 have informed that they are being provided Egg during Mid-Day Meals. 40 (72.7%) out of 60 have informed that the Kitchen is in Hygienic condition. 45 (80.3%) out of 60 have informed that the food is cooked in Hygienical conditions.

5.1.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	9	44
	%	16.7	81.5
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	6	47
	%	10.9	85.5
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	6	47
	%	10.9	85.5
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	6	47
	%	10.9	85.5

From the above table it was inferred that there was Gender Discrimination in serving food informed by 9 (16.7%) out of 60. About 6 students (10.9) out of 60 informed Caste Discrimination in serving food. Gender Discrimination in Quantity of food was informed by 6 (10.9%) out of 60 and about 6 students (10.9%) out of 60 informed Caste Discrimination in Quantity of food.

5.1.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.80	9.40
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	7.70	8.57
A154	I feel secured when in school	9.00	9.47
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	8.80	9.37
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	7.97	8.87
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.83	9.53
A158	I feel lonely in school	5.10	4.37
A159	I like to go to school everyday	9.23	8.80
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.53	8.43
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	7.30	7.27
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	9.30	8.87
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	3.93	5.20
A164	I can talk to boys	7.60	6.03
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.40	8.77
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.83	9.40
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	8.57	8.73

A168	I accept my teachers	9.07	9.13
A169	My teachers inspire me	7.97	8.77
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their menstruation days	7.90	8.43
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	9.10	8.93
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	9.40	9.57
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.40	9.27
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.57	7.30
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	7.10	7.33
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	7.90	8.50
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.13	8.60
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	7.50	8.50
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	9.97	9.97
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.93	9.90
A181	Education empowers me	9.73	9.70
A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.53	9.77
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	9.07	9.63
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.30	9.50
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.33	9.57
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.13	9.50

5.1.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel happy to study in this school' is reported higher by private school students (score = 9.40) compared to government school students (score = 8.80). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 4.97 and 3.87 by government and private school students respectively. Looking at the scores there is a certain population of students who feel lonely in the school. Bullying at school is also reported higher by private schools (score = 6.47) compared to government schools students (score = 5.57)

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=49.88) compared to private schools (M=51.22). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was not statistically significant, $p = 0.886$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to usage of teaching aids, the government school students reported higher (Score = 7.23) compared to private schools (score = 5.17). On availability of teachers to support and clarify student doubts, the government school students reported higher scores (score = 9.13) compared to private schools (score = 8.87). The government schools students reported lower on regular parent meetings (score = 7.93) compared to private schools (score = 9.00).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have a better quality of education (M=57.53) compared to private schools (M=58.80). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 0.365$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the government schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score =9.53) compared to private schools (score = 8.63). The government school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 9.70) compared to private school students (9.20).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel education is relevant (M=37.83) compared to private schools (M=38.77). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.17	4.42	0.319	No
Skill Development	1.08	1.08	1.0	No
Gender equality	5.12	5.10	0.929	No
Inclusion of third gender	0.98	0.95	0.595	No
Average	2.837	2.887		
In Ramanathapuram District, among the study population government school students reported that they not much able to adapt to the education system. There was statistically no significant difference between the government and private all the aspects of adaptability..				

5.1.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

5.1.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & Digital Mode of Education		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	16	44	24	36
	%	13.3	36.7	20.0	30.0
Blended modes of education	N	24	36	17	43
	%	20.0	30.0	14.2	35.8
Digital classrooms teaching	N	41	19	44	16
	%	34.2	15.8	36.7	13.3

Majority of the students (44%) in Government schools mentioned that online mode of education is not adaptable for their school and a similar response was also noted with private school students (36%). Similarly 36.7% the private school students feel blended mode of education is not adaptable, on the other hand the government school students 43% of them feel that blended mode of education is not adaptable. In correspondence to digital classrooms teaching 41% of the government school students mentioned that they are adaptable and 36% of private school students mentioning adaptable.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Online and Digital Mode of Education in Private schools ($M=4.42$) are better compared to Government schools ($M=4.17$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Online and Digital Mode of Education was statistically significant, $p=0.319$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	48	12	51	9
	%	40.0	10.0	42.5	7.5

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Education for Skill Development in Government schools ($M= 1.08$) are equal compared to Private schools ($M= 1.08$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Skill development was statistically not significant , $p =1.0$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	58	2	59	1
	%	48.3	1.7	49.2	0.8
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same-Sex School Adaptable	N	43	17	47	13
	%	35.8	14.2	39.2	10.8
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

Majority of the students (48.2 %) in the Government school Students have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. A similar trend has been observed in the Private school as well, 49.2 % of the private school students reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. Both the school students reported that having teachers of opposite gender is adaptable with 43 % and 47 % respectively. Similarly, both the school students strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development with 50% each.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Gender Equality in Government schools ($M= 5.12$) are better compared to Private Schools $M= 5.10$. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Gender Equality was statistically not significant, $p = 0.929$, 95% confidence interval.

5.1.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

In Which Type Of School, Gender Equality Is Adaptability	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	8	6.7	2	1.7
Co- Ed School	45	37.5	48	40.0
Both	7	5.8	10	8.3
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 37.5 % of students in Government schools reported on this and 40% of the students in Private schools reported on this. 6.7 % of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in same sex schools (girls schools).

5.1.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER BE ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	56	4	59	1
	%	46.7	3.3	49.2	0.8

All the government students 46.7% reported acceptance to inclusion of third gender and about 49.2% of the private school students indicated that third gender should be included, while 3.3 % of the students in Government schools and 0.8 % in Private Schools reported that third gender should not be included.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Government School Students (M = 0.98) and Private School Students (M= 0.95) reported that third gender can be included in their schools.

3.1.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	24	36	23	37
	%	20.0	30.0	19.2	30.8
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	33	27	31	29
	%	27.5	22.5	25.8	24.2
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	18	42	16	44
	%	15.0	25.0	13.3	36.7
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	1	59	2	58
	%	0.8	49.2	1.7	48.3
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	1	59	9	51
	%	0.8	49.2	7.5	42.5

DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	1	59	2	58
	%	0.8	49.2	1.7	48.3
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	7	53	4	56
	%	5.8	44.2	3.3	46.7
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	1	59	0	60
	%	0.8	49.2	0	50.0
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	4	56	10	50
	%	3.3	46.7	8.3	41.7

In the Government School about 24 (20%) out of 60 students have informed that RTE was enforced in school. Similarly in the Private School about 23 (19.2%) out of 60 students have informed that RTE was enforced in school. In terms of gender equality, Government School about 33 (27.5%) out of 60 students have informed that RTE promotes gender equality. Similarly in the Private School about 31 (25.8%) out of 60 students have informed that RTE promotes gender equality. Government Schools about 18 (15%) out of 60 students have informed that there is free education till 14 years of age. Similarly in the Private School about 16 (13.3%) out of 60 students have informed that there is free education till 14 years of age.

In the Government School about 1 (59%) out of 60 students have informed that there is a capitation fee during admission. Similarly in the Private School about 2 (1.7%) out of 60 students have informed that there is a capitation fee during admission. 1 (0.8%) out of 60 government school students have informed that there is an admission screening procedure. Similarly in the Private School about 9 (7.5%) out of 60 students have informed that there is an admission screening procedure. In the Government School about 1 (0.8%) out of 60 students have informed that there is denial of admission. Similarly in the Private Schools about 2 (1.7%) out of 60 students have informed that there is denial of admission.

The table shows that in the Government School about 53 (44.2%) out of 60 students have informed that there is no Physical Punishment. Similarly in the Private Schools about 56 (46.7%) out of 60 students have informed that there is no Physical Punishment. 59 (49.2%) out of 60 government school students have informed that there is no Mental Harassment. In comparison, the Private Schools about 60 (50.0%) out of 60 students have informed that there is no Mental Harassment. About 4 (3.3%) out of 60 government school students have informed that there is 25% Reservation in Private Schools. Similarly in the Private School about 10 (8.3%) out of 60 students have informed that there is 25% Reservation in Private Schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that RTE in Private schools ($M = 5.28$) are better compared to Government schools ($M = 5.22$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to RTE was statistically not significant, $p = 0.802$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2 VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT

5.2.1 AVAILABILITY

5.2.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	42	18	41	19
	%	35.0	15.0	34.2	15.8
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	44	16	41	19
	%	36.7	13.3	34.2	15.8

Majority of the students reported that the schools are present in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 69% (i.e. 35.0% of the students in government and 34.2% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 70.9% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat. 29.1% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are more available ($M=2.58$) compared to government schools ($M=2.52$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p = 0.679$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

Safe Infrastructure	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	17.5	16.03	0.032	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	15.95	22.33	0	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	26.02	27.78	0.043	Yes
Extra-curricular infrastructure	8.38	9.50	0.037	Yes
Disabled friendly infrastructure	8.35	7.88	0.468	No
Average	15.24	16.704		

In Viruthunagar district, as per the above data, safe infrastructure is relatively good in private schools in comparison to government schools. In terms of school building infrastructure, safety related infrastructure, classroom infrastructure and extra-curricular infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools. There is no significance in terms of Disabled Friendly Infrastructure.

5.2.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	1	0.8	3	2.5	27	22.5	29	24.2	2	1.7	1	0.8	19	15.8	38	31.7
Proper Roofing	1	0.8	6	5.0	25	20.8	28	23.3	2	1.7	1	0.8	11	9.2	46	38.3
Proper Flooring	3	2.5	1	0.8	31	25.8	25	20.8	2	1.7	0	0	15	12.5	43	35.8
Electricity	3	2.5	1	0.8	35	29.2	21	17.5	0	0	7	5.8	9	7.5	44	36.7
Auditorium	1	0.8	0	0	21	17.5	38	31.7	2	1.7	2	1.7	18	15.0	38	31.7
Kitchen	1	0.8	7	5.8	30	25.0	22	18.3	1	0.8	4	3.3	19	15.8	36	30

24 % respondents studying in government schools reported that safe buildings standard is very good, while 32 % respondents in private schools reported that it is very good. Another 23 % respondents from government schools and 16 % in private schools reported that the safe building standard is good. 3 % respondents from government schools reported it is poor and 2 % from private schools reported that the safe building standard is very poor.

Among the different aspects of school building infrastructure such as proper roofing, proper flooring, electricity and auditorium, on an average 27 (45 %) out of 60 respondents in government schools reported that the school building infrastructure is very good. In comparison, on an average, 41 (68 %) out of 60 respondents in private schools reported that school building infrastructure is very good. However 5 % in government and 4 % in private schools reported that the other aspects of school building infrastructure is poor.

The above findings show that the school building infrastructure is comparatively good in private schools(M=16.03) when compared to government schools(M=17.5). Therefore government schools need to undertake measures to improve the school building infrastructure. A two-tailed t-test revealed that there is a significant difference between government and private schools in terms of school building infrastructure ($P=0.032>0.05$).

5.2.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	1	0.8	6	5.0	21	17.5	32	26.7	0	0	2	1.7	13	10.8	45	37.5
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	5	4.2	27	22.5	28	23.3	0	0	2	1.7	10	8.3	48	40
First Aid Box	1	0.8	2	1.7	32	26.7	25	20.8	0	0	2	1.7	16	13.3	42	35.0
Properly Laid	0	0	2	1.7	27	22.5	31	25.8	0	0	5	4.2	16	13.3	39	32.5

Road																
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	3	2.5	34	28.3	23	19.2	0	0	2	1.7	21	17.5	37	30.8
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0	4	3.3	36	30	20	16.7	0	0	1	0.8	24	20	35	29.2
CCTV	0	0	5	4.2	25	20.8	30	25.0	3	2.5	0	0	6	5.0	51	42.5

In terms of safety related infrastructure a physical compound wall is highly significant to ensure the safety of students and in this regard, 27 % respondents in government schools reported that the standard of compound wall is very good, while the majority 38 % respondents from private schools reported that it is very good. A considerable 5 % respondents from government schools reported that the standard of compound wall is poor.

Among the other aspects of safety related infrastructure such as fire extinguisher, first aid box, properly laid road, speed breaker near entrance and school zone signboard, on an average 27 (45 %) out of 60 respondents in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison on an average the majority 42 (70 %) out of 60 respondents in private schools reported that the other aspects of safety related infrastructure is very good.

The results of descriptive statistics substantiates the above data whereby, private schools have better safety related infrastructure (M=22.33) compared to government schools (M=15.95). A two-tailed t-test showed that, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools in terms of safety related infrastructure, $p = 0$.

The above data shows that, safety related infrastructure is very good in private schools when compared to government schools. Therefore efforts need to be undertaken in government schools to improve safety related infrastructure.

5.2.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	0	0	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3	0	0	2	1.7	17	14.2	41	34.2
Blackboard	1	0.8	2	1.7	26	21.7	31	25.8	2	1.7	3	2.5	17	14.2	38	31.7
Bench	0	0	4	3.3	27	22.5	29	24.2	2	1.7	1	0.8	15	12.5	42	35.0
Fan	6	5.0	3	2.5	22	18.3	29	24.2	2	1.7	10	8.3	13	10.8	35	29.2
Light	2	1.7	3	2.5	20	16.7	35	29.2	0	0	3	2.5	12	10	45	37.5
Door	1	0.8	3	2.5	22	18.3	34	28.3	1	0.8	1	0.8	16	13.3	42	35.0
Window	2	1.7	2	1.7	22	18.3	34	28.3	3	2.5	8	6.7	14	11.7	35	29.2
Ventilation	1	0.8	7	5.8	19	15.8	33	27.5	3	2.5	2	1.7	14	11.7	41	34.2

In terms of classroom infrastructure, 28 % of students in government schools reported that the standard of classrooms was very good, while 34 % in private students reported that the standard of classrooms was very good.

Further in relation to the other aspects of classroom infrastructure such as availability of blackboard, bench, fan, light, door, window and ventilation, on an average 32 (53 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 40 (67 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better classroom infrastructure (M=27.78) compared to government schools (M=26.02).

A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government and private schools with respect to classroom infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.043$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the classroom infrastructure is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. Therefore government schools need to take initiatives to improve classroom infrastructure.

5.2.1.2.4 EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRA

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	1	0.8	2	1.7	24	20	33	27.5	0	0	5	4.2	21	17.5	34	28.3
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	5	4.2	26	21.7	29	24.2	1	0.8	0	0	19	15.8	40	33.3
Sports Equipments	3	2.5	2	1.7	22	18.3	33	27.5	1	0.8	0	0	26	21.7	33	27.5

With respect to extra-curricular activities in schools, 24 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 33 % students in private schools reported that it is very good. A considerable 4 % in government schools reported that it is poor.

Subsequently in terms of other aspects of extra-curricular infrastructure such as playground and sports equipments, on an average 32 (53 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the extra-curricular infrastructure is very good. In comparison, 36 (60 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the extra-curricular infrastructure is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better extra-curricular infrastructure (M=9.50) compared to government schools (M=8.38). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to extra-curricular infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.037$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, it emerges that extra-curricular infrastructure is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve the extra-curricular infrastructure.

5.2.1.2.5 DISABLED FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	5	4.2	21	17.5	34	28.3	0	0	1	0.8	21	17.5	38	31.7
Hand Rails	0	0	3	2.5	19	15.8	38	31.7	0	0	0	0	32	26.7	28	23.3
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	3	2.5	25	20.8	32	26.7	0	0	2	1.7	13	10.8	45	37.5

With respect to availability of ramps as a standard for disabled friendly infrastructure, 28 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, and 32 % of students in private schools reported it is very good. A considerable 4 % students in government schools reported that it is poor. In terms of the other aspects of disabled friendly infrastructure such as hand rails for stairs, on an average 31 (52 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 36 (60 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that disabled friendly infrastructure is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a marginally better disabled friendly infrastructure (M=8.35) compared to government schools (M=7.88). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disabled friendly infrastructure was not significant, $p = 0.468$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the disabled friendly infrastructure is comparatively good in private schools when compared to government schools. However irrespective of government and private schools both do not yet have the complete aspects of disabled friendly infrastructure and therefore both government and private schools need to take urgent steps to improve disabled friendly infrastructure in the schools.

5.2.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	7.15	7.03	0.671	No
Supportive academic resources	4.4	3.37	0.011	Yes
Freebies supporting academics	8.3	6.32	0.032	Yes
Teaching Staff	14.13	13.85	0.520	No
Extra-curricular Staff	3.5	4.1	0.127	No
Academic learning infrastructure	22.13	26.97	0.007	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	6.67	8.48	0.013	Yes
Average	9.468	10.017		

In Viruthunagar district, the availability of academic resources is relatively better in private schools when compared to government schools. With respect to supporting academic resources, freebies supporting academics, academic learning infrastructure and digital learning infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools.

5.2.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	22	18.3	38	31.7	1	0.8	0	0	18	15.0	41	34.2
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	21	17.5	39	32.5	1	0.8	0	0	20	16.7	39	32.5

With respect to standard of availability of mandatory academic resources such as textbooks, 32 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, and 34 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good.

On an average 39 (65 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 40 (67 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that academic resources is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools ($M=7.15$) have better mandatory academic resources in comparison to private schools (7.03), however the difference is very nominal. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to mandatory academic resources was statistically not significant, $p=0.671$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the mandatory academic resources is slightly good in private schools in comparison to government schools. However the difference between government and private schools is very nominal and both need to undertake initiatives to improve availability of mandatory of academic resources such as textbooks and notebooks.

5.2.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	4	3.3	33	27.5	23	19.2	1	0.8	0	0	22	18.3	37	30.8
Extra Tuition	0	0	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3	1	0.8	0	0	35	29.2	24	20

With respect to availability of scholarship as a supporting academic resource, 19 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 31 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good. A considerable 3 % students in government schools reported that it is poor.

On an average 29 (48 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that supporting academic resources such as scholarship and extra tuition in their school is very good. In comparison, 31 (52 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that supporting resource is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have slightly better supporting resources (M=4.4) compared to private schools (M=3.37). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to supporting resource is statistically significant, $p = 0.011$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the supporting resources is good in private schools compared to government schools. However the difference is nominal and both government and private schools need to take steps to improve the supporting resources such as scholarship and extra tuition.

5.2.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	1	0.8	25	20.8	34	28.3	1	0.8	0	0	20	16.7	39	32.5
Stationary	0	0	0	0	23	19.2	37	30.8	1	0.8	0	0	37	30.8	22	18.3
Bag	0	0	1	0.8	26	21.7	33	27.5	0	0	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	21	17.5	39	32.5	0	0	1	0.8	19	15.8	40	33.3

With respect to standard of availability of uniform as part of freebies, 28 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 33 % students in private schools reported that it is very good.

Further in terms of other aspects of freebies such as stationary and bags, on an average 36 (60 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the standard of availability of all freebies is very good. In comparison, 34 (57 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the availability standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better availability of freebies (M=8.3) compared to private schools (M=6.32). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to freebies was statistically significant, $p = 0.032$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the availability standard of freebies (except uniform) is relatively good in government schools when compared to private schools. Therefore private schools need to improve the availability of freebies to students.

5.2.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	19	15.8	41	34.2	3	2.5	0	0	18	15.0	39	32.5
Teacher for each Subject	1	0.8	0	0	23	19.2	36	30	1	0.8	2	1.7	20	16.7	37	30.8
Male Teachers	0	0	1	0.8	26	21.7	33	27.5	0	0	1	0.8	16	13.3	43	35.8
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	22	18.3	38	31.7	1	0.8	0	0	14	11.7	45	37.5

With respect to teacher for each class, 34 % of students in government schools reported that the availability is very good, while 33 % of students in private schools reported that the availability standard is very good and a considerable 3 % students in private schools reported as very poor.

In terms of availability of teacher for each subject, male teachers and female teachers, on an average 37 (62 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported the standard is very good. In comparison, 41 (68 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have slightly better availability of teaching staff ($M=14.13$) compared to private schools ($M=13.85$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to availability of teaching staff was statistically not significant, $p = 0.520$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the availability of teaching staff is comparatively better in government schools compared to private schools. However the difference is very nominal. Therefore both government and private schools need to undertake initiatives to improve the availability standard of teaching staff.

5.2.1.3.5 EXTRA CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	18	15.0	42	35.0	1	0.8	2	1.7	16	13.3	41	34.2
School Counsellor	0	0	0	0	34	28.3	26	21.7	2	1.7	3	2.5	19	15.8	36	30

With respect to standard of availability of extra-curricular staff, 35 % of students in government schools reported that the standard was very good, while 34 % of students in private schools reported likewise.

On an average 34 (57 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that availability standard of extra-curricular staff is very good. In comparison, 39 (65 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that availability is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have slightly better availability standard of extra-curricular staff ($M=4.1$) compared to government schools ($M=3.5$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to availability standard of extra-curricular staff was statistically not significant, $p = 0.127$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the availability standard of extra-curricular staff is slightly better in private schools in comparison to government schools. However the difference is very minimal. Therefore both government and private schools need to improve the availability of extra-curricular staff.

5.2.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRA

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	3	2.5	4	3.3	34	28.3	19	15.8	2	1.7	3	2.5	23	19.2	32	26.7
Biological Specimens	0	0	1	0.8	32	26.7	27	22.5	1	0.8	2	1.7	23	19.2	34	28.3
Physics Lab	0	0	1	0.8	35	29.2	24	20	2	1.7	3	2.5	23	19.2	32	26.7
Physics Instruments	0	0	0	0	33	27.5	27	22.5	1	0.8	2	1.7	32	26.7	25	20.8
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	35	29.2	25	20.8	2	1.7	0	0	34	28.3	24	20
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	3	2.5	31	25.8	26	21.7	1	0.8	2	1.7	34	28.3	23	19.2

Library	0	0	3	2.5	30	25.0	27	22.5	4	3.3	1	0.8	22	18.3	33	27.5
Computer Lab	0	0	2	1.7	33	27.5	25	20.8	1	0.8	3	2.5	16	13.3	40	33.3
Computers	0	0	0	0	32	26.7	28	23.3	1	0.8	3	2.5	19	15.8	37	30.8

With respect to availability standard of library in Academic infrastructure, 23 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 28 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 3 % students in government schools reported it as poor.

Among the different aspects of academic infrastructure, on an average 25 (42 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the academic infrastructure is good. In comparison, 31 (52 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the academic infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better academic infrastructure ($M=26.97$) compared to government schools ($M=22.13$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to academic infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.007$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the academic infrastructure is good in private schools in comparison to government schools. Therefore government schools need to undertake steps to improve academic infrastructure.

5.2.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	1	0.8	2	1.7	32	26.7	25	20.8	4	3.3	2	1.7	18	15.0	36	30
Smart Classroom	2	1.7	0	0	33	27.5	25	20.8	4	3.3	1	0.8	19	15.8	36	30
Device for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	35	29.2	25	20.8	0	0	1	0.8	25	20.8	34	28.3
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	34	28.3	26	21.7	0	0	0	0	20	16.7	40	33.3

With respect to availability standard of smart classroom as part of digital learning infrastructure, 21 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 30 % of students in private schools reported it is very good and 3 % students in private schools reported that it is very poor.

Further, in terms of the different aspects of digital learning infrastructure such as projector, device for online learning and internet access for online learning, on an average 25 (42 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 37 (62 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better digital learning infrastructure ($M=8.48$) compared to government schools ($M=6.67$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to digital learning infrastructure is statistically significant, $p = 0.013$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the digital learning infrastructure is good in private schools when compared to government schools. The t-test shows that there is statistical significance between government and private schools meaning that government schools need to undertake urgent steps to improve the digital learning infrastructure.

5.2.1.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Own transport facility in your school	8	6.7	52	43.3	57	47.5	3	2.5
Provided bus pass to travel to school	19	36.5	12	23.1	7	13.5	14	26.9

With respect to their own transport facility in school, 48 % students in private schools reported that it is available. In comparison, only 7 % of students in government schools reported that it is available and 43 % students in government schools reported that own transport facility is not available in their school.

Further in terms of bus passes provided to travel to school, 37 % students in government schools reported that they were provided bus passes, while only 14 % in private schools reported that they were provided bus passes and the majority 27 % students in private schools reported that they were not provided any bus passes.

On an average 3(28.5%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the transportation facilities are available. In comparison, 28.5 (47.5%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the transportation facilities are available.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better transport facilities ($M=2.28$) than private schools ($M=1.45$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government and private schools with respect to transport facility is statistically significant $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the transport facility is comparatively good in private schools when compared to government schools. However the provision of bus passes to travel using public transport places students from government schools in a better position than students from private schools. Therefore efforts have to be undertaken by both government and private schools to improve the transport facilities.

5.2.1.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

Sanitation facilities	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	15.2	17.25	0.005	Yes
Privacy related infra	8.27	9.0	0.183	No
Basic hygiene	11.43	13.28	0.003	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	7.97	7.75	0.8	No
Average	10.71	11.82		
In Virudhunagar district, private schools have better sanitation facilities than government schools. Further there is a significant difference between government and private schools in terms of restroom buildings and basic hygiene.				

5.2.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	3	2.5	7	5.8	17	14.2	33	27.5	0	0	2	1.7	25	20.8	33	27.5
Proper Flooring	3	2.5	11	9.2	17	14.2	29	24.2	2	1.7	3	2.5	23	19.2	32	26.7
Taps	0	0	10	8.3	24	20	26	21.7	2	1.7	6	5.0	24	20	28	23.3
Doors	3	2.5	10	8.3	17	14.2	30	25.0	5	4.2	1	0.8	18	15.0	36	30
Exhaust Fan	0	0	3	2.5	24	20	33	27.5	2	1.7	2	1.7	18	15.0	38	31.7
Lights	0	0	7	5.8	28	23.3	25	20.8	4	3.3	2	1.7	21	17.5	33	27.5

With respect to sanitation facilities, the building standard of gender specific restrooms is an important criterion, in this regard 28 % of students in government schools and likewise 28 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 6 % students in government schools reported that it is poor.

Similarly in terms of other aspects of sanitation facilities such as proper flooring, taps and doors in restrooms, on an average 29 (48 %) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the standard is very good. In comparison, 33 (55 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better sanitation facilities ($M=17.25$) compared to government schools ($M=15.2$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities is statistically significant, $p = 0.005$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, it is evident that the sanitation facilities is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve all aspects of sanitation facilities.

5.2.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	2	1.7	8	6.7	24	20	26	21.7	5	4.2	2	1.7	22	18.3	31	25.8
Windows with Privacy blinds	1	0.8	9	7.5	27	22.5	23	19.2	0	0	12	10	15	12.5	33	27.5
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	2	1.7	33	27.5	25	20.8	0	0	0	0	25	20.8	35	29.2

With respect to privacy related infrastructure standard, availability of privacy wall in front of restrooms is an essential component, and in this regard only 21 % of students in government schools reported that the privacy wall standard is very good, while 29 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good.

In terms of the different aspects of privacy related infrastructure, on an average only 25 (42 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that the privacy related infrastructure is very good. In comparison, the majority 33 (55 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better privacy related infrastructure (M=9.0) compared to government schools (M=8.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to privacy related infrastructure is statistically not significant, $p = 0.183$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the privacy related infrastructure is relatively good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to improve privacy related infrastructure for girl students.

5.2.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	1	0.8	16	13.3	23	19.2	20	16.7	2	1.7	3	2.5	22	18.3	33	27.5
Buckets	1	0.8	11	9.2	29	24.2	19	15.8	1	0.8	3	2.5	25	20.8	31	25.8
Jugs	1	0.8	9	7.5	34	28.3	16	13.3	2	1.7	3	2.5	20	16.7	35	29.2
Wash Basin	0	0	0	0	25	20.8	35	29.2	0	0	2	1.7	19	15.8	39	32.5

With respect to standard of basic hygiene, running water in taps is highly essential and in this regard, 17 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while 28 % of students in private schools reported that it is very good and 13 % students in government schools reported that basic hygiene standard is poor.

Similarly in terms of other aspects of basic hygiene such as buckets, jugs and wash basin, on an average 23 (38 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that basic hygiene standard is very good. In comparison, 35 (58 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that it is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better basic hygiene standard ($M=13.28$) compared to government schools ($M=11.43$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene standard is statistically significant, $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the basic hygiene standard is good in private schools compared to government schools. Therefore government schools need to undertake steps to improve the basic hygiene standard.

5.2.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	4	3.3	21	17.5	35	29.2	0	0	2	1.7	19	15.8	39	32.5
Pad Dispenser	2	1.7	3	2.5	24	20	31	25.8	0	0	2	1.7	20	16.7	38	31.7
Pad Incinerator	1	0.8	1	0.8	28	23.3	30	25.0	0	0	0	0	24	20	36	30
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	4	3.3	27	22.5	29	24.2	2	1.7	6	5.0	16	13.3	36	30

With respect to menstrual hygiene related aspects, the availability of menstrual pads is an important standard and in this regard, 29 % of students in government schools reported that it is very good, while the majority 33 % of students in private school reported that it is very good and 3 % and 2 % students respectively in government and private schools reported that it is poor.

Further in relation to other aspects of menstrual hygiene such as pad dispenser, pad incinerator and pad disposal bins, on an average 31 (52 %) out of 60 children in the government schools reported that it is very good. In comparison, 34 (62 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene standard is very good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government schools ($M=7.97$) and private schools ($M=7.75$) have menstrual hygiene related aspects. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to menstrual hygiene related aspects is statistically not significant, $p = 0.8$, 95% confidence interval.

From the above data, the menstrual hygiene related aspects is good in private schools compared to government schools. However the difference is very nominal. Therefore both government and private schools should undertake efforts to improve menstrual hygiene related infrastructure.

5.2.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Gover nment School s	Privat e School s
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	2.80	2.90
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	2.63	2.30
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.47	2.27
	EQUAL ACCESS – GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.97	9.37
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	3.70	4.53
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipment	8.23	9.20
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.27	9.67
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.67	9.23
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	9.30	9.67
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	9.07	9.57
	EQUAL ACCESS – CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	9.63	9.50
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	9.63	9.67
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	9.50	9.30
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.40	9.53
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	9.70	9.57
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	9.63	9.53
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	3.67	3.37
A135	Lower caste students study well	9.20	8.70
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.40	9.33
	EQUAL ACCESS – RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	9.67	9.67
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	9.67	9.53
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	9.70	9.60
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.73	9.33
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	7.47	8.27

A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	8.50	8.20
	EQUAL ACCESS – DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	3.33	4.47
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	9.43	9.60
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.50	9.60
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	9.70	9.83
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	9.53	9.57
A150	Differently Abled students study well	9.27	9.40
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	9.50	9.67

5.2.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

Discrimination free environment	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	14.57	16.15	0.002	Yes
Caste discrimination free environment	15.82	15.58	0.663	No
Disability discrimination free environment	6.45	5.93	0.637	No
Religion discrimination free environment	13.55	14.23	0.108	No
Average	12.59	12.97		
In Viruthunagar district, private schools faced better in comparison to government schools in ensuring gender and religious discrimination free environment. However in other aspects such as caste and disability free environment government schools fared better compared to private schools. There is a significant difference between government and private schools in terms of a gender discrimination free environment.				

5.2.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126 and A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level to the statement ‘Girls are discriminated against based on gender’ is at 3.70 and 4.53 respectively which means that girls studying in private schools feel that there is gender discrimination based on gender in their schools.

It is observed that government school students reported lower on access to sports equipment and the way they are treated by teachers compared to private school students. The girls feel that the environment is free of gender discrimination, however, they also reported not having equal access to opportunities like boys.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better gender discrimination free environment ($M=16.15$) compared to government schools ($M=14.57$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134.

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported similarly. The level of agreement is at 8.90 by government school students and at 8.87 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported lower at 9.03 compared to students from private schools at 9.10. On the treatment of lower caste students by the teachers, the students from private schools rated lower at 8.30 compared to government schools at 8.90. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment ($M=15.82$) compared to government schools ($M=15.58$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.663$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was higher in private schools at 9.00 compared to government schools 8.00. However, access to school facilities have been reported higher by the government schools students at 9.60 compared to private schools at 9.00.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability discrimination free environment ($M=6.45$) compared to private schools ($M=5.93$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.637$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported higher at 8.9 by government school students compared to 8.77 by private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment ($M=13.18$) compared to government schools ($M=13.08$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.734$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.2 INCLUSION

Inclusion	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	28.07	30.2	0.001	Yes
Caste Inclusion	38.02	38.57	0.652	No
Religion Inclusion	25.12	26.4	0.144	No
Disability Inclusion	19.32	17.63	0.535	No
Average	27.63	28.2		
In Virudhunagar district, with respect to inclusion, private schools fared better in gender, caste and religious inclusion when compared to government schools. In the aspect of disability inclusion alone, government schools fared better. Further, there is a significant difference between government and private schools when it comes to gender inclusion.				

5.2.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement ‘My school is a safe place for a girl to study’ is similar among both the schools at 9.53. The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 9.27) compared to private school students (Score = 8.63). The government school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score = 9.20) compared to private school students (score = 8.80). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion (M=28.07) compared to private schools (M=30.02). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement ‘Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles’ while the government school students rated 9.03, the private school students rated 9.10. A similar number of the students from both the schools feel that the disabled students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=38.02) compared to private schools (M=38.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.984$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.2.3 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The government schools rate higher on the statement ‘Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers’ at 9.73 compared to private school children at 8.00. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students study well (score = 7.97) and disabled students can complete school education (Score - 9.60). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion (M=19.32) compared to private schools (M=17.63). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.535$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.2.4 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' was reported higher by government school at 8.93 compared to private school which reported at 8.77. The private school children reported more on children treated without religious discrimination (score = 8.73) compared to government school children (score = 8.57).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=26.4) compared to government schools (M=25.12). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.144$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		GOVERNMENT					PRIVATE				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	18	33	7	2	0	26	20	3	4	7
	%	15.0	27.5	5.8	1.7	0	21.7	16.7	2.5	3.3	5.8
Distance to Higher education school	N	18	34	5	1	2	20	23	2	5	10
	%	15.0	28.3	4.2	0.8	1.7	16.7	19.2	1.7	4.2	8.3

With respect to distance to school that you are going to go for higher education, 15 % respondents in government schools reported that it is less than 1 Km, while 17 % in private schools reported the same. For 28 % of students from government schools the distance is between 1 to 3 Km and likewise 19 % in private schools reported the same.

With respect to distance to school that you are going to go for higher education, % respondents in government schools reported that it is less than 1 Km, while % in private schools reported the same. For % of students from government schools the distance is between 1 to 3 Km and likewise % in private schools reported the same.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools (M= 4.32) are more accessible compared to government schools (M= 3.4). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant , $p = 0.02$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

5.2.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Clean Drinking Water	N	57	3	58	2
	%	47.5	2.5	48.3	1.7
Provide Tumbler/ Glass To Drink	N	52	8	55	5
	%	43.3	6.7	45.8	4.2

The results of the descriptive statistics show that access to clean drinking water in private schools ($M= 3.92$) are good compared to government schools ($M= 3.62$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant , $p = 0.093$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	26	23.2	20	17.9
RO Water	23	20.5	22	19.5
Water Can	6	5.4	13	0.8
Water Dispenser	0	0	2	1.7
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

Many of the students 26 (23.2%) out of 60 have reported that in government schools the source of drinking water is RO water and the majority of the students 22(19.5%) out of 60 in private schools have reported that the source of water as Tap Water.

5.2.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	4	14	34
	%	7.3	25.5	61.8

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	16	1	29
	%	32.7	2.0	59.2

About 61.8% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more and 25.5% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (59.2%) of the students reported that the number of servings are “Unlimited” and 32.7% reported that the number of servings are “Only Once”.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows government schools as providing Nutritious Meal in terms of Quantity($M=3.98$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to access to nutritious meals was statistically significant, $p = 0.00$ confidence interval.

5.2.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	0	3	8	31	10
	%	0	5.5	14.5	56.4	18.2

Food quality is reported as Good by the majority of the students 56.4% and about 5.5% of the students reporting the Quality of food is bad.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	47	1
	%	94.0	2.0
Hygienic kitchen	N	41	10
	%	76.0	18.5
Cooked hygienically	N	43	9
	%	78.2	16.4

With respect to other factors with regard to quality, 94% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 76% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 78.2% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

5.2.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	7	45
	%	13.4	86.5
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	5	47
	%	9.6	90.3
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	5	47
	%	9.6	90.3
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	5	47
	%	9.6	90.3

Majority of the students have reported there is no great discrimination

Most of the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food. 13.4 % of students reported gender discrimination in serving food, 9.6 % of students reported caste discrimination in serving food, 9.6 % of students reported Gender discrimination in quantity of food and 5.3 % of students reported caste discrimination in quantity of food.

5.2.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	9.43	9.53
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	7.93	8.90
A154	I feel secured when in school	9.23	9.53
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	9.53	9.53
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	9.33	8.93
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	9.17	9.70
A158	I feel lonely in school	4.50	4.63
A159	I like to go to school everyday	9.43	9.17
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	7.87	9.13
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	7.57	8.60
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.53	9.33
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	4.53	3.83
A164	I can talk to boys	7.47	7.03
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	9.07	9.43
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	9.27	9.73
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	9.37	9.50
A168	I accept my teachers	9.07	9.63
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.83	9.20
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their menstruation days	9.23	8.33
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	9.53	9.23
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	9.60	9.67
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.53	9.13
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	9.17	7.97
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	8.27	7.97
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	9.17	9.20
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.83	8.97
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	9.17	9.17
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	9.90	10.00
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.73	9.90
A181	Education empowers me	9.67	9.90

A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.70	9.87
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	9.70	9.87
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.63	9.80
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.73	9.73
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.77	9.87

5.2.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel happy to study in this school' is reported little higher by private school students (score = 9.53) compared to government school students (score =9.43). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 4.50 and 4.63 by government and private school students respectively. Looking at the scores there is a certain population of students who feel lonely in the school. Bullying at school is also reported higher by government schools (score =4.53) compared to private school students (score =3.83)

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=51.3) compared to private schools (M=53.85). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was not statistically significant, $p = 0.012$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to usage of teaching aids, the government school students reported higher (Score =8.27) compared to private schools (score =7.97). On availability of teachers to support and clarify student doubts, the private school students reported higher scores (score = 9.67) compared to government schools (score =9.60). The government schools students reported lower on regular parent meetings (score = 8.83) compared to private schools (score =8.97).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have a better quality of education (M=62.63) compared to private schools (M=63.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 0.684$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the private schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in government schools. The private school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score = 9.87) compared to government schools (score = 9.70). The private school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 9.87) compared to government school students (score = 9.77).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Private schools have a better Relevance of education (M=39.47) compared to Government schools (M=38.17). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 0.079$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.48	4.37	0.49	No
Skill Development	1.0	0.82	0.031	Yes
Gender equality	4.73	5.23	0.003	Yes
Inclusion of third gender	0.82	1.0	0.001	Yes
Average	11.03	11.42		
In Virudhunagar District, Tamil Nadu, among the study population both government school students and Private School Students have reported that their schools are adaptable. Apart from Skill Development there was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Online Education, Gender Equality and Inclusion of Third Gender.				

5.2.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

5.2.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & Digital Mode of Education		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	17	43	21	39
	%	14.2	35.8	17.5	32.5
Blended modes of education	N	23	37	16	44
	%	19.2	30.8	13.3	36.7
Digital classrooms teaching	N	44	16	51	9
	%	36.7	13.3	42.5	7.5

Majority of the students (35.8%) in government schools mentioned that online mode of education is not adaptable for their school and a similar response was also noted with private school students (32.5%). Similarly 36.7% the private school students feel blended mode of education is not adaptable, on other hand the government school students 30.8% of them feel that blended mode of education is not adaptable. In correspondence to digital classrooms teaching 36.7% of the government school students mentioned that they are adaptable and 42.5% of private school students mentioning adaptable.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Online and Digital Mode of Education in Government schools (M=4.48) are better compared to Private schools (M= 4.37). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Online and Digital Mode of Education was statistically significant, $p = 0.499$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	54	6	58	2
	%	45.0	5.0	48.3	1.7

Both the government school students and private school students have reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics. 45.0% with the government school students and 48.3% of the private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Education for Skill Development in Government schools ($M = 1.0$) are better compared to Private schools ($M = 0.82$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.031$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	58	2	56	5
	%	48.3	1.7	46.8	4.2
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same-Sex School Adaptable	N	48	12	49	11
	%	40.0	10.0	40.8	9.2
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

Majority of the students (48.3%) in the government school have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. A similar trend has been observed in the private school as well, 46.8% of the private school students reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. Both the school students reported that having opposite teachers is adaptable with government school. Similarly, both the school students strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development with 50.0% each.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Gender Equality in Private schools ($M = 5.23$) are better compared to Government Schools ($M = 4.73$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Gender Equality was statistically significant, $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

In Which Type Of School, Gender Equality Is Adaptable	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	6	5.0	0	0
Co- Ed School	51	42.5	58	48.3
Both	3	2.5	2	1.7
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 48.3% of students in private schools reported on this and 42.5% of the students in government schools reported on this. 5.0% of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in same sex schools (girls schools).

5.2.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
THIRD GENDER BE ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	N	60	0	59	1
	%	50.0	0	49.2	0.8

All the government students 50.0% reported acceptance to the inclusion of third gender and about 49.2% of the private school students indicated that third gender should be included while 0.8% of the students in private schools reported that third gender should not be included.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported that third gender can be included in their schools ($M=0.82$) compared to private schools ($M=1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Inclusion of Third Gender was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

5.2.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	28	32	36	24
	%	23.3	26.7	30.0	20.0
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	32	28	38	22
	%	26.7	23.3	31.7	18.3
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	27	33	16	44
	%	22.5	27.5	13.3	36.7
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	2	58	8	52
	%	1.7	48.3	6.7	43.3
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	5	55	13	47
	%	4.2	45.8	10.8	39.2
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	2	58	5	55
	%	1.7	48.3	4.2	45.8
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	5	55	10	50
	%	4.2	45.8	8.3	41.7
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	1	59	4	56

	%	0.8	49.2	3.3	46.7
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	1	59	11	49
	%	0.8	49.2	9.2	40.8

Majority of the government students (23.3%) reported that RTE is enforced in their school compared to private schools (30.0%). Majority of the students (26.7% in government schools and 31.7% private schools) in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality. From the data, it looks like government school children (22.5%) are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE while only 13.3% of the students in the private schools are aware of this. It looks like private school students (6.7%) are aware of capitation fees during admission. Students in both the schools have reported that they are aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 5% in government school and 13% in private school, which is significantly lesser. . Majority of students from both the schools 58% in government schools and 55% private schools) are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE. A similar trend of being unaware on the physical punishment, mental harassment and 25% admission reservation through RTE in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that RTE in Government schools ($M = 5.33$) are better compared to Private schools ($M = 5.13$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to RTE was statistically not significant, $p = 0.471$, 95% confidence interval.

5.3 COMPARISON BETWEEN RAMANATHAPURAM AND VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICTS

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS					PRIVATE SCHOOLS			
SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant
AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	2.67	2.52	0.339	No		2.62	2.58	0.842	No
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	15.75	17.50	0.012	Yes		16.33	16.03	0.669	No
SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	16.10	15.95	0.885	No		21.72	22.33	0.451	No
CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	23.88	26.02	0.019	Yes		27.10	27.78	0.456	No
EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRA	6.80	8.38	0.002	Yes		8.73	9.50	0.152	No
DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRA	7.18	8.35	0.069	No		7.55	7.88	0.590	No
MANDATORY	6.68	7.15	0.077	No		6.95	7.03	0.801	No
SUPPORTING RESOURCE	4.27	4.40	0.769	No		5.12	3.37	0	Yes
FREEBIES	8.12	8.30	0.834	No		5.87	6.32	0.601	No
TEACHING STAFF	13.80	14.13	0.386	No		13.47	13.85	0.474	No
EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	3.37	3.50	0.736	No		3.47	4.10	0.164	No
ACADEMIC INFRA	21.77	22.13	0.837	No		24.92	26.97	0.240	No

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS					PRIVATE SCHOOLS			
	Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant

DIGITAL LEARNING INFRA	6.07	6.67	0.397	No		7.58	8.48	0.306	No
TRANSPORT FACILITIES	2.42	2.28	0.514	No		1.65	1.45	0.288	No
BUILDING	13.53	15.20	0.014	Yes		16.88	17.25	0.669	No
PRIVACY RELATED INFRA	6.98	8.27	0.026	Yes		8.33	9.0	0.273	No
BASIC HYGIENE	9.70	11.43	0.006	Yes		12.18	13.28	0.102	No
MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED	8.22	7.97	0.782	No		8.20	7.75	0.641	No
GENDER	15.42	14.57	0.101	No		14.72	16.15	0.002	Yes
CASTE	29.13	15.82	0	Yes		28.18	15.58	0	Yes
DISABILITY	5.63	6.45	0.439	No		3.02	5.93	0.006	Yes
RELIGION	13.38	13.55	0.739	No		13.32	14.23	0.081	No
GENDER	28.75	28.07	0.317	No		28.93	30.20	0.026	Yes
CASTE	37.03	38.02	0.472	No		36.15	38.57	0.128	No
RELIGION	25.35	25.12	0.815	No		24.47	26.40	0.054	No
DISABILITY	17.07	19.32	0.395	No		10.57	17.63	0.007	Yes
DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	3.67	3.40	0.483	No		4.07	4.32	0.588	No

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS					PRIVATE SCHOOLS			
	Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Ramanathapuram (Mean)	Virudhunagar (Mean)	P Value	Significant
QUANTITY OF FOOD	4.18	3.98	0.584	No		0.25	0.23	0.934	No
QUALITY OF FOOD	6.17	6.25	0.847	No		0.40	0.35	0.869	No
DRINKING WATER	3.90	3.62	0.107	No		4.0	3.92	0.641	No
CANTEEN	2.32	3.47	0.233	No		2.93	6.30	0.022	Yes
DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	6.58	6.57	0.974	No		0.23	0.42	0.515	No
GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY	49.88	51.30	0.182	No		51.22	53.85	0.016	Yes
QUALITY OF EDUCATION	57.53	62.63	0	Yes		58.80	63.07	0.001	Yes
RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION	37.83	38.17	0.671	No		38.77	39.47	0.034	Yes
ONLINE	4.17	4.48	0.148	No		4.42	4.37	0.814	No
SKILL DEVELOPMENT	1.08	1.0	0.372	No		1.08	0.82	0.002	Yes
GENDER EQUALITY	5.12	4.73	0.035	Yes		5.10	5.23	0.438	No
INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	0.98	0.82	0.021	Yes		0.95	1.0	0.258	No
RTE	5.22	5.33	0.611	No		5.28	5.13	0.626	No

CHAPTER VI

TELANGANA

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

6.1 ASIFABAD

6.2 BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM

6.3 BHUPALAPALLY

6.1 ASIFABAD DISTRICT

6.1.1. AVAILABILITY

6.1.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	40	20	55	5
	%	33.3	16.7	45.8	4.2
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	27	33	13	47
	%	22.5	27.5	10.8	39.2

Majority of the students reported that the schools are present in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 79.1% (i.e. 33.3% of the students in government and 45.8% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 33.3% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat. 66.7% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M =$) compared to private schools ($M =$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically not significant, $p =$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	2.88	2.87	0.899	No
Safety related infrastructure	3.07	6.80	0	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	20.57	23.37	0	Yes
Extracurricular infra	6.92	6.02	0.001	Yes
Disable friendly infra	0.80	0	0.001	Yes
Average	6.84	7.81		
In Asifabad district, safe infrastructure is better in private schools compared to government schools. Apart from the school building infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to safe infrastructure.				

6.1.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Electricity	0	0	41	34.2	19	15.8	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0

100% of the students studying in government & private schools reported that the safe building standard is good. Whereas, 34.2% of the Government schools reported that there is poor standard of electricity and 30.8% of reported poor standard of kitchen infrastructure when compared to 6.7% and 50% respectively of private schools. However the need & usage of kitchen in private school is subjective to the provision of meals.

Among all the different aspects of school building infrastructure, On an average 47 (79%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the Building Infrastructure is good. In comparison, 38 (63%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Building Infrastructure is good. 42 (70%)

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have slightly better Building Infrastructure (M=2.88) compared to Private schools (M=2.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Building Infrastructure was statistically Not Significant , $p = 0.899$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of electricity infrastructure is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on ensuring the standard of electricity and kitchens.

6.1.1.2.2 SAFETY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3	0	0	0	0	24	20.0	36	30.0	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	60	50.0		0	0	0	0	0	53	44.2	7	5.8	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speed Breaker at the Entrance of School	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	60	50.0		0	0	0	0	0	52	43.3	8	6.7	0	0

On average 21(35%) out of 60 children in the Private school reported the Safety related infrastructure is poor. In comparison, 18.4 (30.6%) out of 60 children in Government schools reported that Safety related infrastructure is poor. However, 19 (31.6%) of Government schools and 16 (26.6%) of private schools state that there is good safety-related infrastructure respectively

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Private schools have better safety-related infrastructure (M=6.80) compared to Government schools (M= 3.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to safety-related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the safety-related infrastructure is good in some areas of private schools compared to government schools. Government schools need to ensure the availability of fire safety equipment. Both schools need to have School Zone signboards, Properly laid roads, First aid and CCTV.

6.1.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Blackboard	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Bench	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in both government and the private school reported that there is good classroom infrastructure.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools have better classroom infrastructure. (M=23.37) compared to Government schools (M=20.57). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to classroom infrastructure. was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data shown, it can be inferred that the standard of classroom infrastructures in both Government & Private schools is good, However, It quality of it could be improved to provide a better learning environment.

6.1.1.2.4 EXTRACURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 57.3 (95.5%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of extracurricular infrastructure is good. In comparison, 55.3 (92%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard of extracurricular infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Government schools have a better standard of extracurricular infrastructure (M=6.92) compared to Private schools (M=6.02). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect standard of extracurricular Infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the extracurricular infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. There is a need to improve the standard of sports equipment in private schools.

6.1.1.2.5 DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ramps	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hand Rails	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On average 40 (67%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the disable friendly infrastructure is good. In comparison, there is no availability of disable-friendly infrastructure in private schools

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better disable-friendly infrastructure ($M=0.80$) compared to private schools ($M=0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect disable friendly infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the disable friendly infrastructure is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on building disabled-friendly infrastructure to promote the enrolment of differently-abled students for an inclusive learning environment.

6.1.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	6.0	5.80	0.042	Yes
Supportive academic resources	1.45	0.20	0	Yes
Freebies supporting academics	9.08	8.67	0.159	No
Teaching Staff	11.55	11.55	1.0	No
Extra Curricular Staff	1.65	0.57	0	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	0.40	0	0.042	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	2.70	0.10	0	Yes
Average	4.69	3.84		
In Asifabad district, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the freebies supporting academic resources which include uniforms, stationary, bag, and bicycle, statistically, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard.				

6.1.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school and private schools reported that textbooks and notebooks are available and in good quality.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better mandatory academic resources (M=6.0) compared to private schools (M=5.80). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to mandatory academic resources was statistically significant, $p = 0.042$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the mandatory academic resources are equally good in government schools and private schools. However, The schools need to work on increasing the standard of mandatory academic resources.

6.1.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in both government and the private school reported the standard of supporting resources is good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that they have extra tuition whereas government schools did not have any.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that schools have better-supporting resources ($M=1.45$) compared to private schools ($M=0.20$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to supporting resources was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data shown, the supporting resources are good in both government & private schools, However, it is recommended to improve the quality of the resources and

6.1.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Stationary	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Bag	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 58 (96.6%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the standard of freebies is good. In comparison, 55.25 (92.08%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that freebies are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have a better standard of freebies as a supporting academic resource ($M=9.08$) compared to private schools ($M=8.67$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to freebies as a supporting academic resource was statistically not significant, $p = 0.159$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the freebies as a supporting academic resource are good in both government & private schools. However, schools need to improve the standard of the academic supportive resources given as freebies.

6.1.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of teaching staff is good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard of teaching staff is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that both government schools ($M=11.55$) and private schools ($M=11.55$) have a good standard of teaching staff. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to the standard of the teaching staff was statistically not significant, $p = 1.0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of teaching staff is good in both government & private schools. However, the standard can be improved to ensure a higher quality of teaching staff.

6.1.1.3.5 EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
School Counsellor	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of extracurricular activities is good. In comparison, 58 (96.6%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard of extracurricular activities is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better standards of extracurricular activities ($M=1.65$) compared to private schools ($M=0.57$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between

government schools and private schools with respect to the standard of extracurricular activities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of extracurricular activities is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on ensuring the importance of physical education activities and appoint school counsellors to meet the psycho-social needs of the students.

6.1.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Computers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the academic resources related to Biology lab, Biological specimens & Library are good. In comparison, private schools reported a lack of academic resources reviewed in this study.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better standards of academic resources ($M=0.40$) compared to private schools ($M=0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to standards of academic resources was statistically significant, $p = 0.042$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standards of academic resources are good in government schools compared to private schools. However, the data shows that there is a lack of various academic resources such as chemistry labs, chemicals, physics labs, equipment, computer lab & computers. Both government and private schools need to invest in procuring academic resources which are very essential in providing practical exposure and quality learning experience.

6.1.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the digital learning infrastructure is good. In comparison the private schools lack the availability of smart classrooms or projector

6.1.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	1	0.8	59	49.2	54	45	6	5
BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	0	0	60	50	0	0	60	50

On an average 59 (98.3%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the school does not have transport facilities on its own. although 60 (100%) out of 60 children in government schools said that they are provided bus pass to travel to school In comparison, 54 (90%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that their schools have transport facilities.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better transport facilities ($M=3.98$) compared to private schools ($M=3.10$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to transport facilities was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the transport facility is good in private schools compared to government schools. However, The private schools need to work on providing bus pass for its students. Meanwhile, Having exclusive Government buses for school students would improve ease of accessibility.

6.1.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	10.13	11.83	0	Yes
Privacy related infra	5.53	6.28	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	5.82	7.15	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	2.95	1.97	0.01	Yes
Average	6.10	6.80		
In Asifabad District, Telangana, the private schools have better sanitation facilities compared to government schools. There is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Menstrual hygiene related infrastructure is comparatively slightly better in government schools.				

6.1.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	22	18.3	38	31.7	0	0	0	0	44	36.7	16	13.3	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	24	20.0	36	30.0	0	0	0	0	41	34.2	19	15.8	0	0
Taps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0
Doors	0	0	18	15.0	42	35.0	0	0	0	0	15	12.5	45	37.5	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Lights	0	0	47	39.2	13	10.8	0	0	0	0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0

On an average 31.5(52.5%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of sanitation facility building is good. In comparison, 28 (46.6%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that standard of sanitation facility building is good. However, 32 (53.3%) and 18.5 (30.8%) out of 60 children each in private schools and government schools respectively reported that the sanitation facility building is poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better sanitation facility building (M=11.83) compared to government schools (M=10.13). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to sanitation facility building was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of sanitation facility is moderately good in both schools. Although, The private schools need to work on the improving the standard of sanitation especially in the quality of Gender specific restrooms, proper flooring and functional water taps. Both Government and Private schools need to increase the standard of lighting in the restrooms and secure doors.

6.1.1.5.2 PRIVACY-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	28	23.3	32	26.7	0	0	0	0	45	37.5	15	12.5	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	35	29.2	25	20.8	0	0	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	59	49.2	1	0.8	0	0	0	0	59	49.2	1	0.8	0	0

On an average 53(88.3%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the privacy-related sanitation infrastructure is poor. In comparison, 40.6 (67.6%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that privacy-related sanitation infrastructure is poor. while only 19.3(32.26%) and 7(11.6%) out of 60 children each in government schools and private schools respectively reported that privacy-related sanitation infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better privacy-related sanitation infrastructure (M=6.28) compared to government schools (M=5.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to privacy-related sanitation infrastructure was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the privacy-related sanitation infrastructure is slightly good in government schools. however, the standard is poor in both schools, there is a need to work on the construction of privacy walls in front of restrooms, ensure secure windows and doors with latches.

6.1.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	58	48.3	2	1.7	0	0
Buckets	0	0	25	20.8	35	29.2	0	0	0	0	24	20.0	36	30.0	0	0
Jugs	0	0	25	20.8	35	29.2	0	0	0	0	22	18.3	38	31.7	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 47.5 (79.1%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the basic hygiene related resources is good. In comparison, 34 (56.6%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene related resources is good. However, 26 (43.3%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene related resources is poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better basic hygiene related resources ($M=7.15$) compared to government schools ($M=5.82$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene related resources was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of basic hygiene related resources is good in government schools compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the ensuring running water in taps. Both the schools need to improve the availability and standard of Buckets and jugs in restrooms.

6.1.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0	0	0	58	48.3	2	1.7	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the availability of mensural pads is good. In comparison, Private schools does not have the availability of mensural pads. 54 (90%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of pad disposal bins are good. whereas, 58 (96.6%) out of 60 children in private schools have a poor standard of pad disposal bins.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better mensural hygiene facility ($M=2.95$) compared to private schools ($M=1.97$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to standard of mensural hygiene facility was statistically significant, $p = 0.01$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the mensural hygiene facility is slightly good in government schools when compared to private schools. However, Both the schools lacked the availability of sanitary pad dispensers and incinerators. The private schools need to work on the providing sanitary pads to students and ensure proper disposal bins.

6.1.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	2.00	2.00
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	3.00	4.00
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.00	2.00
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.87	7.97
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	2.13	2.00
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	8.87	8.00
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.93	8.00
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.90	8.00
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	8.87	8.00
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	8.83	8.00
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	8.93	8.00
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	8.93	8.00
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.93	8.00
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	9.00	8.00
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	8.93	8.00
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	8.93	8.00
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	8.90	8.03
A135	Lower caste students study well	2.13	2.00
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.23	8.03
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	8.90	8.00
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	8.97	8.00

A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	9.00	8.00
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.97	8.03
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	8.77	8.07
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	5.37	2.10
	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	2.00	0.00
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	2.00	0.00
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.00	0.00
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	8.00	0.00
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	8.00	0.00
A150	Differently Abled students study well	8.00	0.00
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	8.00	0.00

6.1.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	14.42	13.0	0	Yes
Caste discrimination free environment	31.27	28.03	0	Yes
Disability discrimination free environment	0.10	0	0.319	No
Religion discrimination free environment	13.47	12.02	0	Yes
Average	14.42	13.0		
In Asifabad district, the discrimination free environment is higher in the government school compared to the private schools. A significant difference has been observed in the caste discrimination free environment between the government and private schools. In all measures there is a significant difference between government and private schools except disability discrimination free environment has no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.1.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION-FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination-free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement ‘Girls are discriminated against based on gender’ is lower at 2.13 and 2.00 respectively which means that girls feel that there is no discrimination based on gender in their schools. Though the students reported that they are not discriminated against based on gender, it is observed that private school students

reported lower on safety for girls to study and class leadership roles compared to government school students. The girls feel that the environment is free of gender discrimination, however, they also reported not having equal access to opportunities like boys.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that Government schools have better gender discrimination-free environment ($M=14.42$) compared to Private schools ($M=13.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to gender discrimination-free environments was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, equal access based on gender is good in Government schools compared to Private schools. Private schools can take measures to increase the feeling of equal access to girls to create a certainty gender discrimination-free environment.

6.1.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination-free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported similarly. The level of agreement is at 9.00 by government school students and at 8.00 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported higher at 8.93 compared to students from private schools at 8.00. The same trend of the scores of level of agreement was present on statements of schools accepting all castes, the accessibility of lower caste of school facilities and treatment by others. On being able to study well, the level of agreement is at 2.13 by government school students and 2.00 by private school students. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better Caste Discrimination free environment ($M=31.27$) compared to Private schools ($M=28.03$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Caste Discrimination free environment was statistically Significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the equal access irrespective of caste is good in Government schools compared to Private schools. Private schools can take measures to increase the feeling of more inclusivity of castes to create a certainty to caste discrimination-free environment.

6.1.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination-free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement 'Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was way higher in government schools at 8.00 compared to private schools at 0.00. Overall Disability discrimination is way lesser in government schools than private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better discrimination-free environment for differently abled children ($M=0.10$) compared to Private schools ($M=0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to discrimination-free environment for differently abled children was statistically Not Significant, $p=0.319$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, we see that presence of differently abled students in Government schools is better than the private schools. However, the access to all school facilities should be facilitated with necessary infrastructure and equipment access. Whereas, Private schools should focus on enrollment of differently abled children to be more inclusive.

6.1.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the government schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported higher at 8.03 by private school students compared to 8.97 by government school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better religious discrimination free environment (M=13.47) compared to private schools (M=12.02). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence level.

From the data above, the equal access irrespective of Religion is good in Government schools compared to Private schools. The Private schools can take measures to increase the feeling of more liberation in following any religion castes to create a certainty to religious discrimination free environment.

6.1.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	27.70	24.98	0	Yes
Caste Inclusion	36.45	33.05	0	Yes
Religion Inclusion	24.98	21.10	0	Yes
Disability Inclusion	3.37	3.0	0.297	No
Average	27.70	24.98		
In Asifabad district, among the study population, government school students reported that their schools are more inclusive compared to the private school's students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on gender inclusion, caste inclusion and religion inclusion. With respect to disability inclusion, there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.1.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement 'My school is a safe place for a girl to study' is higher in government school (score=8.97) than private school (score 7.97). The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 8.87) compared to private school students (Score = 8.00). The government school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score = 8.83) compared to private school students (score = 8.00). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion (M=27.70) compared to private schools (M=24.98). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement ‘Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles’ while the government school students rated 8.93, the private school students rated 8.00. A similar number of the students from government schools feel that the disabled students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=36.45) compared to private schools (M=33.05). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement ‘Freedom to follow any religion’ was reported higher by government school at 8.97 compared to private school which reported at 8.03. The private school children reported less on children treated without religious discrimination (score = 8.00) compared to government school children (score = 9.00).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher religious inclusion (M=24.98) compared to private schools (M=21.10). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The government schools rate higher on the statement ‘Differently Abled students is treated well by teachers’ at 8.00 compared to private school children at 0.00. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students studying well (score = 8.00) and disabled students can complete school education (Score = 8.00). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher disability inclusion (M=3.37) compared to private schools (M=3.0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.297$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		GOVERNMENT					PRIVATE				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to School	N	22	20	3	10	5	6	50	3	0	1
	%	18.3	16.7	2.5	8.3	4.2	5	41.7	2.5	0	0.8
Distance to Higher Education	N	17	13	9	10	11	3	11	23	16	7
	%	14.2	10.8	7.5	8.3	9.2	2.5	9.2	19.2	13.3	5.8

Majority of the students (21.7%) of the students in the government school come from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometres. In comparison, a majority of the students (27.5%) in private schools come from a distance of 4 - 6 kilometres. The next great part of

the students in government schools (11.7%) of them comes from a distance of less than 1 kilometre and with regard to private schools, 15.8% of the students come from a distance of 7 - 9 kilometres. The private schools have reported having transportation facilities which are a contributing factor for students from long distances to access them. With regard to higher education, the majority of the students (18.3%) of them reported that higher education school is accessible from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometres. In comparison, the majority of the students (21.7%) in private schools reported that higher education school is accessible within a distance of 4 - 6 kilometres. From the data above, the schools for current education (8th class) and higher education (Intermediate) are accessible to students at similar distances.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools are more accessible ($M=$) compared to government schools ($M=$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to physical accessibility was statistically not significant, $p = 0.099$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

6.1.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CLEAN DRINKING WATER	N	59	1	59	1
	%	49.2	0.8	49.2	0.8
TUMBLER/ GLASS TO DRINK WATER	N	58	2	60	0
	%	48.3	1.7	50	0

49.2% of the students in government and private schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water . Only 0.8% of the students in government and private schools have reported that they do not have access to clean drinking water. Even though the water is provided at the school, the government school students reported lower (48.3%) in providing a tumbler or glass for the students to drink water whereas in private school all (50%) of the students reported having a tumbler or glass to drink water.

6.1.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	30	25.6	0	0
RO Water	0	0	0	0
Water Can	29	24.8	58	49.6
Water Dispenser	0	0	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

Majority of the students (25.6%) in government schools reported that the source of drinking water is tap water while 49.6% of students in private schools reported the source of water as water cans. About 24.8% of the students in the government school have reported the water sources as Water Cans.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools have better drinking water facilities ($M=4.90$) compared to private schools ($M=3.97$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to drinking water facility was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL :QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
QUANTITY OF FOOD SERVED	N	5	29	26
	%	8.3	48.3	43.3

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
NO. OF SERVINGS OF FOOD	N	30	0	30
	%	50	0	50

48.3% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal and 43.3% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is more. With respect to the number of servings, the half of the students (50%) of the students reported that the number of servings are unlimited and the other 50% of the students reported that the number of servings is only once.

6.1.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very God
QUALITY OF FOOD SERVED	N	0	0	30	30	0
	%	0	0	50	50	0

Food quality is reported as good by the half of the students (50.0%) and the other half has reported the food quality is neutral. None of the students reported that the good quality is bad

		Yes	No
EGG DURING MID-DAY MEAL	N	60	0
	%	100	0
KITCHEN IN HYGIENIC CONDITION	N	30	30
	%	50	50
FOOD COOKED HYGIENICALLY	N	30	30
	%	50	50

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 100% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 50% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 50% of the students reported that food is cooked hygienically.

6.1.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN SERVING FOOD	N	0	60
	%	0	100
CASTE DISCRIMINATION IN SERVING FOOD	N	0	60
	%	0	100
GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN QUANTITY OF FOOD	N	0	60
	%	0	100

All the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food.

6.1.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.87	8.00
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	8.10	8.00
A154	I feel secured when in school	8.43	8.03
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	8.77	8.00
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.53	7.97
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.87	8.00
A158	I feel lonely in school	2.00	2.10
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.13	8.00
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.80	8.00
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	8.80	8.00
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.13	8.00
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	4.43	2.10
A164	I can talk to boys	8.43	7.97
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.13	8.00
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.20	8.00

A167	Concepts taught are relevant	8.47	8.00
A168	I accept my teachers	8.47	8.03
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.50	8.10
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	8.83	8.10
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	8.87	8.03
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	8.83	8.03
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	7.27	8.03
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.83	8.03
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	8.47	8.10
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	8.57	8.03
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.43	8.03
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.87	8.00
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	8.83	8.00
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	9.00	8.10
A181	Education empowers me	8.97	8.10
A182	Education helps develop my personality	8.93	8.13
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	8.97	8.13
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.03	8.10
A185	Education improves quality of life	9.03	8.00
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	8.97	8.13

6.1.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel proud to study in this school' is reported higher by government school students (score = 8.53) compared to private schools students (score = 7.97). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 2.00 and 2.10 by government and private school students respectively. Looking at the scores there is a certain population of students who feel lonely in the school. Bullying at school is also reported higher by government schools (score = 4.43) compared to private schools students (score = 2.10)

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=50.15) compared to private schools (M=46.08). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to the acceptability of school and friends was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to usage of teaching aids, the government school students reported higher (Score = 8.47) compared to private schools (score = 8.10). On availability of teachers to support students beyond class hours the government school students reported lower scores (score = 7.27) compared to private schools (score = 8.03). The government schools students reported higher on regular parent meetings (score = 8.43) compared to private schools (score = 8.10).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students have more acceptability of teachers (M=59.37) compared to private schools (M=56.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the government schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score =8.97) compared to private schools (score = 8.13). The government school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 8.97) compared to private school students (8.13). The government school students agreed(score =9.03) higher than private schools students (score =8.00) that education helps to improve the quality of life and creativity (score = 9.03 and 8.10 respectively).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel education is relevant (M=35.87) compared to private schools (M=32.35). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.20	4.02	0.008	Yes
Skill Development	1.23	1.0	0	Yes
Gender equality	5.62	5.98	0	Yes
Inclusion of third gender	1.0	1.0	0	Yes
Average	3.01	3.00		
In Asifabad district, among the study population, government school students reported that their schools are slightly adaptable compared to the private school's students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on adaptability to education.				

6.1.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

6.1.4.1.1 ONLINE AND DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
ONLINE MODE OF EDUCATION	N	58	2	60	0
	%	48.3	1.7	50	0
BLENDED MODE OF EDUCATION	N	50	10	59	1
	%	41.7	8.3	49.2	0.8
DIGITAL CLASSROOM TEACHING	N	57	3	60	0
	%	47.5	2.5	50	0

Majority of the students (48.3%) in government schools mentioned that online mode of education is adaptable for their school and a higher response was also noted with private school students (50%). While the private school students (49.2%) feel blended mode of education is adaptable, on other hand the government school students only 41.7% of them feel that blended mode of education is adaptable. In private schools, all the students (50%) feel the digital classroom teaching is adaptable, and 47.5% of the students reported that digital classroom teaching is adaptable in government schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students feel an online and digital mode of teaching is adaptable ($M=4.20$) compared to government schools ($M=4.02$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to the relevance of education was statistically not significant, $p = 0.008$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		N	%	N	%
SKILL DEVELOPMENT BASED EDUCATION ESSENTIAL	Yes	46	38.3	60	50.0
	No	14	11.7	0	0

The government school students have reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics (38.3%), while only 50% of the private school students reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported skills development is incorporated in their academics ($M=1.23$) compared to private schools ($M=1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to education for skill development was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CONCEPT OF GENDER EQUALITY ADAPTABLE IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50	0	50	0
HAVING TEACHERS OF OPPOSITE GENDER IN SAME SEX SCHOOL ADAPTABLE	N	32	28	1	59
	%	26.7	23.3	0.8	49.2
ADAPTING GENDER EQUALITY CONTRIBUTES TO SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50	0

Majority of the students (50%) in the government school and private school have reported that gender equality is adaptable in their school. 26.7% of government school students and 0.8% of the private school students reported that having opposite teachers is adaptable. Similarly, both the school students strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development.

6.1.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

TYPE OF SCHOOL WHERE GENDER EQUALITY IS ADAPTABILITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	2	1.7	0	0
Co- Ed School	48	40.0	60	50.0
Both	10	8.3	0	0
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 50% of students in private schools reported on this and 40% of the students in government schools reported on this. 1.7% of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in same sex schools (girls schools).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students reported that gender equality is more adaptable in their schools ($M=5.98$) compared to government schools ($M=5.62$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender equality was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		N	%	N	%
THIRD GENDER ACCEPTED IN SCHOOLS	Yes	60	50.0	60	50.0
	No	0	0	0	0

The government students and the private students reported on the inclusion of third gender that 50% of the students indicated that third gender should be included in both schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students reported that third gender can be included in their schools (M=1) and private schools also with (M=1). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to inclusion of third gender was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.1.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

	GOVERNMENT			PRIVATE	
		Yes	No / Don't Know	Yes	No / Don't Know
AWARENESS ON RTE	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50	0	50	0
RTE IN SCHOOL	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50	0	50	0
RTE PROMOTES GENDER EQUALITY	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50	0	50	0
FREE EDUCATION	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50	0	50	0
CAPITATION FEES	N	34	26	60	0
	%	28.3	21.7	50	0
ADMISSION SCREENING	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50	0
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	47	13	60	0
	%	39.2	10.8	50	0

PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50	0	50
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50	0	50
25% RESERVATIONS FOR PVT	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50	0

All of the government students and private students (50%) reported that RTE is enforced in their school . All of the students in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality. From the data, it looks like both schools are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE . It looks like all private school students (50%) are aware of capitation fees during admission. Students in both the schools have reported that they are aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 49.2% in government school and 50% in private school. Majority of students from both the schools (39.2% in government schools and 50% private schools) are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE. The scores for the physical punishment, mental harassment and all are aware of 25% admission reservation through RTE in private schools . The government schools students are unaware physical punishment, mental harassment and 49.2% are aware of 25% admission reservation through RTE.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students are more aware of RTE (M=6.52) compared to government schools (M=6.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to RTE was statistically significant, $p = 0.035$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2 BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM DISTRICT

6.2.1 AVAILABILITY

6.2.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	14	46	44	16
	%	11.7	38.3	36.7	13.3
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	14	46	42	18
	%	11.7	38.3	35.0	15.0

Majority of the students reported that the schools are not available in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 51.6% (i.e. 38.3% of the students in government and 13.3 % of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools are not in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 53.3% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education while 46.7% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M = 3.53$) compared to private schools ($M = 2.57$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	13.93	11.65	0	Yes
Safety related infrastructure	6.62	7.18	0.203	No
Classroom infrastructure	22.55	23.38	0.001	Yes
Extra curricular infra	5.38	5.62	0.538	No
Disability friendly infra	1.68	2.98	0.003	Yes
Average	10.032	10.162		
In Bhadrachari Kothagudem District, Telangana, safe infrastructure is equally better in government schools compared to private schools. Apart from the classroom infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to safe infrastructure.				

6.2.1.2.1 SCHOOL BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Electricity	0	0	26	21.7	34	28.3	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	58	96.7	2	3.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	52	86.7	8	13.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 37 (61.6%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Building Infrastructure is good. However, 45.3 (75%) out of 60 Government school students reported that the Electricity, Auditorium and Kitchen is Poor. In comparison, 65.83 % out of 60 children in private schools reported that Building Infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better Building Infrastructure (M= 13.93) compared to Private schools (M=11.65). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Building Infrastructure was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Building Infrastructure is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on the Building Infrastructure.

6.2.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	16	12.6	44	34.6	0	0	0	0	8	6.3	59	46.5	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	53	44.2	7	5.8	0	0	0	0	35	29.2	25	20.8	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	47	39.2	13	10.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Zone Sign board on the Road	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	12	10.0	48	40.0	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0

The Fire Extinguisher in Private Schools is good (100%), the Roads are laid properly in private schools (50%), the Speed Breakers are good in Private Schools (50%). The Compound Wall in Government is good (34.6 %) and the CCTV in government schools are good (40.0 %)

On an average 16 (26.6 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported the Safety related Infrastructure is good. In comparison, 45 (75.46) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Safety related infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Safety related Infrastructure ($M=7.18$) compared to Government schools ($M= 6.62$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Safety related Infrastructure was statistically not significant , $p = 0.203$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Safety related infrastructure is good in private schools compared to government schools. The Government schools need to work on First Aid Box, Properly laid roads, speed breakers near the entrance of school and School Zone sign board. The Private Schools need to work on First Aid Box.

6.2.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Class room	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Black board	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Bench	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Fan	0	0	21	17.5	39	32.5	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Light	0	0	19	15.8	41	34.2	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Door	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Window	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Ventilation	0	0	17	14.2	43	35.8	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0

In the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools The Classroom (49.2%), The Black board (49.2%), The Bench (49.2%), The Fan (32.5%), The Light (34.2), The Door (47.5%), The Window (45.0%) and the Ventilation (35.8) are reported to be good.

Similarly in Private Schools Classroom (49.2%), The Black board (49.2%), The Bench (50.0%), The Fan (48.3%), The Light (48.3), The Door (50.0%), The Window (50.0%) and the Ventilation (44.2) are reported to be good.

On an average 51 (85.6 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that Classroom Infrastructure is good. In comparison, 58 (97.2 %) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Classroom Infrastructure ($M=23.38$) compared to Government schools ($M=22.55$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Classroom Infrastructure was statistically significant , $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Classroom Infrastructure is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on the Fan, Light and Ventilation.

6.2.1.2.4 EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0	0	0	12	10.0	48	40.0	0	0

It is inferred from the above on an average 39 (65.5) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Extra Curricular Infra is good. In comparison, 49.3 (82.16%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the Extra curricular infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Extra curricular infra (M= 5.62) compared to Government schools (M= 5.38). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra Curricular Infra was statistically significant , $p = 0.538$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Extra curricular infra is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on the Sports Equipment. Both the Government and Private Schools need to work on Extra Curricular Activities.

6.2.1.2.5 DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Hand Rails	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	54	45.0	6	5.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0

From the above table it was inferred that in the Government Schools Ramps (45.8%), Hand Rails (45.8%) are reported by school students to be good and also in the Private Schools the Ramps, Hand Rails and Hand Rails for Stairs are reported to be good.

On an average 38 (64.3) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Disable friendly infra is good. In comparison, 57 (95.3) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Disable friendly infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Disable Friendly Infra (M=2.98) compared to Government schools (M=1.68). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Disable Friendly Infra was statistically Significant , $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Disable Friendly Infra is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on Hand Rails for Stairs.

6.2.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	5.90	5.87	0.743	No
Supportive academic resources	0.18	0.05	0.162	No
Freebies supporting academics	7.65	8.53	0	Yes
Teaching Staff	10.72	11.63	0.001	Yes
Extra Curricular Staff	2.72	3.03	0.026	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	0.45	11.55	0	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	0.50	4.27	0	Yes
Average	4.017	6.418		
In Bhadradi Kothagudem District, Telangana, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in private schools compared to government schools. Apart from the supportive academic resources which include extra tuition and scholarships, statistically there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard				

6.2.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Academic Resources are good. In comparison, 59 (98.3) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Academic Resources are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have good Academic Resources (M=5.90) like Private Schools (M= 5.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Academic Resources was statistically not significant , $p = 0.743$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Academic Resource is equally good in Government schools compared to Private schools. The Government schools Private Schools can work on stationeries and learning equipments.

6.2.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%)out of 60 children in the government school reported that Supportive Resources are good. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools have also reported that Supportive Resources are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have 60 respondents (50%) (M=0.18) and Private schools have 59 respondents (M=0.05). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Supportive Resources was statistically significant , $p = 0.162$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, supportive resources are good in both Government and Private Schools.

6.2.1.3.3 FREEBIES SUPPORTING ACADEMIC LEARNING

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Stationary	0	0	30	25.0	30	25.0	0	0	0	0	11	9.2	49	40.8	0	0
Bag	0	0	33	27.5	27	22.5	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 40 (67%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Freebies are good. In comparison, 39.5 (65.8) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Freebies are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have more respondents who feel that freebies are good = 40 (M= 7.65) compared to Private schools 39.5 (M = 8.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Freebies was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval. From the data above table, both Government and Private School students feel that freebies are good.

6.2.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

From the above table it is inferred that the students in Government Schools have reported that the Teachers for their Class are good - 60 (50.0%), The Teachers for each subject are good - 59 (49.2%), the Male Teachers are good in teaching - 59 (49.2%) and the Female Teacher are good in teaching - 57 (47.5%).

On an average 58 (97.91%) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Teaching Staff are good. About 59.75 (99.58) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Teaching Staff are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools (M=10.72) and Private Schools have better Teaching Staff (M=11.63). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Teaching Staff was statistically significant, $p=0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Teaching Staff is good in both Government and Private schools. Quality teaching needs to be ensured from time to time.

6.2.1.3.5 EXTRA - CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0
School Counsellor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0

On an average 55 (45.8 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Extra- Curricular Staff are good. In comparison, 56 (94.16%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Extra-curricular Staff is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Extra Curricular Staff 56 (94.16) (M=3.03) compared to Government schools 55 (45.8%) (M=3.03). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra-curricular Staff was statistically Significant , $p =0.026$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Extra-curricular Staff is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on bringing School Counsellors.

6.2.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26.7	44	73.3	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	76.7	14	23.3	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	71.7	17	28.3	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	81.7	11	18.3	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	73.3	16	26.7	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	83.3	10	16.7	0	0
Library	0	0	57	47.5	3	2.5	0	0	0	0	59	49.2	1	0.8	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	23.3	46	76.7	0	0
Computers	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	37.5	15	12.5	0	0

From the above table Government School students have reported that the Library 57 (47.5) and Computers 60 (50) in the Government Schools are good. The Private School Students have reported that the Biological Lab 44 (73.35), Biological Specimens 14 (23.3), Physical Lab 17 (28.3), Physical Instruments 11 (18.3), Chemistry Lab 16 (26.7), Chemicals and Equipments 10 (16.7) Computer Lab 46 (76.7) and Computer 15 (12.5).

On an average 19.3 (32.2) out of 60 children in the Private school reported that the Academic Infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Academic Infra 19.3 (32.2%) (M=11.55) compared to Government schools 0.3 (0.55%) (M=0.45). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Academic Infra. was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Academic Infra is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on Biological Lab, Biological Specimens, Physical Lab, Physical Instruments, Chemistry Lab, Chemicals and Equipments and Computer Lab.

6.2.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	57	47.5	3	2.5	0	0	0	0	54	45.0	6	5.0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	54	45.0	6	5.0	0	0
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	83.3	10	16.7	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0

On an average 27 (44.5 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Digital Learning Infra are good. In comparison, 16.5 (27.5) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Digital Learning Infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better Digital Learning Infra 27 (44.5) (M=0.50) compared to Private schools 16 (27.5 %) (M=4.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Digital Learning Infra was statistically Significant , $p = 0.05$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Digital Learning Infra is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on Internet Access online, Smart Classroom and Projector..

6.2.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	7	5.8	53	44.2	44	36.7	16	13.3
PROVIDED BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	0	0	60	100	0	0	60	100

The table shows that 53 (44.2%) of the Government School students have informed that there is no transport facility. In comparison 44 (36.7%) school students have reported that there is transport facility. It is understood that Government Schools have very less transport facilities. Whereas, 60 (100%) of the Government School students and private school students have informed that there is no bus pass. It is understood that Government School Students and Private School students need bus pass facilities.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better transportation facilities (M= 3.32) compared to government schools (M= 3.27). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to transportation facilities was statistically not significant, $p = 0.699$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	12.07	13.58	0	Yes
Privacy related infra	7.25	8.05	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	7.12	9.08	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	2.42	2.93	0	Yes
Average	7.215	8.41		
In Bhadradri Kothagudem District, Telangana, the private schools have better sanitation facilities compared to government schools. Apart from restrooms, there is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Bathrooms with privacy related infrastructure like proper latches, slides and privacy walls are available in government schools.				

6.2.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDINGS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	24	20.0	36	30.0	0	0	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	23	19.2	37	30.8	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Taps	0	0	49	40.8	11	9.2	0	0	0	0	16	13.3	44	36.7	0	0
Doors	0	0	18	15.0	42	35.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lights	0	0	41	34.2	19	15.8	0	0	0	0	7	5.8	53	44.2	0	0

It has been inferred from the above table that in Government Schools and Private Schools that the Buildings are good. On an average 42 (70.55 %) out of 60 children in the Private School students reported that the Buildings are good. In comparison, only 24 (40.2%) out of 60 children in Government School Students have reported that Buildings are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Buildings 42 (70.5) (M=13.58) compared to Government schools 16 (27.5 %) (M=12.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Buildings was statistically Significant , $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Buildings are good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on improving Buildings. Gender Specific Restrooms, Proper Flooring, Taps, Doors, Exhaust Fans and Lights need to be improved. In Comparison in Private Schools Gender Specific restrooms, Proper Flooring, Taps and Lights need Improvement. There is no Exhaust fan in either Government Schools or Private Schools.

6.2.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	45	37.5	15	12.5	0	0	0	0	23	19.2	37	30.8	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	28	23.3	32	26.7	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	24	20.0	36	30.0	0	0	0	0	15	12.5	45	37.5	0	0

On an average 27 (46 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that Privacy Related infra are good. In comparison, 44 (73.33) out of 60 children in private schools have reported that Privacy Related infra are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Privacy Related infra 44(73.33) (M=8.05) compared to Government schools 27 (46 %) (M=7.25). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Privacy Related infra was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Privacy Related infra is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on Latches /Locks on Doors, Windows with Privacy blinds, Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms. Private Schools need to improve on Latches /Locks on Doors, Windows with Privacy blinds, Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms.

6.2.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	47	39.2	13	10.8	0	0	0	0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0
Buckets	0	0	21	17.5	39	32.5	0	0	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0
Jugs	0	0	28	23.3	32	26.7	0	0	0	0	11	9.2	49	40.8	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0

On an average 21 (35 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Basic Hygiene is good. In comparison, 43 (72%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Basic Hygiene is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools have better Basic Hygiene 21 (35%) (M=7.12) compared to Private schools 43 (72 %) (M=9.08). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Basic Hygiene was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the Basic Hygiene is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools need to work on Running water on taps, Wash Basins, Buckets and Jugs and Private Schools need to work on Running Water in Taps.

6.2.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	33	27.5	27	22.5	0	0	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0

On an average 7 (11.2 %) out of 60 children in the government school reported that the Menstrual Hygiene is good. In comparison, 27 (44.5%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Menstrual Hygiene is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Private schools have better Menstrual Hygiene 27 (44.5) (M=2.93) compared to Government schools 7 (11.2 %) (M=2.42). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Menstrual Hygiene was statistically Significant , $p=0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, availability of Pad Disposal Bin is good in Private schools compared to Government schools. The Government schools and the Private Schools need to work on Menstrual Pads, Pad Dispenser, Pad Incinerators and also improve Pad Disposal Bin..

6.2.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	2.10	2.07
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	3.43	3.53
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.10	2.07
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.23	8.60
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	2.00	2.03
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	8.13	8.30
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.13	8.27
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.13	8.20

A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	8.30	8.13
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	8.17	8.20
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	8.20	8.13
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	8.17	8.43
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.20	8.20
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.17	8.30
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	8.17	8.43
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	8.20	8.20
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	8.17	8.33
A135	Lower caste students study well	2.00	2.13
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.13	8.20
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	8.13	8.30
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	8.10	8.33
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	8.20	8.40
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.20	8.27
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	8.40	8.23
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	2.13	2.27
	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	0.00	0.00
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	0.00	0.00
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	0.00	0.00
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	0.00	0.00
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	0.00	0.00
A150	Differently Abled students study well	0.00	0.00
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	0.00	0.00

6.2.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	13.20	13.40	0.114	No
Caste discrimination free environment	28.50	28.88	0.259	No
Disability discrimination free environment	0	0	N.A	N.A
Religion discrimination free environment	12.25	12.50	0.108	No
Average	13.48	13.69		
In Bhadradi Kothagudem District, Telangana, the discrimination free environment is higher in the Private school compared to the Government schools. All the measures under discrimination free environment have no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.2.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

On an average both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement that ‘Girls are discriminated against based on gender’ is higher at 13.20 and 13.40 respectively., it is observed that both in Government school and private school students reported higher on access to sports equipment, that is 8.13 and 8.30 respectively. The girls also feel that they are also treated well by teachers.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better gender discrimination free environment (M=13.20) compared to private schools (M=13.40). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment that there was no statistical significant, $p = 0.114$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement ‘Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination’ was reported similarly. The level of agreement is at 8.17 by government school students and at 8.30 by private school students. About how lower caste students are treated, government schools reported lower at 8.17 compared to students from private schools at 8.43. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still see a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment (M=28.50) compared to government schools (M=28.88). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.259$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.1.3 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' is reported lower at 8.20 by government school students compared to 8.40 by private school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better religious discrimination free environment (M=12.25) compared to government schools (M=12.50). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.108$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.1.4 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

Regarding Disability Discrimination free environment, the students have not reported on any of the related questions

6.2.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	25.55	25.87	0.208	No
Caste Inclusion	33.57	34.05	0.182	No
Religion Inclusion	21.58	21.90	0.228	No
Disability Inclusion	3.02	3.02	1.0	No
Average	21.93	21.21		
Bhadradri Kothagudem District, Telangana, among the study population government school students reported that their schools are more inclusive compared to the private schools students. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on gender inclusion. With respect to the other measures under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.2.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

On the statement 'My school is a safe place for a girl to study' The government School students have responded lower (Score - 8.23) compare to Private schools(Score - 8.60). The government school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 8.30) compared to private school students (Score = 8.13). The government school students also reported that they can share problems with teachers (score = 8.17) compared to private school students (score = 8.20). This shows that girls in the government schools feel more connected to school, teachers and the students than the students in private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools with higher gender inclusion (M=25.55) compared to private schools (M=25.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was no statistically significant, $p = 0.208$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement 'Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles' while the government school students rated 8.20, the private school students rated 8.20. A similar number of the students from

both the schools feel that the lower caste students can relate to other classmates without discrimination and also indicated that the students are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools with higher caste inclusion (M=33.57) compared to private schools (M=34.05). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.182$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' was reported similar by government school at 8.20 compared to private school which reported at 8.27. The private school children reported more on children that they are treated without religious discrimination (score = 8.73) compared to government school children (score = 8.57).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools with higher religious inclusion (M=21.90) compared to government schools (M=21.58). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.228$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

Regarding Disability Inclusion, the students have not reported on any of the related questions.

6.2.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL

		Government					Private				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	8	23	7	7	15	28	14	10	5	3
	%	6.7	19.2	5.8	5.8	12.5	23.3	11.7	8.3	4.2	2.5
Distance to Higher education school	N	8	21	7	7	17	23	16	10	5	6
	%	6.7	17.5	5.8	5.8	14.2	19.2	13.3	8.3	4.2	5.0

From the above table it is inferred that about 21 (17.5%) of the Government School students plan to attend a high school less than 3 Kilometers, 17 (14.2) out of 60 plan to attend a high school above 10 kms, about 7 (5.8%) plan to attend a high school with 4-6 Kms distance, about 7 (5.8%) plan to attend a high school with 7-9 Kms distance, about 8 (6.7%) plan to attend a high school with less than 1 Kms distance.

And in the Private Schools students 23 (19.2%) plan to attend a high school less than 1 Kilometers out of 60. About 16 (13.3%) plan to attend a high school with 1-3 Kms distance, about 10 (8.3%) plan to attend a high school with 4-6 Kms distance, about 5 (4.2%) plan to attend a high school with 7-9 Kms and about 6 (5%) plan to attend a high school above 10 Kms distance.

From the above table it is inferred that in the Government Schools students 8 (6.7 %) out of 60 are attending a school less than 1 Kilometers. About 23 (19.2%) are attending attend a school with 1-3 Kms distance, about 7 (5.8%) are attending attend a school

with 4-6 Kms distance, about 7 (5.8%) are attending attend a school with 7-9 Kms and about 10 (12.5%) are attending attend a school above 10 Kms distance.

And in the Private Schools students 28 (23.3%) are attending attend a school less than 1 Kilometers out of 60. About 14 (11.7%) are attending attend a school with 1-3 Kms distance, about 10 (8.3%) are attending attend a school with 4-6 Kms distance, about 5 (4.2%) are attending attend a school with 7-9 Kms and about 3 (2.5%) are attending attend a school above 10 Kms distance. It was noted that about 15 students in the Government School are traveling above 10 Kms.

6.2.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL & DRINKING WATER

6.2.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Clean Drinking Water	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50.0	0
Provide Tumbler/ Glass To Drink	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 59 (49.2%) out of 60 have informed “Yes” saying that the School provides clean water. About 1 (.8%) out of 60 have informed “No” saying that the School is not providing clean water.

In Private Schools 60 (50 %) out of 60 have informed “that the School provides clean water.

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 60 (50%) out of 60 provides Tumblers/Glass to Drink Water. Similarly in Private Schools also 60 (50%) out of 60 provides Tumblers/Glass to Drink Water. Thus it is inferred that both in Government and Private Schools Tumblers / Glasses are provided.

6.2.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	0	0	1	0.8
RO Water	0	0	0	0
Water Can	60	50.0	59	49.2
Water Dispenser	0	0	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 60 (50%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides Water Can. In Private Schools 59 (49.2%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides Can water. About 1 (0.8%) out of 60 have informed that the School provides Tap water.

It is inferred that both Government Schools and Private Schools need proper drinking water facilities which includes RO Water and Water Dispenser.

6.2.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	13	47	0
	%	21.7	78.3	0

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	36	7	17
	%	60.0	11.7	28.3

47(78.3%) feel that the Quantity of the food is ideal, about 13 (21.7%) of the students feel that the quantity is less

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that Government schools only have food served 20 (33.33) (M=7.83) compared to Private Schools 0 (0 %) (M=0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to food served was statistically Significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

36 (60.0%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served only once. About 7 (11.7%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served twice and 17 (28.3%) out of 60 have informed that Food is served unlimited.

6.2.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEAL: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	0	0	58	2	0
	%	0	0	96.7	3.3	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 58(96.7%) out of 60 have informed that they are neutral in terms of Quality Food. About 2 (3.3%) out of 60 have informed that the Quality of Food served is good.

		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	60	0
	%	100	0
Hygienic kitchen	N	6	54
	%	10	90.0
Cooked hygienically	N	6	54
	%	10	90.0

60 (100%) out of 60 have informed that they are being provided Egg during Mid-Day Meals. 54 (90%) out of 60 have informed that the Kitchen is not in Hygienic condition. 54(90%) out of 60 have informed that in the food is not cooked in Hygienical conditions.

6.2.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	0	60
	%	0	100.0
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	0	60
	%	0	100.0
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	60
	%	0	100.0
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	60
	%	0	100.0

All the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food.

6.2.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.37	8.47
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	8.37	8.43
A154	I feel secured when in school	8.43	8.40
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	8.23	8.43
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.37	8.43
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.27	8.43
A158	I feel lonely in school	2.00	2.00
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.40	8.37
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.30	8.40
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	8.23	8.40
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.30	8.23
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	2.00	2.10
A164	I can talk to boys	8.47	8.33
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of		

	Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.27	8.40
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.27	8.37
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	8.37	8.57
A168	I accept my teachers	8.60	8.73
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.60	8.73
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	8.53	8.63
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	8.63	8.60
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	8.53	8.73
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.53	8.83
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.70	8.80
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	8.53	8.67
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	8.53	8.57
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.60	8.50
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.47	8.53
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	8.30	8.50
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	8.50	8.60
A181	Education empowers me	8.73	8.83
A182	Education helps develop my personality	8.87	9.00
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	8.67	8.70
A184	Education helps me become creative	8.63	8.60
A185	Education improves quality of life	8.47	8.70
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	8.27	8.77

6.2.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel secure when in school' is reported equally higher by government school students (score = 8.43) compared to private schools students (score = 8.40). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 2.00 and 2.00 by government and private school students respectively. Students have also reported that they are bullied based on their looks at 2.00 and 2.10 by government and private school students respectively.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students have more acceptability of school and friends (M=48.22) compared to government schools (M=47.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability of school and friends was not statistically significant, $p = 0.430$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

With respect to inspiration by teachers, the government school students reported higher scores (Score = 8.60) similar to private schools (score = 8.73). On availability of textbooks both the government school students and private school students also reported scores higher scores of (8.60) and (score = 8.73) respectively. The scores in the Quality of Education have reasonably higher scores and most of the variables were equal with small variation comparing with government schools and Private Schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have a better quality of education (M=59.58) compared to private schools (M=60.33). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was not statistically significant, $p = 0.218$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the government schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score =8.67) compared to private schools (score = 8.70). The government school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 8.27) compared to private school students (8.77).

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel education is relevant (M=34.22) compared to private schools (M=34.85). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	4.17	4.28	0.396	No
Skill Development	1.78	1.48	0.001	Yes
Gender equality	5.0	5.07	0.397	No
Inclusion of third gender	1.90	1.55	0	Yes
Average	3.2125	3.095		

Bhadradri Kothagudem District, Telangana, among the study population of government school and private school students reported that their schools are able to adapt to online education, skill development, gender equality and inclusion of third gender. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Skill Development and Inclusion of the third gender. With respect to online education and Gender Equality there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.

6.2.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

6.2.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & digital mode of education		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50.0	0
Blended mode of education	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
Digital classroom teaching	N	58	2	60	0
	%	48.3	1.7	50.0	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 59 (49.2%) out of 60 have informed that they are able to adapt to online mode.. Similarly in Private Schools also 60 (50%) have also informed that they are able to adapt to online mode. However, 60 (50%) out of 60 students of both government and private schools have informed that they are able to adapt to a blended mode of education. Thus it is inferred that both in Government and Private School students are able to adapt to a blended mode of education. Whereas, 58 (48.3%) out of 60 have informed that they are able to Adapt to Digital Classroom Teaching. Similarly in Private Schools also 60 (50%) have also informed that they are able to Adapt to Digital Classroom Teaching.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government school students feel an online and digital mode of teaching is adaptable ($M = 4.02$) compared to private schools ($M = 3.98$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically not significant, $p = 0.321$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	60	50.0	60	50.0
No	0	0	0	0

From the above table it is inferred that in Government Schools 60 (50.0%) out of 60 have informed that Skill Development based Education is Essential. Similarly in Private Schools also 60 (50%) have also informed that Skill Development based Education is Essential. Thus it is inferred that both in Government and Private School students are able to Adapt to Skill Development based Education.

6.2.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same Sex School Adaptable	N	4	56	8	52
	%	3.3	46.7	6.7	43.3
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	60	0	59	1
	%	50.0	0	49.2	0.8

The table shows, 60 (50.0%) out of 60 students of government & private schools each have informed that the concept of Gender Equality is adaptable in School. About 56 (46.7%) out of 60 students have informed that the teachers of the opposite gender are able to adapt in same sex school. In the Private School about 52 (43.3%) out of 60 students have informed that the teachers of the opposite gender are able to adapt in same sex school. 60 (100%) out of 60 government school students have informed that the school does adapting gender equality contributions to societal development. Similarly in the Private School about 59 (98.3%) out of 60 students have informed that the school is adapting gender equality contributions to societal development.

6.2.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

IN WHICH TYPE OF SCHOOL, GENDER EQUALITY IS ADAPTABILITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	5	4.2	0	0
Co- Ed School	52	43.3	59	49.2
Both	3	2.5	1	0.8
None	0	0	0	0

From the above table it is inferred that Gender Equality is adaptable in Co-Education Government Schools 52 (43.3%) out of 60. Similarly in Private Schools also it was inferred that 59 (49.2%) have informed that Gender Equality is adaptable in Co-Education School.

6.2.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	60	50.0	59	49.2
No	0	0	1	0.8

From the above table it is inferred that in the Government School about 60 (100%) out of 60 students have informed that the individuals of the third gender can be accepted in schools. Similarly in the Private School about 59 (98.33%) out of 60 students have informed individuals of the third gender can be accepted in schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students feel that third gender should be accepted ($M= 1.02$) compared to government schools ($M= 1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to relevance of education was statistically not significant, $p =0.319$, 95% confidence interval.

6.2.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50.0	0	50.0
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50.0	0	50.0
DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50.0	0	50.0
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	1	59	1	59
	%	0.8	49.2	0.8	49.2
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	0	60	1	59
	%	0	50.0	0.8	49.2
RESERVATION OF 25% IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	59	1	59	1
	%	49.2	0.8	49.2	0.8

60 (100%) out of 60 Government and Private Schools students each have informed that RTI was enforced in school, t RTI promotes gender equality, there is free education till 14 years of age, there is no capitation fee during admission., no admission screening procedure, there is no denial of admission. 59 (98.33%) out of 60 Government and Private Schools students each have informed that there is no Physical Punishment. 60 (100%) out of 60 government school students have informed that there is no Mental Harassment. Similarly in the Private Schools about 59 (98.33%) out of 60 students have informed that there is no Mental Harassment. 59 (98.33%) out of 60 Government and Private Schools students each have informed that there is 25% Reservation in Private Schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private school students are more aware of RTE ($M=8.02$) compared to government schools ($M=8.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to adaptability to RTE was statistically not significant, $p =0.658$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3 BHUPALAPALLY DISTRICT

6.3.1 AVAILABILITY

6.3.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Current school in the same village/ town as your residence	N	19	41	28	32
	%	15.8	34.2	23.3	26.7
School facility in your village panchayat/ town to continue your higher secondary education	N	7	53	26	34
	%	5.8	44.2	21.7	28.3

Majority of the students reported that the schools are not available in their village or panchayat itself. A total of 60.9% (i.e. 34.2 % of the students in government and 26.7% of students in private schools) of the students reported that the schools are not in their village or panchayat. With regard to higher education, 72.5% of the students reported that they need to go outside their panchayat for higher education while 34.1% of the students reported that the higher education facility is available in their village or panchayat.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools are more available ($M = 3.57$) compared to private schools ($M = 3.10$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to school availability was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.1.2 SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE

SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
School Building Infrastructure	10.78	10.38	0.403	No
Safety related infrastructure	4.87	7.82	0.001	Yes
Classroom infrastructure	16.83	20.78	0	Yes
Extra curricular infrastructure	3.47	3.60	0.808	No
Disability friendly infrastructure	0.97	0.45	0.014	Yes
Average	7.38	8.60		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, Safe Infrastructure is better in Private schools compared to Government schools. Apart from the School Building infrastructure and Extra Curricular Infrastructure, there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to Safe Infrastructure.				

6.3.1.2.1 BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Safe Buildings	0	0	12	10.0	48	40.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Proper Roofing	0	0	20	16.7	40	33.3	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	29	24.2	31	25.8	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Electricity	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0	0	0	20	16.7	40	33.3	0	0
Auditorium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kitchen	0	0	51	85.0	9	15.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 27.1 (46.1%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Building Infrastructure is good. In comparison, 22.1(36.8%)out of 60 children in government schools reported that Building Infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Building Infrastructure (M=10.78) compared to private schools (M=10.38). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Building Infrastructure was statistically no significant , $p = 0.403$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government is good in Building Infrastructure schools compare to private schools. The private schools need to work on the Auditorium, Kitchen.

6.3.1.2.2 SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Compound Wall	0	0	13	10.8	47	39.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Fire Extinguisher	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	60	100.0	0	0
First Aid Box	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Properly Laid Road	0	0	4	3.4	52	44.8	0	0	0	0	1	0.9	59	50.9	0	0
Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
School Zone Signboard on the Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
CCTV	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0

On an average 58.1 (96.8%)out of 60 children in the private school reported the Safety related Infrastructure is good. In comparison, 30(50%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Safety related Infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Safety related Infrastructure (M= 7.82) compared to government schools (M=4.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Safety related Infrastructure was statistically significant , $p = 0.001$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are good in Safety related Infrastructure compare to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Properly Laid Road .

6.3.1.2.3 CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	0	0	22	18.3	38	31.7	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Black board	0	0	38	31.7	22	18.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Bench	0	0	43	35.8	17	14.2	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0
Fan	0	0	54	45.0	6	5.0	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0
Light	0	0	49	40.8	11	9.2	0	0	0	0	12	10.0	48	40.0	0	0
Door	0	0	50	41.7	10	8.3	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Window	0	0	50	41.7	10	8.3	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Ventilation	0	0	45	37.5	15	12.5	0	0	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0

On an average 52(86.6%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Classroom infrastructure is good. In comparison, 16.1(26.8%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Classroom infrastructure is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Classroom infrastructure (M= 3.60) compared to government schools (M= 3.47). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Classroom infrastructure was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are good in Classroom infrastructure compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Fan.

6.3.1.2.4 EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Playground	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Sports Equipments	0	0	54	45.0	6	5.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Extra Curricular Activities	0	0	48	40.0	12	10.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0

On an average 58(96.6%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Extra curricular infra is good. In comparison, 23.3(38.8%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Extra curricular infra is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Extra curricular infra (M= 3.60) compared to government schools (M= 3.47). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra curricular infra was statistically significant , $p=0.808$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are good in Extra curricular infra compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the sorts Equipments

6.3.1.2.5 DISABLED FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ramps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Handrails	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hand Rails for Stairs	0	0	52	43.3	8	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 8(6.7%) out of 60 children in the private school reported that Disable Friendly infras are good. In comparison, out of 60 children in Private schools reported that Disable friendly infras are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Disable friendly infra (M=0.97) compared to private schools (M=0.45). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government

school and private schools with respect to Disable friendly infra was statistically significant, $p = 0.014$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government schools is good Disable friendly infra compare to private schools. The private schools need to work on the Ramps, HandRails.

6.3.1.3 ACADEMIC RESOURCES

ACADEMIC RESOURCES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Mandatory academic resources	4.18	5.42	0	Yes
Supportive academic resources	0	0	NA	NA
Freebies supporting academics	5.63	7.63	0	Yes
Teaching Staff	9.68	10.85	0.015	Yes
Extra Curricular Staff	3.07	2.50	0.002	Yes
Academic learning infrastructure	8.93	14.17	0	Yes
Digital learning infrastructure	0.07	1.40	0	Yes
Average	4.50	6.0		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, the availability of academic resources and their standard are better in private schools compared to government schools. Apart from the supportive academic resources which include extra tuition and scholarships, statistically there is a significant difference between government and private schools with respect to academic resources and their quality standard.				

6.3.1.3.1 MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Notebooks	0	0	21	17.5	39	32.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 59 (98%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Mandatory is good. In comparison, 47.5 (79.1%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Mandatory is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Mandatory (M= 5.42) compared to government schools (M= 4.18). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Mandatory was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private is good in Mandatory compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Notebooks.

6.3.1.3.2 SUPPORTING RESOURCES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Scholarship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Extra Tuition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Not Applicable, since there is no response to the respective questions from both Government and Private School Students.

6.3.1.3.3 FREEBIES

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Uniform	0	0	15	12.5	45	37.5	0	0	0	0	2	1.7	58	48.3	0	0
Stationary	0	0	41	34.2	19	15.8	0	0	0	0	17	14.2	43	35.8	0	0
Bag	0	0	36	30.0	24	20.0	0	0	0	0	9	7.5	51	42.5	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0

On an average 53(88%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Freebies is good. In comparison, 18.3(30.5%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Freebies are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Freebies (M= 7.63) compared to government schools (M=5.63). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Freebies was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private is good in Freebies compared to government schools. The government schools need to work regarding Bicycles.

6.3.1.3.4 TEACHING STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher for your Class	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Teacher for each Subject	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Male Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Female Teachers	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Teaching staff is good. In comparison, 59.7(99%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Teaching staff is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Teaching staff (M=10.85) compared to government schools (M=9.68). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Teaching staff was statistically significant, $p = 0.015$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are good in Teaching staff compared to government schools. The government schools need to work regarding teachers for your Class.

6.3.1.3.5 EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education Teacher	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
School Counsellor	0	0	2	3.3	58	96.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0

On an average 59 (98.3%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the Extra-curricular staff is good. In comparison, 30 (50%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that Extra-curricular staff is good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Extra-curricular staff (M= 3.07) compared to private schools (M= 2.50). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Extra-curricular staff was statistically significant, $p = 0.002$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the government is good in Extra-curricular staff compared to private schools. The private schools need to work on the School Counsellor

6.3.1.3.6 ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Biology Lab	0	0	52	43.3	8	6.7	0	0	0	0	5	4.2	55	45.8	0	0
Biological Specimens	0	0	53	44.2	7	5.8	0	0	0	0	33	27.5	27	22.5	0	0
Physics Lab	0	0	57	47.5	3	2.5	0	0	0	0	10	8.3	50	41.7	0	0
Physics Instruments	0	0	59	49.2	1	0.8	0	0	0	0	45	37.5	15	12.5	0	0
Chemistry Lab	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39.2	13	10.8	0	0
Chemicals & Equipments	0	0	59	49.2	1	0.8	0	0	0	0	46	38.3	14	11.7	0	0
Library	0	0	60	50.0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	59	49.2	0	0
Computer Lab	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	60	50.0	0	0
Computers	0	0	51	42.5	9	7.5	0	0	0	0	8	6.7	52	43.3	0	0

On an average 56.2 (93.6%) out of 60 children in the private school reported that Academic infras are good. In comparison, 38.30 (63.8%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Academic infras are poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Academic infra ($M=14.17$) compared to government schools ($M=8.93$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Academic infra was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are good in Academic infra compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on the Computers.

6.3.1.3.7 DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Projector	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	40.0	12	10.0	0	0
Smart Classroom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Device for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Internet Access for Online Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 15(25%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the Digital learning infra is poor. In comparison, 12 (20%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that Digital learning infra is poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better Digital learning infra (M=1.40) compared to private schools (M= 0.07). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Digital learning infra was statistically significant , p = 0, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the private schools are slightly good in Digital learning infra compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on ensuring the availability and accessibility of digital infrastructural development to have be relevant with the technology aided education era.

6.3.1.4 TRANSPORT FACILITIES

	GOVERNMENT				PRIVATE			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOL HAVE ITS OWN TRANSPORT FACILITY	0	0	60	50	60	50	0	0
PROVIDED BUS PASS TO TRAVEL TO SCHOOL	0	0	60	50	0	0	60	50

On an average 60 (100%) out of 60 children in the government schools reported the transport facilities are not available in their schools. In comparison, 60 (100%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that transport facilities are available in their schools. However, Neither of the schools provided bus passes to travel to school.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better transport facilities (M=4.0) compared to government schools (M=3.0). The government schools can work on transport facilities and Bus Pass,while the private schools need to work on bus passes.

6.3.1.5 SANITATION FACILITIES

SANITATION FACILITIES	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Restroom buildings	4.40	9.45	0	Yes
Privacy related infra	0.03	0.77	0	Yes
Basic hygiene	2.80	4.77	0	Yes
Menstrual hygiene related	0.68	1.73	0	Yes
Average	2.00	4.18		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, the private schools have better sanitation facilities compared to government schools. There is a significant difference between government schools and private schools with respect to sanitation facilities. Bathrooms with privacy related infrastructure like proper latches, slides and privacy walls are better in private schools compare to government schools.				

6.3.1.5.1 SANITATION BUILDINGS

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender Specific Restrooms	0	0	42	35.0	18	15.0	0	0	0	0	14	11.7	46	38.3	0	0
Proper Flooring	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0
Taps	0	0	57	47.5	3	2.5	0	0	0	0	6	5.0	54	45.0	0	0
Doors	0	0	58	48.3	2	1.7	0	0	0	0	19	15.8	41	34.2	0	0
Exhaust Fan	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lights	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50.0	0	0

On an average 45.3 (75.5%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the standard of restroom buildings are poor. In comparison, 6.5 (10.8%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standard of restroom buildings are poor. However 43.5 (72.5%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that the standards of restroom buildings are good.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better buildings ($M=9.45$) compared to government schools ($M=4.40$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to the standard of restroom buildings was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the standard of restroom buildings is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on improving the standard of restroom buildings.

6.3.1.5.2 PRIVACY RELATED INFRA

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Latches / Lock on Doors	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2.5	57	47.5	0	0
Windows with Privacy blinds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Privacy Wall in front of Restrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3	58	96.7	0	0

On an average 38.3 (63.8%) out of 60 children in the private schools reported the privacy related infrastructure in restrooms are good. In comparison, 20 (33.3%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that privacy related infrastructure in restrooms is poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better privacy related infrastructure ($M=0.77$) compared to government schools ($M=0.03$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to privacy related infrastructure was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data above, the privacy related infrastructure in restrooms is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on improving the standard of doors and windows with adequate safety to ensure privacy. The poor standard of locks on door is a grave concern to privacy.

6.3.1.5.3 BASIC HYGIENE

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Running Water in Taps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	100.0	0	0
Buckets	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27.5	27	22.5	0	0
Jugs	0	0	60	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	30.8	23	19.2	0	0
Wash Basin	0	0	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On an average 45 (75%) out of 60 children in the government school reported the basic hygiene related infrastructure is poor. In comparison, 17.5 (29.1%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene related infrastructure is poor. Whereas, 27.5 (45.8%) out of 60 children in private schools reported that basic hygiene related infrastructure is good

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better basic hygiene related infrastructure ($M=4.77$) compared to government schools ($M=2.80$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to basic hygiene was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data, the basic hygiene related infrastructure is good in private schools compared to government schools. The government schools need to work on providing running water in taps and improve the standard of sanitation. Private schools need to provide wash basins in restrooms to encourage proper hand hygiene.

6.3.1.5.4 MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED

	GOVERNMENT								PRIVATE							
	Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good		Very Poor		Poor		Good		Very Good	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Menstrual Pads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Dispenser	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Incinerator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pad Disposal Bin	0	0	55	45.8	5	4.2	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	56	46.7	0	0

On an average 56 (93.3%) out of 60 children in the private school reported the standard of disposal bins for sanitary pads is good. In comparison, 55 (91%) out of 60 children in government schools reported that the standard of disposal bins for sanitary pads is poor.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better menstrual hygiene related factors ($M= 1.73$) compared to government schools ($M= 0.68$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to menstrual hygiene related factors was statistically significant , $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

From the data, the standard of disposal bins for sanitary pads is good in private schools compared to government schools. However, The both government and private schools lack the availability of sanitary pads, dispensers and incinerators. There is an adverse need to provide mensural hygiene resources and infrastructure to facilitate inclusive and considerate learning environment for girl children.

6.3.2 ACCESSIBILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	EQUAL ACCESS		
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	2.23	2.47
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	2.90	2.90
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	2.40	3.00
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER		
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	8.53	8.40
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	2.17	2.73
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	8.57	8.70
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.57	8.30
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	8.33	8.63
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	8.37	8.53
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	8.53	9.10
	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE		
A130	School accepts students from all castes	8.47	8.60
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	8.37	8.20
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	8.40	9.10
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.70	8.47
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	8.37	8.20

A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	8.40	9.10
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	8.83	8.70
A135	Lower caste students study well	2.27	2.50
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	8.57	8.63
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION		
A137	School accepts students from all religion	8.63	9.00
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	8.43	8.77
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	8.60	8.67
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	8.67	8.83
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	8.47	8.87
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	2.13	2.43
	EQUAL ACCESS - DISABILITY		
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	3.97	0.00
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	2.00	0.00
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	8.00	0.00
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	8.03	0.00
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	10.00	0.00
A150	Differently Abled students study well	9.97	0.00
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	9.97	0.00

6.3.2.1 DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender discrimination free environment	13.82	14.18	0.196	No
Caste discrimination free environment	29.88	30.10	0.647	No
Disability discrimination free environment	0.45	0	0.043	Yes
Religion discrimination free environment	12.85	13.13	0.197	No
Average	14.25	14.35		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, the discrimination free environment is equal in the government school and private schools. Except for Disability discrimination free environment, all the other measures under discrimination free environment have no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.3.2.1.1 GENDER DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A124, A125, A126, A127.

In both government and private schools, the agreement level on the statement 'Girls are discriminated against based on gender' is lower at 2.17 and 2.13 respectively which means that girls feel that there is no discrimination based on gender in their schools. Though the students reported that they are not discriminated against based on gender, it is observed that private school students reported higher access to sports equipment and lower class leadership roles compared to government school students. The girls feel that the environment is free of gender discrimination, however, they also reported not having equal access to opportunities like boys.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better gender discrimination free environment ($M=14.18$) compared to government schools ($M=13.82$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.196$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.1.2 CASTE DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A131, A132, A133, A134

The level of agreement on the statement 'Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination' was reported lower in private schools.. The level of agreement is at 8.70 by government school students and at 8.47 by private school students. On class leadership opportunities, students from government schools reported lower at 8.40 compared to students from private schools at 9.10. On the treatment of lower caste students by the teachers, the students from private schools rated lower at 8.20 compared to government schools at 8.37. At large the caste discrimination is not present in the schools, however, the students still sees a slight difference in terms of opportunities and teacher treatment in government schools than private schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have a better caste discrimination free environment ($M=30.10$) compared to government schools ($M=29.88$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste discrimination free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.647$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.1.3 DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following statements were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A147, A146, A145

The level of agreement for the statement ‘Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination’ was lower in private schools at 0.00 compared to government schools at 8.00. However, access to school facilities have been reported higher by the government schools students at 2.00 compared to private schools at 0.00.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have a better disability free environment ($M=0.45$) compared to private schools ($M=0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to a disability free environment was statistically significant, $p = 0.043$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.1.4 RELIGION DISCRIMINATION FREE ENVIRONMENT

The following were analyzed to understand the gender discrimination free environment: A138, A139, A140

The level of agreement on the statements, the private schools reported higher on statements related to relationships among students based on religion and treatment of students based on religion. The level of agreement on the statement ‘Freedom to follow any religion’ is reported higher at 8.83 by private school students compared to 8.67 by government school students.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better religion free environments ($M=13.13$) compared to government schools ($M=12.85$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government schools and private schools with respect to religion free environment was statistically not significant, $p = 0.197$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.2 INCLUSION

INCLUSION	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Gender Inclusion	26.53	27.20	0.120	No
Caste Inclusion	35.30	35.67	0.479	No
Religion Inclusion	22.47	23.28	0.012	Yes
Disability Inclusion	4.63	3.0	0.042	Yes
Average	22.23	22.28		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, among the study population both government school students and Private School Students have reported that their schools are more inclusive. There was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Religious inclusion and Disability Inclusion. With respect to the other measures under the inclusion there was no significant difference between the government and private schools.				

6.3.2.2.1 GENDER INCLUSION

The level of agreement on the statement 'My school is a safe place for a girl to study' is slightly higher in government schools (8.53) than private schools (8.40). The private school children reported that they are treated well by teachers (Score = 8.53) compared to government school students (Score = 8.37). The private school students also reported that they can share things with teachers (score = 9.10) compared to government school students (score = 8.53). This shows that girls in the private schools feel more connected to school and the teachers than the students in government schools.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that private schools have better gender inclusion (M=27.20) compared to government schools (M= 26.53). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender inclusion was statistically not significant , $p = 0.120$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.2.2 CASTE INCLUSION

A similar level of agreement is reported in the statement 'Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles' while the government school students rated 8.40, the private school students rated 9.10. The government school children reported that they feel that the lower caste students can relate to other classmates without discrimination (Score = 8.70) compared to private school students (Score = 8.47). The government school children reported that they are well treated by the teachers without any discrimination (Score = 8.37) compared to private school students (Score = 8.20).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools (M= 35.67) compared to government schools (M= 35.30) are almost similar in caste inclusion. A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to caste inclusion was statistically not significant, $p = 0.479$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.2.3 RELIGION INCLUSION

The level of agreement to the statement 'Freedom to follow any religion' was reported higher by private schools at 8.83 compared to government schools which reported at 8.67. The private school reported more children are treated well without religious discrimination (score = 8.67) compared to government school children (score = 8.60).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better religious inclusion (M=23.28) compared to government schools (M=22.47). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to religious inclusion was statistically significant , $p = 0.012$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.2.4 DISABILITY INCLUSION

The government schools rate higher on the statement 'Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers' at 8.03 compared to private school children at 0.00. The opinions of government school children seem to be stronger and more inclined towards disability inclusion, their level of agreement with respect to disabled students study well (score = 9.97) and disabled students can complete school education (Score - 9.97). The children might have built this attitude as they would have encountered a disabled student in their school.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better disability friendly (M= 4.63) compared to private schools (M= 3.0). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to disability inclusion was statistically significant, $p = 0.042$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.3 SCHOOL ACCESSIBILITY: DISTANCE TO SCHOOL FROM HOME

		Government					Private				
		Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM	Less than 1 KM	1 KM – 3 KM	4 KM – 6 KM	7 KM – 9 KM	Above 10 KM
Distance to school	N	16	20	7	3	14	12	14	24	6	4
	%	13.3	16.7	5.8	2.5	11.7	10.0	11.7	20.0	5.0	3.3
Distance to Higher education school	N	0	9	2	3	46	3	12	14	3	28
	%	0	7.5	1.7	2.5	38.3	2.5	10.0	11.7	2.5	23.3

Majority of the students (16.7%) of the students in the government school come from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometers. In comparison, a majority of the students (20.0%) in private schools come from a distance of 4 - 6 kilometers. The next great part of the students in government schools (13.3%) of them comes from a distance of less than 1 kilometer and with regard to private schools, 11.7% of the students comes from a distance of 1 - 3 kilometers. The private schools have reported having transportation facilities which are a contributing factor for students from long distances to access them. With regard to higher education, the majority of the students (38.3%) of government schools reported that higher education school is accessible from a distance of above 10 kilometers. In comparison, the majority of the students (23.3%) in the private schools reported that higher education school is accessible within a distance of 4 above 10 kilometers.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better distance to school ($M=7.08$) compared to private schools ($M= 6.28$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to better distance to school was statistically significant, $p = 0.044$, 95% confidence interval

6.3.2.4 NUTRITIOUS MEAL AND DRINKING WATER

6.3.2.4.1 DRINKING WATER

DRINKING WATER		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
CLEAN DRINKING WATER	N	51	9	60	0
	%	42.5	7.5	50.0	0
PROVIDE TUMBLER/ GLASS TO DRINK	N	44	7	48	12
	%	39.6	10.4	43.2	6.8

About 42.5% of the students in government schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water and 50% (i.e. all the students) in the private schools have reported that they have access to clean drinking water. Only 7.5% of the students in government schools have reported that they do not have access to clean drinking water. Even though the water is provided at the school, the government reported lower (39.6%) in providing a tumbler or glass for the students to drink water whereas in private school 43.2% of the students reported having a tumbler or glass to drink water.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better drinking water facilities ($M= 4.80$) compared to government schools ($M= 3.97$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to drinking water was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.2.4.2 SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Tap Water	21	18.9	12	10.8
RO Water	1	0.9	0	0
Water Can	28	25.2	48	43.2
Water Dispenser	1	0.9	0	0
Hand Pump	0	0	0	0

Many of the students (25.2%) in government schools reported that the source of drinking water is Water Can and the majority of the students (43.2%) in private schools reported the source of water as Water Can. About 18.9% of the students in the government school have reported the water sources as Tap Water.

6.3.2.4.3 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUANTITY OF FOOD

		Less	Ideal	More
Quantity of food	N	7	50	0
	%	12.3	87.7	0

		Only Once	Twice	Unlimited
Number of serving	N	39	0	18
	%	68.4	0	31.6

About 87.7% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is ideal and 12.3% of the students reported that the quantity of the food is less. With respect to the number of servings, the majority of the students (68.4%) of the students reported that the number of servings are Only Once and 31.6% reported that the number of servings are Unlimited..

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools only ($M=7.55$) . A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to access to nutritious meal was statistically significant, $p = 0.0\%$ confidence interval.

6.3.2.4.4 ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS MEALS: QUALITY OF FOOD

		Very Bad	Bad	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Quality of food	N	0	3	54	0	0
	%	0	5.3	94.7	0	0

Food quality is reported as neutral by the majority of the students (94.7%) followed by 5.3% of the students reporting the quality of food is bad.

Quality of Food		Yes	No
Egg in mid-day meal	N	57	0
	%	100	0
Hygienic kitchen	N	57	0
	%	100	0
Cooked hygienically	N	0	57
	%	0	100

With respect to other factors with regard to quality , 100% of the students reported that eggs are provided in the mid-day meals. and 100% of the students reported that food is prepared in a hygienic kitchen and 100% of the students reported that food is not cooked hygienically.

6.3.2.4.5 DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY

		Yes	No
Gender discrimination in serving food	N	3	54
	%	5.3	94.7
Caste discrimination in serving food	N	4	53
	%	7.1	92.9
Gender discrimination in quantity of food	N	0	57
	%	0	100
Caste discrimination in quantity of food	N	3	54
	%	5.3	94.7

Most of the students have reported that there is no discrimination in serving the food or in providing the right quantity of the food. 5.3% of students reported gender discrimination in serving food, 7.1% of students reported caste discrimination in serving food, 5.3% of students reported caste discrimination in quantity of food.

6.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY

	All the scores are converted to scale of 10 , the minimum score is 2 and the maximum score is 10 The closer the score to 10, the stronger the level of agreement to the statement	Government Schools	Private Schools
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS		
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	8.53	8.87
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	8.40	8.80
A154	I feel secured when in school	8.73	9.00
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	8.63	9.20
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	8.53	8.73
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	8.80	9.07
A158	I feel lonely in school	2.13	2.13
A159	I like to go to school everyday	8.60	9.17
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	8.90	8.67
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	8.40	8.90
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	8.83	8.73
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	2.47	2.47
A164	I can talk to boys	8.77	9.13
	QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers		
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	8.50	8.63
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	8.77	8.87
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	8.47	9.00
A168	I accept my teachers	8.97	9.03
A169	My teachers inspire me	8.47	8.77
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	8.87	9.00
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	8.50	8.60
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	8.80	9.03
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	8.30	8.43

A174	Textbooks available in regional language	8.63	8.90
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	8.20	8.43
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	8.53	8.93
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	8.00	8.47
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	8.30	8.97
	RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education		
A179	Girls should be educated	8.63	9.00
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	8.87	8.77
A181	Education empowers me	8.77	9.23
A182	Education helps develop my personality	9.40	9.50
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	8.90	8.87
A184	Education helps me become creative	9.03	9.07
A185	Education improves quality of life	8.57	9.10
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	9.03	9.23

6.3.3.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS (GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY)

On the acceptability of schools, The acceptability of parents to feel secure to send their girl child to school is higher in private schools (9.20) compared to government schools (8.63). the students from government schools and private schools reported that they feel happy to study in the school. The level of agreement to the statement 'I feel proud to study in this school' is reported slightly higher by private school students (score = 8.73) compared to private schools students (score = 8.53). Though the students reported lower on feeling lonely at the school at 2.13 by government and private school students each.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better acceptability (M= 51.57) compared to government schools (M= 49.87). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to acceptability was statistically significant, $p = 0.009$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.3.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHERS (QUALITY OF EDUCATION)

On acceptability of teachers, the teachers concern for students wellbeing are high in both government and private schools, In terms of teaching aids used and acceptance of it private schools are higher (8.43) compared to government schools (8.20). The acceptability to teachers to clarify doubts are higher in private schools (9.03) compared to government schools (8.80). The level of agreement to the statement "I accept my teachers" is reported to be similar among both government and private schools with a slight difference.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better quality of education (M=61.53) compared to government schools (M= 59.65). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to quality of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.021$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.3.3 ACCEPTABILITY OF GIRL'S EDUCATION (RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION)

Students in the private schools feel education is relevant and more important for girls compared to girls in private schools. The government school children feel that education helps to learn new skills (Score =8.90) compared to private schools (score = 8.87). The private school students also feel that education helps them to face challenges (score = 9.23) compared to government school students (9.03).

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better Relevance of Education (M= 36.58) compared to government schools (M=35.60). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to Relevance of Education was statistically significant, $p = 0.024$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.4 ADAPTABILITY

ADAPTABILITY	Government Schools (Mean)	Private Schools (Mean)	P Value	Significant
Online education	3.92	4.12	0.010	Yes
Skill Development	1.0	1.0	NA	NA
Gender equality	6.23	6.0	0.003	Yes
Inclusion of third gender	1.0	1.07	0.042	Yes
Average	3.03	3.04		
In Bhoopalapally District, Telangana, among the study population both government school students and Private School Students have reported that their schools are adaptable. Apart from Skill Development there was a statistically significant difference between the government and private schools on Online Education, Gender Equality and Inclusion of Third Gender.				

6.3.4.1 CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY

6.3.4.1.1 ONLINE & DIGITAL MODE OF EDUCATION

Online & Digital mode of education		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Online mode of education	N	60	0	54	6
	%	50.0	0	45.0	5.0
Blended mode of education	N	60	0	48	12
	%	50.0	0	40.0	10.0
Digital classroom teaching	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

Majority of the students 60 (100%) out of 60 students in government schools mentioned that online mode of education is adaptable for their school and a similar response was also noted with private school students with 54 (90%). While the 60 (100%) out of 60 government school students feel the blended mode of education is adaptable, on other hand the private school students only 48 (80%) out of 60 feel that blended mode of education is adaptable. In government schools and private schools students 60 (100%) out of 60 students each feel the digital classroom teaching is adaptable.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better online & digital mode of education ($M = 4.12$) compared to government schools ($M = 3.92$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to online & digital mode of education was statistically significant, $p = 0.010$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.4.1.2 EDUCATION FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

		Government		Private	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Education for skill development	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

In government school and private school students 60 (100%) out of 60 were reported that skill development is incorporated in their academics.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that both government and private schools have better education for skill development ($M = 1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples - NA

6.3.4.2 GENDER EQUALITY

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
Gender equality		Yes	No	Yes	No
Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
Teachers Of Opposite Gender In Same Sex School Adaptable	N	5	55	4	56
	%	4.2	45.8	3.3	46.7
Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0

The government schools and private schools students 60 (100%) out of 60 students have reported that gender equality is adaptable in the schools. In private school students with 55 (91%) students reported that having opposite teachers is adaptable while the 60 (6.6%) out of 4 students they not adaptable with opposite gender teachers. Similarly, both the school students 60 (100%) out of 60 strongly believe that gender equality contributes to societal development.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that government schools have better gender equality ($M = 6.23$) compared to private schools ($M = 6.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to gender equality was statistically significant, $p = 0.003$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.4.2.1 ADAPTABILITY OF GENDER EQUALITY BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

IN WHICH TYPE OF SCHOOL, GENDER EQUALITY IS ADAPTABILITY	GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
	N	%	N	%
Same Sex Schools	0	0	0	0
Co- Ed School	41	34.2	56	46.7
Both	19	15.8	4	3.3
None	0	0	0	0

Students feel that gender equality is more adaptable in co-ed schools, with 60 (93%) out 56 of students in private schools reported they are adaptable in co-ed schools and 60 (68.3%) out 41 of the students in government schools reported they are adaptable in co-ed schools. In 60 (31.6%) out 60 of the students in government schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in both schools. In 60 (6.6%) out 4 of the students in private schools feel that gender equality is adaptable in both schools.(girls schools).

6.3.4.2.2 INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Third Gender Accepted In Schools	N	60	0	56	4
	%	50.0	0	46.7	3.3

While the government students reported mixed responses on the inclusion of third gender and about 60 (100%) out 60 of the students indicated that third gender should be included and in 60 (63%) 56 of the students in private schools reported that third gender should be included. While 60 (5.5%) out 4 of the students in private schools reported that third gender should not be included.

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that private schools have better inclusion of third gender ($M = 1.07$) compared to government schools ($M = 1.0$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to inclusion of third gender was statistically significant, $p = 0.042$, 95% confidence interval.

6.3.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

		GOVERNMENT		PRIVATE	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
IS RTE ENFORCED IN YOUR SCHOOL	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
DOES RTE PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
FREE EDUCATION TILL 14 YEARS OF AGE	N	60	0	60	0
	%	50.0	0	50.0	0
CAPITATION FEES DURING ADMISSION	N	60	0	58	2
	%	50.0	0	48.3	1.7
ADMISSION SCREENING PROCEDURES	N	59	1	59	1
	%	49.2	0.8	49.2	0.8

DENIAL OF ADMISSION	N	55	5	34	26
	%	45.8	4.2	28.3	21.7
PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT	N	1	59	4	56
	%	0.8	49.2	3.3	46.7
MENTAL HARASSMENT	N	0	60	0	60
	%	0	50.0	0	50.0
25% RESERVATION IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	N	59	1	60	0
	%	49.2	0.8	50.0	0

The government and private schools students 60 (100%) out 60 of the students are reported that RTE is enforced in the school. The students 60 (100%) out 60 of the government schools and private schools in both the schools believe that RTE promotes gender equality. From the data, it looks like only government school private school children (100%) are aware that education is free until 14 years of age under RTE. It looks like government school students 60 (100%) out 60 are aware of capitation fees during admission, while the private school students 60 (96.6%) 60 out are aware of capitation fees during admission. Students in both the schools have reported that they are aware of the admission screening procedures under RTE i.e. 60 (82%) 60 out students in government school and private school.

Majority of students from the government schools 60 (91.6%) out 55 of the students are aware that admission can be denied under RTE and in private school 60 (56.6%) out 34 of the students are aware that admission can be denied under RTE. Similarly students from the government schools 60 (8.3%) out 5 of the students are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE and in private school 60 (43.3%) out 26 of the students are not aware that admission can't be denied under RTE. A similar trend of being 60 (100%) 60 students in both schools were unaware of the physical punishment, mental harassment and they are aware about 25% admission reservation through RTE in 60 (100%) out 60 students in private schools, while government schools 60 (98.3%) out 59 of the students were aware about 25% admission reservation through RTE.

The results of the descriptive statistics show that government schools have better Right to education ($M = 8.02$) compared to private schools ($M = 7.58$). A two-tailed t-test for independent samples showed that the difference between government school and private schools with respect to right to education was statistically significant, $p = 0$, 95% confidence interval.

6.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN ASIFABAD, BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM AND BHUPALPALLY DISTRICTS

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradri Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradri Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant
AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	2.88	3.53	3.57	0	Yes		2.87	2.57	3.10	0.002	Yes
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	12.87	13.93	10.78	0	Yes		12.07	11.65	10.38	0	Yes
SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	3.07	6.62	4.87	0	Yes		6.80	7.18	7.82	0.327	No
CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	20.57	22.55	16.83	0	Yes		23.37	23.38	20.78	0	Yes
EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRA	6.92	5.38	3.47	0	Yes		6.02	5.62	3.60	0	Yes
DISABLE FRIENDLY INFRA	0.80	1.68	0.97	0.019	Yes		0	2.98	0.45	0.037	Yes
MANDATORY	6.0	5.90	4.18	0	Yes		5.80	5.87	5.42	0.069	No
SUPPORTING RESOURCE	1.45	0.18	0	0	Yes		0.20	0.05	0	0.001	Yes
FREEBIES	9.08	7.65	5.63	0	Yes		8.67	8.53	7.63	0.035	Yes
TEACHING STAFF	11.55	10.72	9.68	0	Yes		11.55	11.63	10.85	0	Yes

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant

EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	1.65	2.72	3.07	0	Yes		0.57	3.03	2.50	0	Yes
ACADEMIC INFRA	0.40	0.45	8.93	0	Yes		0	11.55	14.17	0	Yes
DIGITAL LEARNING INFRA	2.70	0.50	0.07	0	Yes		0.10	4.27	1.40	0	Yes
TRANSPORT FACILITIES	3.98	3.32	4.0	0	Yes		3.10	3.27	3.0	0	Yes
BUILDING	10.13	12.07	4.40	0	Yes		11.83	13.58	9.45	0	Yes
PRIVACY RELATED INFRA	5.53	7.25	0.03	0	Yes		6.28	8.05	0.77	0	Yes
BASIC HYGIENE	5.82	7.12	2.80	0	Yes		7.15	9.08	4.77	0	Yes
MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED	2.95	2.42	0.68	0	Yes		1.97	2.93	1.73	0	Yes
GENDER	14.42	13.20	13.82	0	Yes		13.0	13.40	14.18	0	Yes
CASTE	31.27	28.50	29.88	0	Yes		28.03	28.88	30.10	0	Yes
DISABILITY	0.10	0	0.45	0.059	No		0	0	0	NA	NA
RELIGION	13.47	12.25	12.85	0	Yes		12.02	12.50	13.13	0	Yes
GENDER	27.70	25.55	26.53	0	Yes		24.98	25.87	27.20	0	Yes

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant

CASTE	36.45	33.57	35.30	0	Yes		33.05	34.05	35.67	0	Yes
RELIGION	24.98	21.58	22.47	0	Yes		21.10	21.90	23.28	0	Yes
DISABILITY	3.37	3.02	4.63	0.059	No		3.0	3.02	3.0	0.370	No
DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	5.02	6.03	7.08	0	Yes		5.22	4.27	6.28	0	Yes
QUANTITY OF FOOD	4.35	3.47	3.33	0	Yes		0	0	0	NA	NA
QUALITY OF FOOD	7.50	7.83	7.55	0.216	No		0	0	0	NA	NA
DRINKING WATER	3.97	4.95	3.97	0	Yes		4.90	4.97	4.80	0.206	No
CANTEEN	2.0	2.0	2.0	NA	NA		2.0	2.0	2.0	NA	NA
DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	8.0	8.0	7.43	0.004	Yes		0	0	0	NA	NA
GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY	50.15	47.87	49.87	0.003	Yes		46.08	48.22	51.57	0	Yes
QUALITY OF EDUCATION	59.37	59.58	59.65	0.936	No		56.27	60.33	61.53	0	Yes
RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION	35.87	34.22	35.60	0.004	Yes		32.35	34.85	36.58	0	Yes
ONLINE	4.20	4.02	3.92	0	Yes		4.02	3.98	4.12	0.062	No

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOL						PRIVATE SCHOOL				
	Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Asifabad (Mean)	Bhadradi Kothagudem (Mean)	Bhupalpally (Mean)	P Value	Significant

SKILL DEVELOPMENT	1.23	1.0	1.0	0	Yes		1.0	1.0	1.0	NA	NA
GENDER EQUALITY	5.62	5.90	6.23	0	Yes		5.98	5.90	6.0	0.088	No
INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	1.0	1.0	1.0	NA	NA		1.0	1.02	1.07	0.069	No
RTE	7.32	8.0	8.02	0	Yes		8.0	8.02	7.58	0	Yes

CHAPTER VII
COMPARISON BETWEEN STATES

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

AVAILABILITY OF SCHOOL	3.12	2.70	2.59	3.33	0	Yes		3.02	2.65	2.60	2.84	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, Telangana has better availability of government schools (M=3.33), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=3.12). A statistical ANOVA test showed that there is a significant difference, P = 0 in terms of availability of government schools. In comparison, Andhra Pradesh (M=3.02) has better availability of private schools followed by Telangana (M=2.84). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0) in terms of availability of private schools. According to the National findings of the 'Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) 2022', between 2006 and 2014 there was a steady decline in the enrolment of children aged 6 to 14 years in government schools. In the year 2014 the enrolment figures in government schools stood at 64.9 % remaining unchanged for the next 4 years. This figure increased sharply from 65.6 % in 2018 to 72.9 % in 2022 and the enrolment in government schools is very visible across all states in the country. Against this finding, the rate of enrolment can be either sustained or increased only if there is adequate availability of both government and private schools in each of the above four states. In this regard, in comparison to Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, both Tamil Nadu and Kerala need to undertake steps to ensure availability of schools at all levels so as to enable higher enrolment of girl students in both government and private schools.													
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE	16.81	20.37	16.63	12.53	0	Yes		13.68	15.40	16.18	11.37	0	Yes
The results of the descriptive statistics, shows that, Kerala has better availability of building infrastructure in government schools (M=20.37), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=16.81). Telangana (M=12.53) stood last among the four states in terms of availability of building infrastructure in government schools. A statistical ANOVA test showed that there is a significant difference, P = 0 in terms of availability of building infrastructure in government schools. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu (M=16.18) has better building infrastructure followed by Kerala (M=15.40). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant difference (P=0) in terms of availability of private schools.													
SAFETY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	13.22	19.27	16.02	4.85	0	Yes		16.02	18.17	22.03	7.27	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, Kerala has better availability of safety related infrastructure in government schools (M=19.27), followed by Tamil Nadu (M=16.02). Telangana (M=4.85) stands last among the four states in terms of availability of safety related infrastructure in government schools. An ANOVA test showed that													

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

there is a significant statistical difference, $P = 0$. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=22.03$) has better safety related infrastructure followed by Kerala ($M=18.17$). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in availability of safety related infrastructure in private schools.

CLASSROOM INFRASTRUCTURE	23.46	25.98	24.95	19.98	0	Yes		22.89	22.10	27.44	22.51	0	Yes

The results of descriptive statistics shows that, Kerala has better availability of classroom infrastructure in government schools ($M=25.98$), followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=24.95$). An ANOVA test showed that there is a significant statistical difference, $P = 0$. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=27.44$) has better safety related infrastructure followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=22.89$). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in availability of classroom infrastructure in private schools.

EXTRA CURRICULAR INFRASTRUCTURE	8.19	9.60	7.59	5.26	0	Yes		7.72	8.48	9.12	5.08	0	Yes

In terms of extra-curricular infrastructure, the results of descriptive statistics shows that, Kerala has better availability of extra-curricular infrastructure in government schools ($M=9.60$), followed by Andhra Pradesh ($M=8.19$). An ANOVA test showed that there is a significant statistical difference, $P = 0$. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=9.12$) has better extra-curricular infrastructure followed by Kerala ($M=8.48$). An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in availability of extra-curricular infrastructure in private schools.

DISABLED FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE	6.88	9.67	7.77	1.15	0	Yes		4.01	7.27	7.72	1.14	0	Yes

With respect to disabled friendly infrastructure, the results of descriptive statistics shows that, Kerala has better availability of disabled friendly infrastructure in government schools ($M=9.60$), followed by Tamil Nadu ($M=7.77$). Telangana state stood last with regard to disabled friendly infrastructure. An ANOVA test showed that there is a significant statistical difference, $P = 0$. In comparison, among private schools, Tamil Nadu ($M=7.72$) has better extra-curricular infrastructure followed by Kerala ($M=7.27$). Here again Telangana stood last among private schools. An ANOVA Test further revealed that there is a significant statistical difference ($P=0$) in availability of extra-curricular infrastructure in private schools.

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant
MANDATORY ACADEMIC RESOURCES	5.92	3.97	6.92	5.36	0	Yes		5.42	5.62	6.99	5.69	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, as far as mandatory academic resources such as textbooks and notebooks are concerned, Tamil Nadu stood first among Government schools with the highest mean value (M=6.92) and Andhra Pradesh (M=5.92) took the second place. Kerala (M=3.97) is placed last among the four states. An ANOVA Test showed that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0) between the four states. In comparison in Private schools Tamil Nadu stood again in the first place with the highest mean value (M=6.99) followed by Telangana (M=5.69). Here again the results of ANOVA Test showed that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0). The findings show that except for Andhra Pradesh, the availability of mandatory academic resources is good in the private schools in Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Telangana when compared to government schools and hence government schools should undertake initiatives to provide the basic academic resources such as textbooks and notebooks to students.													
SUPPORTING RESOURCE	3.17	3.87	4.33	0.54	0	Yes		1.12	4.45	4.24	0.08	0	Yes
From the results of descriptive statistics it can be inferred that, with respect to supporting academic resources such as scholarship and extra-tuition in government schools, Tamil Nadu took the first place with the highest mean value (M=4.33) followed by Kerala (M=3.87). Telangana fared very low with regard to supporting academic resources. On the other hand, among private schools, Kerala stood first followed by Tamil Nadu (M=4.24). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools revealed that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0). The above findings show that Telangana state fared very low in terms of availability of supporting academic resources and therefore steps are to be taken to provide the needed academic resources.													
FREEBIES	7.54	4.13	8.21	7.46	0	Yes		4.42	4.85	6.09	8.28	0	Yes
The results of descriptive statistics shows that, with regard to better availability of freebies such as uniforms, stationary, bag and bicycle in government schools, Tamil Nadu stands first among the four states with the highest mean value (M=8.21) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=7.54). In comparison, with regard to private schools, Telangana (M=8.28) tops the list with better availability of freebies to support academics and Tamil Nadu (M=6.09) stands second. A separate statistical ANOVA Test done for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference. The above findings further showed that Kerala took the last spot in both government and private schools when it came to availability of freebies for students to provide academic support.													

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant
TEACHING STAFF	11.22	13.88	13.97	10.65	0	Yes		11.74	13.55	13.66	11.34	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to availability of teaching staff in government schools, Tamil Nadu stands first with the highest mean value (M=13.97) followed by Kerala (M=13.88). Telangana (M=10.65) stands last among the four states in availability of teaching staff. In comparison, with regard to private schools, Tamil Nadu (M=13.66) once again tops the list immediately followed by Kerala (13.55). Here again Telangana has taken the last spot in availability of teaching staff. A separate ANOVA Test done for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0).													
EXTRA-CURRICULAR STAFF	3.95	5.62	3.43	2.48	0	Yes		4.56	4.52	3.78	2.03	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with regard to availability of extra-curricular staff in government schools, Kerala stands first with the highest mean value (M=5.62) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=3.95). In comparison, in terms of private schools Andhra Pradesh (M=4.56) has better availability of extra-curricular staff followed by Kerala (M=4.52). Further separate ANOVA Tests done for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0).													
ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE	10.53	29.52	21.95	3.26	0	Yes		8.47	22.12	25.94	8.57	0	Yes
The results of descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to availability of academic infrastructure in government schools, Kerala stands first with the highest mean value (M=29.52) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=21.95). In comparison, in terms of availability of academic infrastructure in private schools, Tamil Nadu stands first with the highest mean value (M=25.94) followed by Kerala (M=22.12). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference.													
DIGITAL LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE	2.28	9.52	6.37	1.09	0	Yes		2.40	6.08	8.03	1.92	0	Yes
It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to availability of Digital Learning infrastructure in government schools, Kerala has better availability with the highest mean value (M=9.52) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=6.37). In comparison, in terms of private schools, Tamil Nadu has better availability of digital learning infrastructure													

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

(M=8.03) followed by Kerala (M=6.08). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

TRANSPORT FACILITIES	3.81	2.87	2.35	3.77	0	Yes		3.36	2.03	1.55	3.12	0	Yes

From the results of descriptive statistics, it can be inferred that, in terms of availability of transport facilities in government schools, Andhra Pradesh has better transport facilities (M=3.81) followed by Telangana (M=3.77). In comparison, with regard to private schools, Andhra Pradesh once again has better transport facilities (M=3.36) followed by Telangana. A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for government and private schools states shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

BUILDING (RESTROOMS)	15.38	15.95	14.37	8.87	0	Yes		15.30	12.02	17.07	11.62	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to availability of restroom building infrastructure such as gender specific restrooms, proper flooring, taps and doors in government schools, Kerala has better availability with the highest mean value (M=15.95) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=15.38). In comparison, in terms of private schools, Tamil Nadu has better availability of restroom building infrastructure (M=17.07) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=15.30). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

PRIVACY RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE	8.06	8.20	7.63	4.27	0	Yes		6.33	5.55	8.67	5.03	0	Yes

From the results of descriptive statistics, it can be inferred that, in terms of availability of privacy related infrastructure for girl students in government schools, Kerala has better privacy related infrastructure with the highest mean value (M=8.20) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=8.06). In comparison, with regard to private schools, Tamil Nadu has better privacy related infrastructure (M=8.67) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=6.33). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for government and private schools states shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

BASIC HYGIENE	11.09	12.15	10.57	5.24	0	Yes		9.46	9.48	12.73	7.0	0	Yes

The results of descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to availability of basic hygiene aspects in government schools, Kerala stands first with the highest mean value (M=12.15) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=11.09). In comparison, in terms of availability of basic hygiene aspects in private schools, Tamil Nadu stands first with the highest

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

mean value (M=12.73) followed by Kerala (M=9.48). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference.

MENSTRUAL HYGIENE RELATED	9.31	11.13	8.09	2.02	0	Yes		2.35	8.02	7.98	2.21	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to availability of menstrual hygiene related aspects in government schools, Kerala stands first with the highest mean value (M=11.13) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=9.31). In comparison on the other hand, with regard to private schools, here again Kerala (M=8.02) has better availability of menstrual hygiene related aspects such as menstrual pads, pad dispenser, pad incinerator and pad disposal bins followed by Tamil Nadu (M=7.98). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference (P=0).

GENDER	15.87	14.77	14.99	13.81	0	Yes		15.84	14.85	15.43	13.53	0	Yes

In terms of gender discrimination free environment for girl students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Andhra Pradesh fared better with the highest mean value (M=15.87) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=14.99). In comparison, in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh (M=15.84) has better gender discrimination free environment followed by Tamil Nadu (M=15.43). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, (P=0).

CASTE	30.06	28.52	22.48	29.88	0	Yes		31.11	28.28	21.88	29.01	0	Yes

With respect to caste discrimination free environment for girls students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Andhra Pradesh (M=30.06) fared better followed by Telangana (M=29.88). In comparison, in terms of private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh (M=31.11) has better caste discrimination free environment followed by Telangana (M=29.01). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, (P=0).

DISABILITY	4.95	8.68	6.04	0.18	0	Yes		2.76	5.95	4.47	0	0	Yes

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

In terms of disability based discrimination free environment for girls students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=8.68) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=6.04). In comparison, with regard to disability based discrimination free environment private schools, here again Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=5.95) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=4.47). A statistical ANOVA test done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

RELIGION	13.13	13.22	13.47	12.86	0.082	No		13.55	13.78	13.78	12.55	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to religion based discrimination free environment for girl students in government schools, Tamil Nadu fared better with the highest mean value (M=13.47) followed by Kerala (M=13.22). A statistical ANOVA Test done among government schools showed that there is no significant difference statistically, P=0.082. In comparison, in terms of religion based discrimination free environment in private schools, both Tamil Nadu and Kerala equally fared better with the same mean value (M=13.78) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=13.55). A statistical ANOVA Test done among private schools shows that, unlike government schools, there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

GENDER	29.48	27.83	28.41	26.59	0	Yes		29.71	27.58	29.57	26.02	0	Yes

In terms of gender based inclusion for girl students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Andhra Pradesh has better inclusion with the highest mean value (M=29.48) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=28.41). In comparison, in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh (M=29.71) has better gender based inclusion followed by Tamil Nadu (M=29.57). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, (P=0).

CASTE	37.31	35.35	37.53	35.11	0	Yes		37.83	35.85	37.36	34.26	0	Yes

With respect to caste based inclusion for girls students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Tamil Nadu (M=37.53) has better inclusion followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=37.31). In comparison, in terms of private schools, Andhra Pradesh (M=37.83) has better caste based inclusion followed by Tamil Nadu (M=37.36). A statistical ANOVA Test done separately for both government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, (P=0).

RELIGION	25.32	25.98	25.23	23.01	0	Yes		26.11	25.97	25.43	22.09	0	Yes

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to religion based inclusion for girl students in government schools, Kerala has better inclusion with the highest mean value (M=25.98) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=25.32). In comparison, in terms of religion based inclusion in private schools, Andhra Pradesh fared better with the highest mean value (M=26.11) followed by Kerala (M=25.97). A statistical ANOVA Test done among private schools shows that, there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

DISABILITY	15.67	23.98	18.19	3.67	0	Yes		10.34	17.87	14.10	3.01	0	Yes

In terms of disability based inclusion for girls students in government schools, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, Kerala has better inclusion with the highest mean value (M=23.98) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=18.19). In comparison, with regard to private schools, Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=17.87) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=14.10). A statistical ANOVA test done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	5.84	5.42	3.53	6.04	0	Yes		5.52	5.80	4.19	5.26	0	Yes

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to distance to government schools from home, Telangana fared better with the highest accessibility i.e. distance to school (M=6.04), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=5.84). In comparison, with respect to distance from home to private schools, Kerala fared better with the highest mean value (M=5.80) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=5.52). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

DRINKING WATER	3.63	4.30	3.76	4.29	0	Yes		3.72	4.23	3.96	4.89	0	Yes

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to accessibility to drinking water in government schools, Kerala fared better with the highest accessibility (M=4.30), followed by Telangana (M=4.29). In comparison, with respect to accessibility to drinking water in private schools, Telangana fared better with the highest mean value (M=4.89) followed by Kerala (M=4.23). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

QUANTITY OF FOOD	4.77	4.85	4.08	3.72	0	Yes		0	0	0.24	0	0	Yes

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to quantity of food in government schools, Kerala fared better with the highest accessibility (M=4.85), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=4.77). In comparison, with respect to quantity of food in private schools, Tamil Nadu fared better with the highest mean value (M=0.24). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

QUALITY OF FOOD	7.28	6.53	6.21	7.63	0	Yes		0	0	0.38	0	0	Yes

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to quality of food in government schools, Telangana fared better with the highest accessibility (M=7.63), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=7.28). In comparison, with respect to quality of food in private schools, Tamil Nadu fared better with the highest mean value (M=0.38). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

DISCRIMINATION IN MEAL ACCESSIBILITY	7.51	7.53	6.58	7.81	0	Yes		0	0	0.33	0	0	Yes

The results of the descriptive statistics shows that, with respect to discrimination in meal accessibility in government schools, Telangana reported lowest discrimination with a mean value (M=7.81), followed by Kerala (M=7.53). In comparison, with respect to discrimination in meal accessibility in private schools, Tamil Nadu reported lowest discrimination with the mean value (M=0.38). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

GENERAL ACCEPTABILITY	54.39	48.83	50.59	49.29	0	Yes		55.42	46.0	52.53	48.62	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to general acceptability of girl students in government schools, Andhra Pradesh reported better acceptability with the highest mean value (M=54.39), followed by Tamil Nadu (M=50.59). In comparison, with respect to general acceptability in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh reported better acceptability with the mean value (M=55.42) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=52.53). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

QUALITY OF EDUCATION	61.37	59.48	60.08	59.53	0.059	No		62.16	53.22	60.93	59.38	0	Yes

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

In terms of quality of education in government schools, it can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, Andhra Pradesh reported better quality with the highest mean value (M=61.37), followed by Tamil Nadu (M=60.08). In comparison, with respect to quality of education in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh reported better quality of education with the mean value (M=62.16) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=60.93). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION	37.47	37.03	38.0	35.23	0	Yes		38.02	37.65	39.12	34.59	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to relevance of education in government schools, Tamil Nadu reported better relevance of education with the highest mean value (M=38.0), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=37.47). In comparison, with respect to relevance of education in private schools, Tamil Nadu reported better with the mean value (M=39.12) followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=38.02). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

ONLINE	4.42	4.05	4.33	4.04	0	Yes		4.26	4.58	4.39	4.04	0	Yes

With respect to adaptability of online mode of education, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, in government schools, Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the highest mean value (M=4.42), followed by Tamil Nadu (M=4.33). In comparison, with respect to adaptability of online mode of education in private schools, Kerala reported better adaptability with the mean value (M=4.58) followed by Tamil Nadu (M=4.39). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

SKILL DEVELOPMENT	1.51	1.25	1.04	1.08	0	Yes		1.55	1.28	0.95	1.0	0	Yes

In terms of adaptability to skill development based education, results of the descriptive statistics shows that, among government schools, Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the highest mean value (M=1.51), followed by Kerala (M=1.25). In comparison, with respect to adaptability to skill development based education in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the mean value (M=1.55) followed by Kerala (M=1.28). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

GENDER EQUALITY	5.16	5.47	4.93	5.92	0	Yes		5.23	5.73	5.17	5.96	0	Yes

7.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANDHRA, KERALA, TAMILNADU AND TELANGANA STATES

	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS							PRIVATE SCHOOLS					
	Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant		Andhra Pradesh (Mean)	Kerala (Mean)	Tamil Nadu (Mean)	Telangana (Mean)	P Value	Significant

With respect to gender equality, results of the descriptive statistics that, in government schools, Telangana reported better adaptability to gender equality with the highest mean value (M=5.92), followed by Kerala (M=5.47). In comparison, in terms of gender equality in private schools, here again Telangana reported better adaptability with the mean value (M=5.96) followed by Kerala (M=5.73). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

INCLUSION OF THIRD GENDER	1.49	0.95	0.90	1.0	0	Yes		1.66	0.87	0.98	1.03	0	Yes

It can be inferred from the descriptive statistics that, with respect to inclusion of third gender in government schools, Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the highest mean value (M=1.49), followed by Telangana (M=1.0). In comparison, with respect to inclusion of third gender in private schools, here again Andhra Pradesh reported better adaptability with the mean value (M=1.66) followed by Telangana (M=1.03). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

RTE	6.52	6.10	5.28	7.78	0	Yes		6.48	7.07	5.21	7.87	0	Yes

With regard to enforcement of RTE, results of the descriptive statistics that, among government schools, Telangana reported better enforcement of RTE with the highest mean value (M=7.78), followed by Andhra Pradesh (M=6.52). In comparison, with respect to enforcement of RTE in private schools, here again Telangana reported better enforcement (M=7.87) followed by Kerala (M=7.07). A statistical ANOVA test, done separately for government and private schools shows that there is a significant statistical difference, P=0.

CHAPTER VIII

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

8.1 ASPIRATIONAL DISTRICTS OF ANDHRA PRADESH

4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of Andhra Pradesh, South India

Since our independence in 1947, there have been numerous educational Schemes, Policies, and Acts to improve the literacy status. By 2030, India hopes to achieve Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 by promoting lifelong learning and ensuring that everyone has access to high-quality education (GoI, 2015). Several constitutional support measures, such as the universalisation of education and reservation policies were implemented to correct the historical disparity in education distribution caused by India's social structure. However, there is still a significant gap in educational attainment among Indian population, as evidenced by the gender and class social gaps. India's skewed sex ratio of 940 females to 1000 males is one among them and is evidence that gender equality is still a long way off (Census, 2011). With regard to policy interventions, it is sensible to examine whether these educational endeavors have been inclusive enough to seal the social gaps in educational attainment and make its distribution more equitable on the way to this ambitious goal of SDG 4.

The Government of India's Transformation of Aspirational Districts Programme is a significant policy initiative aimed at accelerating the transformation of districts that lag behind on particular development parameters. Here, we focus on education in the three aspirational districts of Andhra Pradesh namely Visakhapatnam, YSR Kadapa and Vizianagaram. Six Key informant interviews and six Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were undertaken with stakeholders of educational sector in both private (3 KII's and 3 FGDs) and government (3 KII's and 3 FGDs) schools. The surveys were recorded and notes were taken simultaneously for better understanding of the content and thereby aided in theme development during analysis. By incorporating grounded theory methodology, the analysis of transcribed documents and information from the sample site provided the basis for the current findings. The direct quotes that were taken from the KIIs/FGDs have been reworked to make them clearer and easier to understand, but the "meaning" or essence of their quotes have not been changed. The themes and sub themes are presented on the girl child education perspective and glides through as government and private school comparison. The findings include 7 themes and 13 sub themes.

1) Knowledge, awareness and perception:

A) Right to Education Act:

Unison was noted among all the respondents in favour of imparting RTE act. A teacher from a private school in Vizianagaram stated *‘RTE act is very timely and necessary as some parents aim to provide good education for boys when compared to girls’* revealing the intra-household allocation of education based on gender.

However, poor knowledge was widely seen among the respondents, irrespective of government or private institute, about the provisions under the act and whether or not the act was being implemented in their school.

I am not fully aware about all the provisions but it (RTE act) is helping students from low income families to access education says a teacher from a private school, Vishakhapatnam. She then went on to say I am also unaware whether it is implemented in my school.

This demands training programmes for the teachers and other stakeholders that they may guide the beneficiaries properly about the Rights to Education towards the new spectrum of life. Towards this, a private school teacher suggested the need is not only a training programme but also a monitoring mechanism in her statement *‘we (teachers) need training on this act. There should also be a team who regularly checks all the schools on its status of implementation. Most of the private schools here are budget schools and do not follow the 33% seat allocations’*.

However, we could see that the goal of the act (compulsory education upto 14 years of age) was achieved as all the respondents stood in agreement. *‘All the students complete atleast 10th std even if their parents are illiterate’* - Teacher, private school in Vishakhapatnam.

B)Educational Indicators: Both the state and central government have been taking continuous efforts to enhance the Gross Enrolment Ratio and reduce the dropout rates and share the same opportunity to the disadvantaged group of people as well. We see that the state of Andhra Pradesh is yet below the national average in GER of higher secondary education as the national average stands at 57.6% in 2021-22. With this in mind, the stakeholders of both government and private schools were posed the question on GER and dropout rates. It was noticed that none of the stakeholder was aware of either of the indicators but were only capable of sharing a guesstimate. Most of the respondents, majorly being school principals, revealed an improved status of GER and a reduced status of drop outs. School principal of a government higher secondary school in Vishakhapatnam mentioned

I don't know the exact GER but as far as I am aware it has improved. Government has introduced enormous number of educational schemes and also brought in structural changes in terms of school monitoring and scheme delivery to the needy people. This was rightly mentioned as the overall GER has increased from 30% to 35% over the last five years.

Similarly, a private school principal in Kadapa substantiated this response along with a reason stating ‘*Most of the parents are aware of the importance of education. Hence the enrollment is higher and dropout rates have reduced when compared to previous years.*’

However, the improvement seems to differ based on the community and the geographical location as the principal of a private school in Vizianagaram highlighted that ‘*Gross enrollment ratio is lower here when compared to other districts in Andhra as we have the highest tribal population, remote location and most of the parents are illiterate.*’ He further went on to state that drop outs were majorly due to the nomadic living style of migrated parents.

2) Availability

A) Free academic resources and literate teachers VS safe transportation and extracurricular activities?

With the ultimate goal of drawing children to school without any underlying hindrance of financial crunch, freebies such as books, notebooks, uniforms, footwear, etc are distributed in all Government schools. Another surprising and beneficial initiative is the distribution of free electronic tablets to students of std 8th worth RS. 32,000/- with the goal of bringing them close to technology and satisfying their quest for knowledge. Likewise, digital classrooms with projectors are yet another corner stone in Government schools.

However, a teacher in a Government school, Vizianagaram stated ‘*We have digital classrooms but they are dysfunctional. Hence, we use our mobile phones or tablets to teach students the materials*’ revealing the defunct status.

With regards to teaching, competence and commitment comes along with education. Principal, of a Government school, Vizianagaram spoke with confidence and claimed ‘*We are already above the private schools in many ways. In private schools you see teachers who sometimes don't even have a B.Ed degree. They are trained by the school personnel and then asked to teach the students. Government schools teachers hold B.Ed degrees and are recently trained professionally by NEP*’

Though the private schools may be limited in the above aspects, extracurricular activities in the form of martial arts for girls and school transportation facility that picks up and drops the students at the door step seem to be their trump card.

B) Safe and functioning WASH facilities

The school timings for both government and private schools extend approximately for not less than 6-7 hours a day and this long stretch demands the availability of basic WASH facilities such as safe drinking water, toilets with water facility, etc... Moreover, since the girl students are also adolescents, the situation may be far more appalling if unavailable. As rightly stated by the private school principals, Visakhapatnam '*Lack of toilets is one of the reasons why girl students do not come to school or drop out*'.

In our data, it was encouraging to find that all the 12 schools were equipped with WASH facilities. Also, with the presence of *Nadu Nedu* scheme for both government and private schools, the infrastructure continues to keep improving and sustaining, thereby aiding in better learning outcomes and education indicators. '*We have toilet facilities for the students with running water*' –Teacher, Government school, Vizianagaram. Undoubtedly, private schools are also well equipped in this regard.

Also, public private partnerships are in place which engages the local leaderships to help in building the much needed infrastructure

We engage with the local leaders and avail their support to construct the necessary infrastructure said the Mandal Education Officer, YSR Kadapa, who further added that there are less than 5% drop outs which is astonishing considering the humongous numbers of previous years.

C) Mid-day meals

With the presence of SMCs and vast improvements made by the government to improve the quality under Jagananna Gorumudda (MDM) schemes, Mid-day meals remain an underlying factor in Government schools for improving the GER and also bridging the gap between boys and girls percentage. Currently the meals are provided to all students of classes 1st to 10th.

Since we (SMC) are active here, we customize the meals and make sure it is nutritious. We recently upgraded the menu and made sure eggs are provided without fail. There is also one vegetable every day stated an SMC member, Government school, YSR Kadapa, who monitors the mid-day meals closely.

To this, the school teacher added with pride *‘The students also like the meals and ask for second time. We don’t stop them from eating’* speaking of its good taste as well.

D) Menstrual Health Management (MHM)

According to the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council, approximately 23% of girls in India discontinue schooling due to the lack of access to sanitary napkins (Period poverty), essential services like running water in toilets and absence of disposal facilities. Similarly, National Family Health Survey (NFHS) - 5 (2019–20) found that the number of girls in 15-24 years of age using sanitary pads was 69 per cent. Bearing this in mind, *Swechcha* programme was introduced in 2021, where the state government enters into collaborations with the local vendors and supply 10 sanitary pads per child per menstrual cycle.

The government doesn't provide the sanitary pads directly. We partner with a nonprofit nearby which supplies the necessary sanitary pads for the students. These are available with the teacher and the students can avail them during their menstrual days. They are also taught on how to wear the pads, how to dispose the pads and how to take care of their health during menstruation- Principal, Government school, Visakhapatnam

Likewise, sick room for girls to rest during extreme cramps and an incinerator is present in a Government institute in vizianagaram but lacks human resources for Operations and Maintenance.

On the other end, we see the private schools performing well with respect to O & M but lack the supply of free sanitary products in few schools. A Principal, private school, Vizianagaram stated *‘We have menstrual pads, a dedicated female teacher who support them, dedicated washrooms and pad disposable bins. The cleaning staff will take the pads and burn in the incinerator’*. Yet another private school teacher in Vishakhapatnam mentioned the presence of change rooms and disposal system but the absence of free sanitary pads.

‘One should not shy away from talking about Menstruation. We need to create more awareness among female students and educate them on safe practices’- CM added under the Swechcha programme to bring in gender inclusion and remove inhibitions on this rather natural monthly event of girls and women.

Towards this, we found quotes both in Government and private schools where no segregation was seen and rather a more conducive environment has been set for the girls to practice safe and hygienic menstruation. *‘Though we have female staff who instruct the students and handle all Menstrual related aspects for the students, we also tell our male staff to be mindful. They oblige to allow the girls to freely interact with the female staff even in the middle of the class hours incase of any urgency’*- Principal, private school, YSR kadapa.

3) Accessibility

A) Location of schools

This plays a vital determinant as there may be expenses incurred such as bus or auto fare if the school is far from the residence. It acts as a financial burden on low income families that they might not wish to carry. This was rightly raised in the statement *‘Students of classes 1 to 3 are expected to avail schools within 3kms radius which I feel it is very unsafe’* of a teacher, Government school, Vizianagaram, who discussed about the poor accessibility of Government schools in remote regions and how it can jeopardize the lives of students even though free bus pass exists.

Transportation facilities are poor in this area. Only after all of us requested, they (Government) have allotted one bus in this route which is also very irregular. Some parents are earning well and can afford to hire autos for their child. How will other parents afford this out-of-pocket expense? asks a Teacher, Remote Government school, Vizianagaram

With regards to girl children, this also speaks in the direction of possible sexual exploitation enroute to school. Due to the safety concerns, parents of girl children are often found escorting them to school which not only affect their work routine but can act as a predisposing factor to discourage them from attending school as they consider it an encumbrance on them. *‘They are afraid of the spike in alcoholism and usage of drugs among boys. If you compare before and after COVID 19 pandemic, there is a significant increase in terms of drinking in public area. Boys are drinking on the roadside and teasing girls’*- Principal, private school in Vishakhapatnam.

Private schools provide transportation services like school buses where the students are picked up and dropped at their residences, thus warranting safety. However, high and higher secondary girl students who attend

special classes after school hours miss the bus shuttle and parents pick them up. In our sample, we noted students coming as far as from 10kms radius and mostly utilize autos as school bus service coverage is limited. Both the revelations warrant for an increase in the number of schools within the aspirational districts.

B) Inclusive education

The education for Children with Special Needs (CWSN) and those from the disadvantaged groups is made mandatory under the RTE act and is encouraging to see schools across aspirational districts in the state abiding by this. A principal of a Government school stated

Depending on their disabilities, we welcome the differently-abled children to be enrolled here. Sometimes we refer them to the special schools or else if it is not a serious form of disability, we encourage them to stay in a regular school like ours.

This may be due to unavailability of disable friendly infrastructure in a regular school. Likewise, this was no different in a private school setting as the Principal in YSR Kadapa stated that their school has disabled students and are given special attention. He, however, revealed the lack of supportive infrastructure in the school.

This was mirrored in a response of teacher in a budget private school as she not only stated the absence of friendly infrastructure but also the schools' unaffordable status

If we need to enroll them in our school, we should have proper facilities like disable friendly washrooms, ramps, handrails, benches, etc. We also need to have special transportation facilities for them. It will be difficult to create such facilities in a budget school.

Presenting as a silver lining to the above shortcomings, a private school in Vizianagaram has disable friendly infrastructure such as ramps and rails. It is also under deliberation to build elevators for the disabled students to access without barriers. The school principal further added with commitment that financial support and extra academic push is also given to them in his school. Extending such financial support to disabled students was seconded by other respondents of private schools as well.

4) Acceptability

A) Upgradation of education system and relevance manifested in Government institutes

Skill based training and motivation acts as an attestation of the education system being in relevance. A Principal of a Government school, Vishakhapatnam said

The current education system is helping the girl students to cope with the changes in the society. We provide skill training to the students by inviting prominent with an intention of empowering them. The SMC promotes educational awareness among the parents.

The teaching methodology in Government institutes is also upgraded. In the morning hours the students learn the theory and in the afternoon they are exposed to practical aspects of the content. We did not record any educational upgradation made recently in private schools.

B) Discrimination- A thing of the past!

As per the projection drawn from the data, it clearly indicated no division of responses on the query whether the issue of gender, caste or religion come in the way of girl child education.

There is no discrimination in any form here or even in our locality. We see all the students mingling with each other, be it from the Brahmin community or the SC/ST community. In the past, there were scenarios on caste discrimination but is absent now- Principal, private school, Vishakhapatnam.

Even among the teachers, caste doesn't seem to play any role. The private school teachers in FGDs showcased their amicability as they addressed each other as 'anni'. They also went on to say that the only reason they enquire about the caste or religion from a student was to fill in school registers. These statements clearly reflected that the girl children were not suppressed on the basis of caste in any situation in the school.

With respect to gender discrimination, media seems to have a strong influence as boys get influenced and indulge in negative behaviour towards the girls of their school as shared by a principal of Government school in Visakhapatnam.

5) Adaptability

A) Changing needs- women empowerment

As beautifully highlighted by the Mandal Education Officer, YSR Kadapa ‘As a MEO, I can boldly assure that we are bringing in gender discrimination free education and society. We are encouraging girls in all fields and trying to inculcate the feeling of being accepted.’ This forms the basis of any future development and empowerment.

Non academic, additional programmes are being rolled out equally in Government and private schools such as martial arts, career guidance and other motivational talks.

We hold special programs for 6th to 10th standard students so that they are ready to face the society. Students are trained in self defense and other martial arts. We also have special coaching that enable the student to know more about budding courses and new careers - Principal, private school, Visakhapatnam.

We provide career guidance to the students and every day in the assembly we talk about the changing careers, and how they need to be prepared for the different jobs that are on the rise- Teacher, Government school, Vizianagaram

Follow-up mechanisms are also set up in certain private schools revealing the well settled and empowered status of passed out girl students.

B) Digital learning and teaching

As expected, digital learning do not seem to fall back when it comes to private schools. However, with regards to Government schools though large strides are made and electricity, lights and projectors are available, they fall short in quality and scope for sustenance.

We have digital classrooms in our school. But it is under repairs and we are not actually using it now- Principal, Government school, Vizianagaram

6) Policies and schemes- Back bone of Government schools

Government has introduced a great deal of educational schemes and also brought in structural changes in terms of school monitoring. ‘*This is one of the reasons why there is improvement in the enrollment ratio*’ says principal of a Government school in Visakhapatnam. In the state of Andhra Pradesh, we see a wide range of long standing and newly initiated schemes that are holistic in nature covering academic resource needs, infrastructural needs, WASH facilities, nutrition, financial support in terms of cash credits and also health coverage. Few of the schemes mentioned by the respondents were

YSR Jagananna Vidya Kanuka Yojana

Amma vodi (private and government)

Jagananna Gorumudda

Dr. YSR Kanti velugu

Jagananna Vidya Deevena

Mana Badi Nadu nedu

Free Tablet Yojana

Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV)

‘We still have to create awareness in the community as most of the parents are unaware of the schemes and how to avail them. We should also educate the girl students on their rights’ says a teacher of a residential Government school in Visakhapatnam highlighting the lack of awareness on schemes and how it is interconnected with the RTE act. Surprisingly, the teachers are also not fully aware of different policies of the government and requested for an awareness programme.

Gaps

We find that all the respondents perfectly resonate with each other and there seems to be an agreement on the following statement

From the time the new Chief Minister Mr.Jagan Mohan Reddy has taken seat, there are no gaps in implementing the schemes said a government school principal. He also further added that every ward has an education volunteer who ensures that beneficiaries are availing the schemes without fail by acting as a supervisor.

7) Suggestions for Girl child education advancements

Well striving education institutes, both private and government are seen around the three aspirational districts of Andhra Pradesh. One major reason for improvement in girl child education is attributed to the English medium of education upgraded in government schools serving the immediate need of good communication and language skills. We even witness caste and gender segregated schools which indefinitely attract the parents if they seek a sense of belonging and feeling of security for their girl child (Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) scheme)

On the whole, we see both strengths and shortcomings in Government and Private schools. Nevertheless, tremendous strides have been made in recent years by the state government to bridge the gap that existed previously between private and government schools in respect to infrastructure, upgradation of education system and inclusive education.

Multiple suggestions were heaped by respondents and are as follows:

- Awareness of the importance of education and the provisions under RTE act to parents, girl children and teachers.
- Ensure that the schemes are reaching beneficiaries on time.
- Schools to build their credibility and assure parents on their girl child's safety and wellbeing.
- Availability of 2 to 3 residential schools within each mandal.
- Unbiased system of education.
- Removing the lottery system for admission in residential schools and providing admission on basis of most needy children.
- Special programs focusing on girl empowerment.
- Financial aid for the students from remote localities to act as incentives.
- Creating videos which highlight the current society and how girls can grow as influential citizens like our former women leaders.
- Parental academic monitoring and support during after school hours.
- Extending the scope of RTE act upto post graduation level of education for girls.

8.2 ASPIRATIONAL DISTRICT OF KERALA

4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational District of Kerala, South India

Kerala stands out as an example of how India should develop. Its contributions to social development, particularly the expansion of services like education, health care, and land reform, have received widespread praise. However, these accomplishments have not reached the less fortunate members of society, particularly the tribals, in a sufficient manner. These Western Ghats tribal communities account for 1.5 percent (4.84L) of the state's population. The general population has a high literacy rate of 93.91 percent, while tribals only have a literacy rate of 74.4 percent (census, 2011). In terms of education, only 0.8% of the population holds a diploma, while graduates and higher make up the meager 1.2%. With special reference to the female gender, the literacy rate among the female tribes is only 70%, not forgetting the state has well achieved its 'total literacy status' during the 1990s. Besides, it is the only state in the country having a higher female population than male population (1000/1084).

In this perspective, the aspirational district of Kerala, Wayanad which holds the major chunk of tribal population deserves special research and policy implementation with regards to education and a peek into the female population chiefly. We have undertaken a qualitative survey among key stakeholders in the form of 2 FGDs (Government and Private school) and 2 KIIs (Government and Private school) in the district to unveil the RTE act implementation status and identify gaps among schemes if any. Following a Grounded theory methodology, codes, axial codes, sub themes and themes emerged using NVivo software for analysis. There are 7 themes and 14 subthemes.

1) Education Indicators:

A) Dropout rates- continue to be a worry!

Though the state made headlines with its remarkably low dropout rate of 0.11 % in the year 2019-2020, the aspirational district has a sizeable percentage of overall dropout rates more than 1% and continues to be a worry. Although the GER remains on the rise and is attributed with the home visits carried out by the school, dropout rates continue to be a concern.

The real drop-out starts in higher secondary- Headmaster, private school.

Correspondingly, the private schools take special initiatives and send students from poor backgrounds to the lower primary sessions to avail free breakfast scheme since it is an aided part of the school.

It is widely accepted that poverty, **distance from school, and parents' attitudes towards their children's education** are major determinants of whether or not children stay in school. Apart from this, it should be noted here, that dropout rate is the highest among girl students because in certain tribal communities the girls are married off at a very young age as they are perceived to be a burden to their family. This **cultural hindrance** though low continues to be still prevalent. Similarly, another issue that plagues these tribal areas is **drug and alcohol abuse among both the parents**, acting as de-motivators, distractions and discouragement for the child. These ancient factors for drop out continue to remain the reasons for drop outs in Wayanad.

With this being said, the District Planning Officer mentioned '*As per the indicators of ADP in education, Wayanad has already achieved 100% growth and reached its saturation. This reflects why there is a low rate of progress in this district*'. This cannot be denied as Wayanad has been ranked first in Niti Aayog's list of ADP. The district made this achievement after its rapid strides in health, nutrition, financial inclusion and skill development sectors.

B) High incidence of absenteeism

The students are irregular to school. This phenomenon is mainly seen in Govt. schools and Govt. aided schools said a Headmaster, Private school

He further shared the hidden reasons such as **domestic violence, alcoholism among parents, and distractions during extended festivals**. Yet another vital reason is **the medium of education being a major red flag** for the tribes since every tribal community has their own clan language. They also find other subjects like science, mathematics and English difficult. Though mentor teachers are available, instead of taking on the challenge and paving their way through, students choose the easy way out.

'The tendency to be absent is the major issue we face among the girl students of backward households' states a teacher, Government school. She also justified her statement on the grounds of illiterate status of parents, unawareness on the vitality of education and direct orders to children to take up work during the harvest seasons in order to complement the household income. Though legally banned, child labour is still widely practiced in Wayanad, both blatantly and secretly.

An awakening moment was recorded as a teacher from a Government school stated that the real reason for students irregular attendance was '**lack of interest in studies**' combined with burdensome household chores. This is not a new trend as is alike the NFHS-5 survey where similar reason emerged on top of the list.

2) Availability:

A) Educational resources

Under the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan, the State Government provides free textbooks to all students enrolled in Government schools from grades I through VIII. In this, the center is responsible for 60% of the cost, while the state is responsible for the remaining 40%. Additionally, the state Government provides all female students in Government schools with free textbooks from its budget to IX to XII students. Divergent to this is the functioning of private schools where the students need to pay for their textbooks though procured from the Government.

The students pay Rs.500/- approximately per term for their textbooks- Teacher, Private school

Laboratory facilities are yet another cornerstone for students to enhance their academic results by understanding the theoretical concepts of science. In our survey, **presence of laboratories was not recorded** even in high and higher secondary schools across Govt. and private schools.

As, digital learning and teaching is highly relevant in this 21st century, an IT teacher of a private school mentioned ‘*When compared with Government schools, the IT facilities we have here are less. Government schools have laptops and other digital systems. It would be beneficial at this time, if we get such digital/ technological support from the Government*’ and added brownie points to **Government schools for their better digital resource availability**. However, in the other end of the spectrum, though available, teachers of Government school complained about the **dysfunctional state of computers**.

B) Infrastructure and Sanitation facilities

Private schools are seen to be falling way below expectations in respect to infrastructure and sanitation facilities.

We have a shortage of infrastructure such as classrooms and sanitation blocks. We also lag behind in maintenance personnel. We depend on the society to raise funds for any improvements and this takes extended time durations- Teacher, Private school.

In Government schools a sense of sufficiency was seen among the respondents as they agreed, ‘*we have good quality and sufficient infrastructure here*’. The Swachh Bharat Swachh Vidyalaya scheme states that the ideal

student-toilet ratio should be one toilet and three urinals for every 40 students. But, in this regard, schools across the nation lag behind in this ratio and so does schools in Wayanad.

The number of toilets compared to the number of students is less. Construction of new toilets is underway- Teacher, private school.

C) MHM-Products & Facilities

Considering poverty being one of the reasons for drop out, it is easy to understand that **period poverty is widely prevalent among the tribal community**. Bearing the brunt of this, it is only right to say that basic sanitation facility and availability of free sanitary products at school play a crucial role for the girl students to decide on attending or not.

There are free sanitary pads and a proper disposal system for the adolescent girls. They are educated on menstrual hygiene as well- stated Headmaster, private school who serves in a well furnished school with sanitation facilities

The statement below made news as Kerala leads a revolutionary step of promoting the usage of menstrual cups among school students. Not only is this worthy of recognition, but will eventually improve the menstrual health of its users and working conditions of sanitation workers.

In all the Government schools sanitary pads are available for free. Menstrual Cups are also promoted based on the new guidelines of the Education Department and it is great to see them adapting to this rather new product. Counseling is given to those who are afraid of using menstrual cups- District Planning Officer, Government.

A proper **disposal mechanism for sanitary pad users was however absent in the Govt. school** and needed maintenance of sanitation blocks.

D) Mid day meals

Mid day meals will continue being a backbone in Government settings, attracting the most privation struck students. By extending its scope to the non-beneficiaries, teachers of Government settings make mid day meals yet another motivating factor for parents from poor and BPL background to send their students to school. *‘Since not all students studying 8th std and below consume the mid day meals, we as teachers are able to cover*

the students of higher classes as well' - Teacher, Government school. She then further stated that the meals are highly nutritious and comes with a wide variety of side dishes, milk and eggs are provided twice a week, and deficiencies in any form among the students are a thing of the past. The teachers also raised their voice to widen the scope of coverage in the free breakfast scheme as well. The private school teachers are seen to be doing this as they extend breakfast to middle school students as well by sending them to the lower classes which are aided.

3) Accessibility:

A) Presence of schools- contradictory opinions

'Good number of schools is available in this district' said the Headmaster, private school which was contradicted by a teacher of another private school as she remarked that students in remote areas still find it difficult to reach school and that they come as far as from 10kms away. Here, **reluctance to travel to distinct places where schools are located among girl children** should be taken into deliberation since these are foremost remote settings and alcohol abuse is ubiquitous.

Nevertheless, special schemes for arranging transportation facilities to students living in the interior forests and inaccessible areas are in place. *'There is a project called Gothra Saradhi and we do not have any problem with travel for the tribal children'* - Teacher, Government school. However, the District Planning Officer added to this *'Ever since the tribal department stepped back and management moved to the local Govt, there is shortage of funds in this scheme. There will inevitably be a reduction in the number tribal children coming to school from remote tribal hamlets if this projects halts'*. Here, it is also imperative to note that since the transportation is exclusively for tribal children, we notice the nontribal students struggling to take the overcrowded private transportations. On the other end, the private schools offer transportation but have their own limitations. **The unavailability of hostel facilities in the schools** also contributes to the cons.

B) Inclusive education:

Differently-abled: In the 21st century, the movement for inclusion in education has grown significantly. It is presumptuous that students with abilities and with disabilities will be able to access high-quality, equitable education through an inclusive educational approach. To put it another way, the concept of social justice in education can be bolstered by inclusive education.

In this direction, *'there is a special room and special educators for the differently abled students in our school'* mentioned the Headmaster, private school. Conversely, *'Buds schools for the mentally challenged children are present in 11 out of 23 panchayats. Education department has appointed special educators to address the*

needs of differently-abled children’ says the DPO as he beams with joy to see such special steps taken to address the otherwise overlooked aspect. But, **presence of disable friendly infrastructure was not mentioned** by both private and Govt. school respondents.

Slow learners: The role of a teacher goes well beyond teaching. *‘Identification of learning disabilities is usually done by the class teacher and then by the Special Educator’* says a teacher, Government school, who requests for formal training on this forum in order to offer more. *‘We do not conduct special classes for the slow learners. However, under the CWSN (IED) scheme, teachers at available here twice a week’* said a Teacher, Government school who desires the service to be more frequent. While this was the scenario in Govt. schools, the private schools hold special classes for slow learners.

4) Acceptability:

A) Discrimination- archaic and obsolete!

On 14th Dec, 1960, The Convention against Discrimination in Education was adopted to combat discrimination and racial segregation in education be it caste, gender, nationality or other irrelevant tags. In this aspirational district, we see unison among both the educational settings that **discrimination is strongly condemned**.

In the meetings called by DEO, all the school headmasters are given instructions on how to ensure child friendly atmosphere and it is our responsibility to timely identify issues of students and manage them effectively- Headmaster, private school.

The Government has come up with gender neutral uniforms- says the DPO. Girl students are seen to take the front role for all sectors when compared to boys.

5) Adaptability:

A) Changing needs and impact on student outcomes

The topic of gender equality begins well with the right awareness and knowledge among the citizens. With this being said, gender segregated and customized **sex education classes** were delivered to students during summer vacations, claims the Government schools, which will not only reduce the crime rates against women but also inculcate the sense of security. Yet another distinguishing step taken is the **personality development** training provided by the Health and Education Department. However, this did not seem to be effective as parents continued to state the dependent attitude of their girl children.

With regards to private school, **counseling sessions** were given to parents during Saturdays and to students during substitution hours. This seemed to be solving the previously mentioned problems as a teacher went on to say that more than half of the students' social commitment and self reliance improved over time. Subsequently, career guidance is bestowed to students of class 10th. Follow up mechanisms are also claimed to be set up in private schools.

Recently, I came to know that a fellow alumnus is currently working in the High Court. Likewise, there are socially committed students who turned out to be farmers, doctors, engineers, directors, etc - Teacher, Private school

B) Perception of NEP

Though Kerala has raised strong objections against the implementation of NEP on the grounds of diversity of the nation being taken for granted and making education accessible only for the elite class, R. Bindu, Minister for Higher Education stated that it cannot be completely avoided.

Though yet to be implemented, Teachers of private school said '*We believe that NEP will not publish any circular that can harm us. We are ready to adapt to the changes and work towards betterment*'. Even parents shared their mindset of being forward thinking and accepting in their words '*Teachers have to be flexible in this profession and mould the students in the required manner*'.

With regards to the three pronged language formula, surprisingly, **welcoming comments were given by teachers**. One such quote was '*The current education system introduces Hindi only at class X and then it goes into writing and other higher chores. It might be because of the high cognitive development of the students these days but introducing a language at an early stage can be more helpful as language development happens in an early stage*' - Teacher, Government school

With that being said, teachers shared their disapproval on the number of examinations being reduced to just two per year as it might not bring out the best academic performance of the students.

6) School developmental functioning- PTA & SMC:

To help parents and teachers adapt to the changing concepts in the society and involve parents into the children's academics, PTAs are conducted uniformly in both private and Government settings once in three months. However, SMCs seem to be irregular in private and termly in Government.

7) Policies and schemes:

A) Schemes mentioned by the respondents:

- ❖ Mid day meals
- ❖ Free breakfast scheme for tribal students
- ❖ Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan
- ❖ Kerala free laptop scheme
- ❖ Free bicycle scheme
- ❖ Gothra saradhi scheme
- ❖ Mentor teachers for language barriers among tribal students
- ❖ Joyful Learning Maths
- ❖ Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan
- ❖ Kudumba shree for women in the community
- ❖ ORC initiative under Integrated Child protection Scheme (ICPS)
- ❖ CWSN (IED) scheme

Teachers were oblivious about Beti Bachao Beti Padhao, central Government scheme and in fact mentioned that there were no schemes exclusively for girl children.

B) Gaps

As most of the respondents seemed oblivious about the names of many schemes available and its provisions, identifying gaps by them was undoubtedly a task and unreliable. However certain respondents shared their views. *‘There are no gaps in the policies and their implementation specific to education’*- Headmaster, Private school. This was also widely accepted by respondents in Government settings.

Gothra saradhi scheme seems to stand in the spot light ever since the management shifted to local panchayat which face monetary issues. *‘In the month of June, states a teacher of a Government school, the transportation facility serving the most remote regions was disrupted and led to increase in no. of absenteeism among students’*.

C) Niti Aayog

The targets are well achieved as per ADP in regards to quantity, but quality needs to be improved. Toilet facility is available in all the schools, but some of them may not be having running water facilities. Even the student-toilet ratio is way below the recommended rate- Headmaster, Private school

As per the National Assessment Survey (NAS) 2020-21 the quality of education is poor in Wayanad compared to other districts. The report says that the students are far behind in English, Malayalam, Science and Maths.

Based on this, Niti Aayog has directed to take remedial steps by conducting special meetings of School heads. Further special classes are being arranged for selected students who perform poorly.

Suggestion towards RTE act for Girl child education

Below is the list of suggestions stated by the respondents and drawn by the researcher based on the field survey

- Extending compulsory and free education upto higher secondary.
- Improved sanitation and infrastructural facilities across all schools in district.
- Awareness campaigns for parents and extend informal education options to those who are interested.
- Exclusive scholarships for girl children of backward communities and increasing the amount of existing scholarships.
- Monetary support to the BPL families.
- Authorities should take steps to regularize transportation facility of 'Gothra sarathi' and widen its scope.
- Breakfast scheme to cover all the school students.
- Monthly incentives to mothers to act as a way of encouragement.
- Continuation of home visits by the teachers and bring back students who are absent for long.
- Social worker should be employed to address the issue of child labour among tribes who take up daily wages or seasonal jobs. Legal actions can be initiated against the employees.
- Stringent laws against alcohol and drug abuse in public places and ensuring CCTVs are installed.
- Child line or social workers should be set up to look into child marriage issues.
- Customize the medium of education to be tribal-friendly and inculcate lessons on their culture to establish a sense of relevance.
- Cultural and sports can be given preferences to aid in all-round development.

8.3 ASPIRATIONAL DISTRICTS OF TAMIL NADU

4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of Tamil Nadu, South India

Policymakers have developed a number of programmes to address the problem of pronounced disparities in the indices of development in various parts of India. The previously-launched programmes to address this, however, lacked centralized monitoring systems, were riddled with flaws, lacked convergence, lacked access to real-time data, etc. The Government started the **Aspirational Districts Programme** in order to successfully and speedily reform the districts that have shown the least improvement among specific development metrics. In the state of Tamil Nadu, Virudhunagar and Ramanathapuram were selected among 115 other districts across all states of India. The programme has five core dimensions which are monitored closely and rankings are allotted.

In this survey, we focused on the dimension of education in the two Aspirational Districts of Tamil Nadu by comparing Government and private school under the 4A's framework - Availability, Accessibility, Adaptability and Acceptability. 4 FGDs (2 Government & 2 Private) and 4 KIIs (2 Government & 2 Private) were conducted among key stakeholders in the field of education in both the districts. As girl child education still falls below par and remain as an potential aspect for improvement, the survey and analysis has been drawn on this quintessential division. 7 themes and 15 sub themes emerged.

1) **SCHOOL EDUCATION INDICATORS**

a) Gross Enrolment Ratio- inequality

Virudhunagar district bagged the first ranking in Niti Aayog but still conceals dark realities of gender inequality. The DEO, Virudhunagar stated '*The girls ratio of enrolment is lesser than the boys*'. This was the similar response received by the other respondents such as a private school correspondent and teachers in the district of Virudhunagar. However, school management committee members of a Government school in Muthandiapuram, Virudhunagar denied such inequalities in her statement

In this school, the female students are more than the males. Take for examples the 6th std has a strength of 23 students and out of which 13 are girls.

Not much of differences were recorded in the district of Ramanathapuram in both Government and private schools.

b) Dropout rates

It is disappointing to face the reality of dropouts even in a state like TN that stands as an example in the sector of education. The school correspondent of a well performing private school in the district of Virudhunagar unraveled the reality and shared the origin of it

We still witness drop outs especially 6th std and upwards. This is due students above 5th std solely depending on their own or parents aid in studies. The parents are unable to teach the child and neither can afford tuition fees.

Poverty, backwardness, child marriage, caring for siblings, child labour to meet household needs and migration are reasons recorded by the respondents of both private and Government schools. The principal of a private school in Ramanathapuram shared her experience about a case of child marriage and how it stood as a wall between education and the child even when a well established ChildLine works against it. *‘A girl student here got married after her 11st std examinations due to her parents’ decision. She later discontinued her education. She was extremely studious and we as a school could not see this evil taking over her future. So we approached her family and convinced them to send her back. She rejoined and completed her studies’.* A difference of prevalence was noticed in the same district as teachers from a Government school stated **dropouts to be more among male students** and how schools take initiative to counsel and bring back the students.

Early marriage was also observed in a Private school in Ramanathapuram as they recorded 20 students out of 31 in a higher secondary standards being married during the COVID 19 pandemic as schools were closed and parents felt the need of moving girl children into the hand of a male (husband) and securing their wellbeing.

c) DEO and CEO- Visitation & Responsibility

District Education Officer and Chief Education Officer differ in their frequency of visitations and are often indirect. On the whole, we see the CEO visiting more often than DEO. Following are the list of duties undertaken by them respectively.

Responsibility	
DEO	CEO
Ensure quality of education	Appoint and monitor education supervisors
Regular monitoring visits	Administration of schools
Conducting brainstorming meeting with head and teachers	Formulates new methods to develop managements and student results
Improving GER and attendance rates	Regular monitoring visits
Manage and promote educational policies	Document student academic performance

2) **AVAILABILITY**

a) Academic resources

Government schools in both the districts distribute freebies and ensure availability of academic resources for students and teachers. Uniforms, footwear, stationary, textbooks, notebooks, etc are few among the 10 free items for the welfare of the students. On the other end of the spectrum, **lack of safe infrastructure** is a downfall in Government schools as rightly stated by a teacher from Ramanathapuram. She also highlighted a list of other un-availabilities: **Safe classrooms, benches and science laboratories** upto high school. **Dedicated laboratory facilities were missing across all Government schools** in both the district. Illam thedi kalvi is a milestone initiative that is practiced across both the districts where volunteers ensure both the academic and a multidimensional progress of primary level students. They teach subjects, impart interest in cultural activities and life skills such as basic gardening training. They also expose the students to digital usage. School infrastructure was safer and better in private schools across both the districts.

With regards to extracurricular activities, **sports were underplayed as schools lacked playgrounds and dedicated PET teachers** (Ramanathapuram). PTA and SMCs are also regularly carried out. While the former is more regular in private schools, the latter is well functioning in Government schools and work towards settling school issues and raising financial aid. Another miscellaneous aspect available across most of the schools is first aid kit and is regularly used in case of injuries. CCTV's were rarely seen in Government schools and more frequent in private settings.

b) WASH facilities- Drinking water & Toilets

With regards to drinking water, both the **districts face water scarcity, high salt content and corrosion of taps** which make it unsuitable for drinking. Towards this, CEO, Ramanathapuram stated

We get Cauvery river water once in every three days which the schools store and use. To avoid unprecedented health issues developing among the students by consuming salt water, we will ensure RO is installed in all schools very soon

Availability of safe WASH facilities is pivotal for all students especially for adolescent girls. With respect to toilets, they are widely available in both Government and private schools. **Sweepers and cleaners are employed** and ensure clean toilet blocks. *‘About 95% of schools have toilets with running water. The remaining 5% face water scarcity which happens because of lack of underground water’* says CEO in Ramanathapuram. Apart from this reason, poor maintenance also leads to water being unavailable in these schools.

We can't ensure 24 hours running water because many schools are dependent on bore well. Sometimes the motors get repaired and take 2-3 days for the plumber to get it fixed- CEO, Ramanathapuram

Private schools have a better toilet and drinking water facility. A disability friendly toilet is also available in a private school in Virudhunagar.

c) MHM

Free napkins and good facilities to practice safe menstrual health and hygiene are available in both Government and private schools. **Incinerators are placed in all schools** but lack the right maintenance and have become defunct. **Teachers are also trained on adolescent health and wellbeing, menstrual hygiene, right disposal method** and impart the knowledge on all menstruating girls. Schools however lack dedicated counselors.

Other than the presence of incinerators and a closed dustbins, outstanding measures were taken in a private school in Virudhunagar in order to distribute free sanitary pads, the most widely used product among school students. The school initially placed free napkins in the library for girls to utilize. Due to its success, they started making their own sanitary pads.

3) ACCESSIBILITY

a) Location & mode of commuting

Most of the sampled schools are in rural settings and demanded students to access from long distances as well. While Government institutes made students to use local transportation likes buses and autos, private schools provided own transportation like buses and vans that pick students up from a common spot. However, not all the private schools' transportation remains effectively utilized due to unaffordable prices and parents/guardians using own vehicles. An exception was seen in a private school in Virudhunagar and is documented as follow:

More than 50% of students who commute from more than 3kms use our transportation facility as it is very affordable- Correspondent, Private school, which has a good reputation across the district.

Availability of hostel facilities is also recorded in a Government school of Ramanathapuram but was absent in another and gave the only option of out of pocket payment by the students to stay in nearby hostels.

b) Inclusive education

Differently-abled: Students are admitted in regular schools and are given at most privileges in both Government and private settings. The former follows instructions passed on by the District Commissioner such as special seating arrangements in class, training & empowerment under CWSM and granting scholarships under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) scheme of Rs.3000/- per annum per child. The latter has **special disable friendly facilities** and is documented by a Principal in Virudhunagar

We have an elevator and disable friendly toilets. We have also financial helped a differently able student to undergo surgery and bought him a walker to use within the school campus

Slow learners: Private school respondents of Virudhunagar claim of taking special efforts to aid slow learners such as making them sit in **front rows, giving extra time to write down notes, avoiding corporal punishments, and posing easy questions during tests** to motivate and encourage them. A parent attested to their claims and further added that the school holds **word and memory games**. Government schools follow a different approach.

Slow learners need special attention. We have divided the sections as A, B, C and D, where A section has students who do well and D section students are slow learners. This is continuously monitored and also reported- Government school, Ramanathapuram

While both the approaches seem different, the only converging step is **extra classes** available after school hours in both settings.

c) Mid day meals- Discord noticed!

Right from the start multiple discords have been recorded. It must be taken into consideration that there are some complaints received regarding the quality of meals and refusal to consume by the students.

The mid day meals are tasty and of good quality. We add more cereals and nutritious items-
Teachers, Government school, Ramanathapuram

Taste of the mid day meals were deliberated among the respondents. While a teacher revealed that it was good and incidents are seen where teachers provide mid-day meals to students of higher secondary session who do not bring their lunch, discord began within the same district as teachers of another Government school denied it. They further said that the **taste is outdated and not fitting the students' preferences**. They also witnessed parents bringing food in the afternoons. The school principal has appointed a dedicated teacher to oversee the process of preparation and ensure good quality.

As a suggestion, teachers from Ramanathapuram requested for an upgrade in menu by adding a **non-vegetarian item**. They have documented the change in eating habits among the students that led to atleast 50% wastage every day. On the other end, a stigma is seen among the students as they perceive the meals suitable for the poor only and consider it a shame to consume.

Apart from this, Nutritional supplements & Tablets, and De-worming tablets are given at regular intervals.

4) ACCEPTABILITY

a) Relevance of system of education

RTE act, 2009 demands upgradation of the education system in order to equip the students to face the future.

The earlier education system was better. Former Chief Minister Mr. Kamarajar provided more educational reforms. There is no value for Tamil students in their own state. Their future is spoiled- Teachers, Government school, Ramanathapuram

Widespread negative perceptions were received. Parents of a private school raised valid suggestions for upgrading the education system as they perceived it to be outdated

1. Government school syllabus should be upgraded in order to produce competent students capable of competing with students of other syllabus (CBSE, ICSE, etc)
2. Digital class rooms should be used effectively for the welfare of students
3. Provide computer literacy universally to all students
4. Identify talents and ambitions of students and focus on it in higher secondary
5. Improve English communication skills by enrolling dedicated teachers.

A private school principal added her point to the list that newly employed teachers themselves lack good English communication skills in order to impart on the students. Poor studying habits developed over the years among state board students in which they simply memorize and reproduce. However, CBSE board enables overall development as examinations depend on their thinking and competency alone. Yet another private school teacher mentioned a drawback of having MCQ questions in examinations that prevent the students from writing the answers which is obligatory for imparting English skills.

b) Discrimination- caste, gender, religion

Unison among all the respondents was noted for this aspect as respondents agreed on **discrimination free school environment**. Parents also approved on the same. However, DEO in Virudhunagar stated that discrimination happens as the traditions are attached to religious beliefs which schools are working against. He stated the following

The practice of wearing sacred threads that denote castes has been abolished slowly in schools, in order to ensure no discrimination amongst the students- DEO, Virudhunagar

Similarly, private school Teacher shared her experience where a riot began in the community as religious attire of Muslim girls were perceived to be unwelcomed in schools. Parents approached the school and made sure their girl child practice religious needs. She then added that it was the society that does bring in discrimination and not the school per se.

5) **ADAPTABILITY**

a) Changing needs

The following are the provisions available in Government and private schools inorder to meet the changing demands in the society

Government	Private
Career guidance	Smart class rooms
Extracurricular activities and sports	Televisions
Digital facilities	Tablets for every classroom
	Career guidance
	Extracurricular activities and sports
	Skill development, self defense and yoga

6) **POLICIES & SCHEMES**

a) RTE act

Awareness- It was present among all the respondents but knowledge was limited. While most of the respondents appreciated and acknowledged the importance of the act in current societal living, suggestions for betterment were shared by others

- a) Conduct awareness campaigns among the tribal residents in particular to improve their level of awareness

- b) Extend the scope upto 16 years of age till the student completes 12th std
- c) Build more co-education school to break down gender inequality and crime rates against women

Implementations- CEO, Ramanathapuram mentioned the two vital drawbacks in Government schools and reflects on the underachieved implementation RTE act

- a) Lack of infrastructural development and maintenance
- b) Poor reading and writing skills among students

b) Existing schemes- Few of the schemes mentioned by the respondents are

- ✚ **Free cycle scheme-** received negative responses as teachers felt finances are needed for far more important aspects such as better infrastructure and building compound wall
- ✚ **Free laptop scheme-** received negative responses as teachers felt college going students will benefit more. Also, encouraged cash transfer of that allotted amount to the students account for higher education.
- ✚ **Illam thedi kalvi-** positive feedback
- ✚ **Free bus pass schemes**
- ✚ **Nutritious meal programme**
- ✚ **Scholarship for the students** who have lost their sole bread winner in accidents
- ✚ **Scholarship for disabled students**
- ✚ **Moovalur Ramamirtham Ammaiyar Higher Education Assurance Scheme**
- ✚ **Kshatriya school**
- ✚ **Scholarship for SC/ST students**

c) Gaps

Majority of the respondents mentioned that all the schemes reach students on time and get distributed to girls first and later to boys. ‘*School in Ramanathapuram has not received certain academic resources such as geometry box, atlas, etc*’ stated the CEO. Likewise, certain schemes delay to reach to students such as bicycle and laptop scheme. **Poor quality** was registered by a teacher in Ramanathapuram who stated poor quality of bicycle, footwear and other academic resources that do not last for the whole term.

7) **GIRL CHILD EDUCATION**

The question of whether we are **moving from equality to equity** comes in as a good number of respondents raised the need of special focus for boys if not atleast equal focus for boys and girls.

In this locality you cannot find a single girl who is illiterate or has dropped out. That is not the same incase of boys. 95% of girl children here have a degree attached to their name. We need special focus for the boys- Teacher, private school, Ramanathapuram

Suggestions by teachers and parents

- Ensure safety within school campus and in society.
- Doorstep pick up and drop across private schools and dedicated transportation facilities for school students by Government.
- Improving WASH facilities to ensure 100% accessibility by menstruating girls anytime
- Awareness campaigns on RTE act and importance of education conducted for the tribal beneficiaries.
- Parental academic monitoring and support especially to students of 6th and above standards.
- Employing well educated and competent teachers in both Government and private schools.
- Digital competencies of students should be fostered.
- Inculcating habit of reading in early age of students and providing books in place of laptops.
- Both theoretical and practical teaching to improve education system and academic performance of students.
- Common education system across the nation inorder to ensure equal knowledge is imparted for students of same standard.
- Inculcate Hindi as the third language to add value in their skill set.

8.4 ASPIRATIONAL DISTRICTS OF TELANGANA

4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of Telangana, South India

The merged state of Andhra Pradesh put RTE act into effect on April 1st, 2010. This statute is still in effect in both the states of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, even though the state was divided in 2014. The Right to Education (RTE) Act is regarded as one of the inclusive education policies that sought to raise the literacy rate and offer high quality education for children in primary and secondary schools. Yet, we notice female literacy to be lower than male literacy in every district of Telangana and raise a quest for deep rooted reasons.

The aspirational districts- Kothagudem, Asifabad and Bhoopalapally which are under surveillance for their lag in multiple sectors of development by Niti Aayog were chosen for this study and education aspect was under scrutiny between Government and Private schools. The data was collected from stakeholders by means of six FDGs (3 Government schools & 3 Private schools) and six KIIs (3 Government schools & 3 Private schools). By using NVivo software for qualitative analysis, codes, axial codes, sub themes and themes were developed. **The results are comprised in a total of 7 themes and 14 sub themes.**

School Education Indicator

▪ **Gross Enrolment Ratio in schools**

Respondents widely agreed that GER has been gradually increasing over the years. They also agreed that **Government school enrollments have significantly improved over the last two years by approx. 20%.** This was especially attested by the District Education Officer, who visits his district Bhoopalapally regularly for monitoring and supervision. With that being said, we noticed that parents still preferred private schools as the enrollment ratios reduced in Government settings after the Private schools reopened post COVID 19 pandemic. A teacher claimed that the general distribution of enrolment is 60:40 students in Private and Government settings. This statement was well opposed by the DEO who mentioned that ever since the medium of education changed to English in the Government schools, the enrollments ratio has been steadily increasing than their private counterparts.

In regards to gender, we noticed a **poor girl child enrolment ratio in both private and Government institutions.**

In this school only 31 percent of students are girls. That's the usual ratio of boys and girls in schools around here as we are operating in remote settings- Principal, Private

The above lines prove the existence of gender favoritism for education and regional intra-household variations in remote localities of Telangana. This calls for continuing home visits, awareness programmes and more girl child specific schemes.

▪ Drop out

On the aspect of drop outs, respondents revealed that 5-10 percent of students drop out every year and are infact happy about the scenario as it used to be worse in the previous years and is expected since they operate in rural locations. Reasons for such were claimed to **be poverty, backwardness, societal evils such as dowry for educated girls and early marriage, illiteracy of parents, and the temporary reason of COVID 19 pandemic where school were shut.** Specific to the state, **the lack of good connectivity for transportation in remote settings** was raised repeatedly by all the stakeholders.

Most of the parents are not able to afford the school fees, especially the farmers. The other reason is poor connectivity as the villages are not well connected to the town where the school bus reaches to pick up the students. Though we provide transportation facilities, they are not able to afford the auto fare to reach the pickup spots. Close to 8% of the students dropout because of these reasons- Principal, private school, Kothagudem.

It is obvious that students who drop out on the basis of financial shortages from private schools do not approach the Government schools. This can be due to the stigma attached to Government schools or perception of the poor quality of education and infrastructure. This preference to private schools still exist and are attested by responses when Government school respondents mentioned *‘The dropouts approach Navodaya vidyalaya schools which are affiliated to CBSE medium of education and provide free and quality residential facilities’*. Yet another vital reason for dropouts was **the feeling of poor security for their children perceived by parents.** *‘Parents are really afraid of the current situation in society, especially regarding girls safety.’*

2. Availability:

A) Academic resources

Provision of Government schools with academic resources and infrastructure such as a school building, 24hours electricity, running water, toilets, playground, library, computers, blackboard, furniture, secured compound wall with a gate, a separate kitchen for preparing mid –day meals, and instructional materials are mandatory. However, there are gaps as they are not only absent but also of dysfunctional state if present. *‘A lot of schools don’t have playgrounds as per the RTE. Without regular physical exercise the student can’t be strong mentally’* stated a Teacher, private school, Bhoopalapally. Also, **libraries and computers are widely unavailable in Government schools**. On the other end of the spectrum, though academic resources are given for free, teachers have stated the disadvantages since the parents perceive it to be of poor quality and do not value it. With respect to Private schools, almost all the samples here possessed the facilities stated above except the free uniforms, books, Mid-days meals and other academic resources.

B) Nutritional needs met in Government schools

The centerpiece of all Government schools, Mid-day meals acts as a major attraction to the poor and Below Poverty Line students to attend schools. They are faced with the possibility of starvation when they drop out or do not enroll themselves in school. The quality of the meals is regularly monitored by organizers in the district who ensure fine ingredients are used. **Highly nutritious food such as eggs, green leafy vegetables and dhal are distributed thrice weekly** to aid in the protein requirement for school going students. Likewise, protein powder is given as a supplement. Apart from the mid-day meals, healthy hot evening snacks are also provided to the Xth std students who attend special classes in Government school with a budget of Rs. 15/- per child. Peanut candies and sesame seed candies are given regularly for the girls who are diagnosed with anemia.

C) PTM & SMC

In Government schools, regular PTMs are organized and recognition for the well performing students is given in the form of awards in the presence of their parents. However, 30% of the parents do not attend as they do not prioritize it in the midst of their work routine or simply lack awareness on its importance. In the same way, SMCs are well functioning in all Government schools of our sample and are used to raise funds and repair infrastructural damage.

3) Accessibility:

A. Transportation

'Students travel as far as from 15kms away to access the Government school in Kothagudem' stated a teacher in a Government school. They also do not provide transportation to their students.

Poor roads and transportation are a common issue here said a teacher from a Government school, Kothagudem. Only after our headmaster approached the RTC office they gave free bus passes for the girl student. The boys need to pay about 300 rupees per month for transportation.

The DEO stated that an existing scheme transfers a cash amount directly to the bank account towards this but was not mentioned by any other respondent. Likewise, due to shortcomings such as poor road facilities, limited pickup spots and unaffordable fees, **private schools which have transportation facilities are not very effective**. In this regard, private school respondents suggested Government to provide better road facilities and increase no. of schools.

Parents cannot afford bearing the transportation cost (autos) even to the spot where the school bus can pick the child up. So they decide not to send the girls to school as she is perceived to be a temporary member of the family who will move out after marriage-
Teachers, private school, Kothagudem

B. Inclusive education- Twists and turns

▪ Differently-abled:

Government schools take a lead with respect to inclusive education for differently-abled children. There are dedicated special teachers that are hired by the Government. On the other end, inclusive education for the differently-abled students in private school was present with twists and turns in the respondent's perceptions.

‘There are special schools available for disabled students or children with special needs as per RTE requirements. However, including special children in a regular school is a better option to make the child feel like the others’- Teacher- private school, Kothagudem, who was accepting and accommodative of special needs students enrolled

However, she further added *‘Government should support disabled students who want to study in private schools’* since fee concessions or special infrastructure cannot be sanctioned by the private school management for the ‘minority population’. This was contradicted by a fellow respondent who felt the need of exclusive schools for disabled students in her statement *‘There is a special school in Palwancha Municipality where children with special needs can join. Government should build more such schools so that students can join there.’*

Though there are enrolments in regular schools, we noticed lack of infrastructure in both Govt. and private schools. Nevertheless, special attempts have been made by the schools by extending their supports in the form of exclusion free treatments and extra attention. *‘Recently the Telangana state Government have implemented a program which will benefit students with disabilities and who are deaf or blind’* said the DEO of Bhoopalapally. He further said new equipments will be in place for all the school students in the line of inclusiveness.

▪ **Slow learners:**

Special classes exist free of cost in Government schools and payable in private schools. Special measures are also taken in private schools as part of this. A private school teacher in Asifabad stated *‘We look at the performance of the children and we group as per their performance and tutor them separately. We divide them as 3 - good, average, below average. We make them look at the good students and see how he is studying. The good students will also encourage the average and normal students to talk to others and support the other students.’*

c. Menstrual Health and Management

Sanitary products are not available free of cost in either of the school settings. While Government schools have halted the free supply, but have recently signed a contract with local sanitary product vendors, Private schools have not provided sanitary products all the way. Disposal method, toilet facility with running water and maintenance personals are available in both settings. *‘Recently 32 Government*

schools have been equipped with pad vending and disposing machines. An organization called ECL sponsored these machines with an overall budget of 38laks' said DEO of Bhoopalapally who highlighted the collaboration with NGOs. Nevertheless, presence of these vending machines was not recorded by any other respondent.

4. Acceptability

A. Discrimination free environment

The children are treated equally irrespective of their religion, caste, community or gender across both Government and private schools. Yet, discrimination is seen in a form of partiality where only those students who performed well academically were encouraged to take part in extracurricular activities as stated by Teacher, Government school, Kothagudem.

5) Adaptability

A. Educational system

Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation is practiced in Government schools which incorporate practical and hands on learning techniques. But, positive and negative remarks were obtained on this and are recorded in the boxes below

We are following Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) as a process of assessment, mandated by the Right to Education Act but it has its own pros and cons. The method of teaching is easy to grasp by the students but demands a lot of project work that need procurement of project resources, stationary, printouts, etc which are unavailable in remote areas where the students reside- Teacher, Government school, Bhoopalapally

Students are not motivated in this pattern of education since they receive unexpected questions during examinations and end up getting poor marks. They eventually lose interest in studies and dropout- Teacher, Government school, Asifabad

Yet another remarkable programme in Government schools are the **three-pronged strategy of Manna Ooru Mana Badi, medium of education in English and Tholimettu programme, 2023** under FLN. News reports prove the improvement this has brought to the academic performance of students of Government schools

B. Changing needs

Sex Education, Career Guidance and Menstrual Hygiene Awareness Programmes are delivered in Government schools to equip the students for their future. As for the private schools, a teacher in Bhoopalapally suggests '*Along with the academics, there should be mandatory classes for self defense to help the students defend themselves when need arises*'. While this school desired this inclusion, school in Kothagudem provides karate classes to girls. They also organize competitions, dance competitions, cultural activities, personality development classes, and computer classes to help their students in holistic developments. Digital learning is in place in both the settings and the benefits of it was beautifully highlighted in the statement below

Schools should bring innovation into their curriculum such as digital learning. When the teaching aids are digital, it is easy for the students to understand and think out of the box-
Principal, private school, Kothagudem

6. Policies and schemes

A. RTE Act- Awareness, suggestions and level of implementation

Awareness was limited among the respondents on the benefits under the act. Those who were aware displayed different of opinions. Like, a Teacher in a Private school in Bhoopalapally highlighted the cons of allowing students to get enrolled in any school without a transfer certificate since they take this for their advantage. They move from school to school when they perform poorly in academics and are remorseless of their actions. Private schools do not follow the RTE protocols when it comes to hours a student devotes to schooling per day ie., Daily 6 hours is what the recommended timings are but private schools stretch it to 8 hours. They also do not follow the 33% allotment for RTE act. An anticipated feedback was received from a teacher to extend the scope of coverage upto post graduation for girl children under the act.

B. Aspirational districts

In few of the high-schools the **Government has provided projectors** with a budget of Rs.70,000 to enhance the learning experience for the students. In **primary schools televisions have been provided** and the **teachers have been trained for improving children's English communication skills**. Yet another direct action taken towards girl child education is **ensuring safety in school**.

Once all the students arrive at school, we close the gates until 4:30PM. Inorder to enter school, special permission should be availed by the school authorities- Teacher, Government school, Kothagudem who are promoting girl child education in the form of safety and security

Also, **Government schools are taking part in FLN programme**. The Niti Aayog is collaborating with Byju's and conduct examinations to sort out merit students and provide them free coaching such as NEET and IIT entrance exams based on their ambitions. 'Nearly 30 students have been selected for this and they are provided with tabs' stated the DEO, Bhoopalpally

C. Schemes and Gaps

As mentioned by respondents:

Tholi mettu
Foundational Literacy & Numeracy
Sarva shiksha abhiyan
Badi bata
Scholarships for SC students
Beti Bachao Beti Padhao
Sukanaya samurddhi
Jayashankar Badi Bata Programme

Gaps:

- Provisions of scheme benefits are full swing only at the beginning of academic years and fade away gradually.
- Awareness on availing transportation schemes for private school students on the website are limited and time restricted.

- Amma vodi scheme is unavailable unlike their sister state AP. This is sensed as a major gap in promoting girl child education by respondents.

7. Girl child education:

In Government school of Bhoopapally district, special initiatives are in place for the nutritional needs of a girl child. Likewise, a private school in Kothagudem offer fee concession for girl students. An unpopular opinion was stated by the Principal, private school, Kathagudem.

We should move from equality to equity. There should not be any scheme dedicated only to one particular gender. On the contrary we have to identify well deserving students of poor backgrounds to avail a scholarship of 25-30 percent annually on the school fees, books, uniforms, etc to study in private schools.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are drawn from the respondents for enhancing girl child education under RTE act

- ✚ Girl students should be strictly monitored from Village Panchayat level so that school dropout cases can be avoided.
- ✚ Parents should be counseled about their girl's education and its long term repercussions.
- ✚ Nutritious food provided to school children as a part of mid-day meals program can be given to all the students upto XIIth std.
- ✚ Gender segregated schools and colleges for girls should be at reachable distance and sufficient facilities like toilets and sanitary pads should be available.
- ✚ A suitable mode of education and teaching method for all the stakeholders should be deliberated and chosen.
- ✚ Scholarship and other financial aids should be extended for girl students who would like to pursue higher education.
- ✚ Computer and other technical education should be given more importance. Self defense classes can be made mandatory.
- ✚ Content regulation should be very strict as young people are strongly influenced by the media.
- ✚ For those who are weak at academics, free tuitions need to be conducted by the school so that they do not find the easy route of dropping out.

CHAPTER IX

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS & DISCUSSIONS

UNDERSTANDING THE 4-As

Katarina Tomasevski said - 'For education to be meaningful it must be available, accessible, acceptable and adaptable.' Katarina Tomasevski was former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education and developed the 4-A framework which is one of the best frameworks to understand and assess the situation of education. The framework can be used in a participatory process to enable people to think through what the right to education means to them.

The 4 As can be summarized as follows

Availability – that education is free and government-funded and that there is adequate infrastructure and trained teachers able to support education delivery.

Accessibility – that the system is non- discriminatory and accessible to all, and that positive steps are taken to include the most marginalized.

Acceptability – that the content of education is relevant, non-discriminatory and culturally appropriate, and of quality; that the school itself is safe and teachers are professional.

Adaptability – that education can evolve with the changing needs of society and contribute to challenging inequalities, such as gender discrimination, and that it can be adapted locally to suit specific contexts.

extract from <https://educationaroundtheworld.wordpress.com/>

Further in context to the study, the researchers through secondary research have developed a conceptual framework to examine the 4-As framework in examining the right to girl children education. Each of the As can be understood at 3 levels - structural, practice and quality.

At **structural level** - it is all about ensuring that the specific need, facility, material is present. For example, school buildings, benches, textbooks, playgrounds, etc.

At **practice level** - it is not just about having the specific need, facility or material but also bringing in certain practices that lets all the students avail, access, adapt and accept it. For example, ensuring that they are required sports material for the girls to play, ensuring that girls are also encouraged similarly as boys to play sports, ensuring x% of the seats are dedicated for girls, etc.

At **quality level** - it is the most important level, where periodic measures are taken to review the status of the need, facility or material and bring in relevant strategy and mechanism to improve the same. For example, teacher trainings are conducted to capacitate them to new pedagogy, parent-teacher meetings to review the school facilities and its impact on education of children.

9.1 CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE 4 -A INTO A SCHOOL SYSTEM

	Structural	Practice	Quality
Available	Basic infrastructure needed for the school to operate		Standard & maintenance of the basic infrastructure
Accessible	Are all those available accessible? fees, learning materials, food, travel, entitlements from school, safety conditions, provisions for physically challenged,	No gender discrimination No caste discrimination Disable friendly	Associations to handle relevant issues (Parents Teachers Association, School Management Committee, School Development Committee)
Adaptable	Basic conditions/infrastructure fitting to needs of the students, schedules considering the local weather/climate, curriculum as per student's language, languages of instruction as per students, usage of teaching aids, teaching methodologies, evaluation instruments and procedures	Knowledge of local realities, responding to diversity, responding to inequality, adapting teaching methods, adapting teaching materials/aids, adapting evaluation tools	Teacher training, Associations responding to diversity and inequality, process to review & upgrade infra to fit to needs of students,
Acceptable	Satisfaction of child (such as self-esteem, dignity, family and social respect, breaking with loneliness and isolation, socialization and interaction with peers, and simply having fun)		Mechanisms to evaluate learners' satisfaction

A simple example to understand the 4-A framework

Let us say the school is focusing on impart basic computer education to high school students

Availability - the school should ensure that they build or set up a computer lab, with proper computers, tables, chairs, necessary power supply, internet connection, etc., now the school can say that the computer lab is available at the school for the children.

Accessibility - It is not just about setting it up, it is also giving access to the students to use it. The school should include computer classes into the student's timetable and let students access the infrastructure to learn. As a new infrastructure is added, the school might tend to take an extra fee for the same which should be economical and if possible not to be charged. While having a timetable is at structural level, ensuring fee waiver or no fee change with the new additional setup is at practice level. At quality level, monitoring the computer classes are happening as per the schedule.

Adaptability - let us say the school is located in a rural area in Tamil Nadu, with respect to adaptability, the school should appoint a teacher who can speak Tamil and can explain the concepts in the vernacular language. The textbook materials to teach can be in vernacular medium so that students can learn easily.

Acceptability - The students learning the computer classes are feeling happy and the parents feel that the school has included the most relevant course into the curriculum, then there is good acceptability of the computer classes at the school.

If any of the aspects above was not inline, then the computer education at the said school is not inline with the 4-A framework and therefore the quality of the education is not up to the mark.

9.1 SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

9.1.1 AVAILABILITY

9.1.1.1 Availability of school

In the following study, we examined the availability of high school (8- 10th standard) in the same village and the availability of higher secondary education (11 - 12th standard) in the same village. The RTE Act has had a significant impact on improving the availability of schools in India. The Act mandates that all government schools must meet specific infrastructure and teacher requirements to ensure quality education. Additionally, the Act also provides for the establishment of new schools in areas where there are none. As a result, the number of schools in the country has increased significantly over the past decade.

According to the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) 2020, the enrolment rate of children aged between 6 and 14 years in India stands at 96.2%. This is a significant improvement from 92.7% in 2009 when the RTE Act was enacted. The report also highlights that the number of schools in the country has increased by 14.6% from 2009 to 2020. These figures indicate that the RTE Act has had a positive impact on improving the availability of schools in India.

In the current study, the %age of students who told that the **school is available in their village or panchayat** is as follows:

Table 9.2 - Availability of school in their village

District	%age of students who said school is in their village (Government)	%age of students who said school is in their village (Private)	%age of students who said higher secondary school is in their village (Government)	%age of students who said higher secondary school is in their village (Private)
Visakhapatnam	68.4	75.0	53.4	48.4
Vizianagaram	15.0	83.4	13.4	8.4
YSR (Kadapa)	68.4	58.4	45.0	20.0
Wayanad	55.0	45.0	75.0	90.0
Ramanathapuram	61.6	61.6	66.6	71.6
Virudhunagar	70.0	68.4	73.4	68.4
Asifabad	66.6	91.6	45.0	21.6
Bhadradi Kothagudem	23.4	73.4	23.4	70.0
Bhoopalapalli	31.6	46.6	11.6	43.4

9.1.1.2 Safe infrastructure

In the current study, we have not just examined the presence of proper building i.e. building with proper roofing and proper flooring. We tried to understand the building infrastructure in terms of its safety, disabled friendliness, proper classrooms and presence of extra curricular infrastructure like playgrounds, etc.

In 2016, the government of India launched the Accessible India Campaign, which aims to make public spaces and buildings, including schools, accessible to people with disabilities.¹ As part of the

¹"Accessible India Campaign." Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. <http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/content/page/accessible-india-campaign.php>

campaign, schools are required to undertake accessibility audits and make necessary modifications to their infrastructure to ensure that they are disabled-friendly.

The government has also introduced guidelines for the construction of disabled-friendly school buildings. These guidelines include features such as ramps, wider doorways, accessible toilets, and tactile paving to aid navigation for visually impaired students.²

Here is the %age of students who indicated that school have a better **disable friendly infrastructure (ramps & handrails)**

Table no. 9.3 Disable friendly Infrastructure

District	%age of students who reported school have ramps (Government)	%age of students who reported school have ramps (Private)	%age of students who reported school have handrails (Government)	%age of students who reported school have handrails (Private)
Visakhapatnam	100.0	0.0	98.4	86.6
Vizianagaram	100.0	0.0	100.0	50.0
YSR (Kadapa)	100.0	90.0	100.0	85.0
Wayanad	100.0	96.8	100.0	93.4
Ramanathapuram	76.6	73.4	88.4	75.0
Virudhunagar	91.6	98.4	95.0	100.0
Asifabad	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Bhadradri Kothagudem	91.6	98.4	91.6	96.6
Bhoopalapalli	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

²"Guidelines for a Barrier Free Built Environment for Persons with Disabilities." Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India.
http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/Barrier_Free_Environment_Guidelines.pdf

Classroom design can impact the ability of teachers to deliver effective instruction and students' ability to learn. Studies have shown that classrooms with natural light, good ventilation, and appropriate acoustics can improve student engagement and academic achievement. Therefore, classroom construction should prioritize the inclusion of such features.³

Here is the %age of students who indicated that school have good **classroom infrastructure (ventilation and windows)**

Table No. 9.4 Classroom Infrastructure - Ventilation & Windows

District	Ventilation (Government)	Ventilation (Private)	Windows (Government)	Windows (Private)
Visakhapatnam	100.0	88.4	95.0	68.4
Vizianagaram	100.0	100.0	98.4	96.6
YSR (Kadapa)	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.0
Wayanad	98.4	88.2	93.4	80.0
Ramanathapuram	96.8	95.0	78.8	100.0
Virudhunagar	31.6	23.4	36.6	23.4
Asifabad	85.0	88.4	91.6	96.6
Bhadradri Kothagudem	90.0	100.0	71.6	88.4
Bhoopalapalli	25.0	76.6	16.6	83.4

9.1.1.3 Academic resources

One of the most important materials required for the student to study are proper textbooks and notebooks which are treated as the basic and mandatory learning material. Having access to a proper textbook and notebooks have proven to have better academic learning experience for the students. There has also been significant improvement in timely distribution of textbooks and notebooks to the students (reference).

In the current study, we have noticed that the following % age of the students reported that the notebooks and textbooks provided are good in condition. While the notebooks and textbooks

³ "Classroom Design and Learning: How Classroom Design Affects Student Engagement and Learning Outcomes." OpenEd.com.
<https://www.openedu.com/classroom-design-and-learning-how-classroom-design-affects-student-engagement-and-learning-outcomes/>

provided by the government schools are free, the notebooks and textbooks provided are part of the fee and the students don't need to pay anything extra.

Table No. 9.5 Academic Resources - Notebooks & Textbooks

District	%age of students who indicated textbook are good (Government)	%age of students who indicated textbook are good (Private)	%age of students who indicated notebooks are good (Government)	%age of students who indicated notebooks are good (Private)
Visakhapatnam	100.0	88.4	100.0	88.4
Vizianagaram	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
YSR (Kadapa)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Wayanad	98.4	93.2	100.0	100.0
Ramanathapuram	98.2	100.0	100.0	96.8
Virudhunagar	70.0	65.0	100.0	98.4
Asifabad	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Bhadradri Kothagudem	100.0	98.4	100.0	98.4
Bhoopalapalli	93.4	96.6	65.0	100.0

In the following study, we have also examined the supporting resources like scholarships, extra tuition, and freebies that are provided to promote academic learning among the students. Research has shown evidence that the financial situation of the parents is also impacting the continuity of academics. Government has sorted this by introducing a range of scholarships that encourage students from difficult backgrounds to study. These scholarships help the students to meet other academic expenses and travel to the school. This also encouraged the parents to send the children to school. For example, Ammavodi is one such scheme in Andhra Pradesh where the mother will be credited with ~2000 rupees a month if the child is sent to school regularly.

Alongside cash incentives (scholarships), the government has also brought in a lot of freebies such as uniforms, bags, bicycles, etc. that support the students continuing their education. Research has shown that providing bicycles to the girls has improved the attendance percentage of the students in the school.

Here are the %age of students who mentioned that the freebies provided are of good quality.

Table No. 9.6 Freebies - Supporting Academic Resource

District	%age of students who indicated the freebies provided are of good (Government)	%age of students who indicated the freebies provided are of good (Private)
Visakhapatnam	49.58	23.75
Vizianagaram	74.58	50.00
YSR (Kadapa)	74.2	100.0
Wayanad	46.0	85.0
Ramanathapuram	25.0	13.0
Virudhunagar	60.0	57.0
Asifabad	92.08	96.6
Bhadradri Kothagudem	67.0	65.8
Bhoopalapalli	88.0	30.5

The current study also compared the facilities available for practice based learnings (labs and equipment). We got a mixed response from the districts, while some reported having the labs and equipment others reported none.

Here is the %age of students who reported that the labs are present in good in their schools

Table No. 9.7 Academic Resources - Labs & Equipments

District	%age of students who indicated the labs are of good (Government)	%age of students who indicated the labs are of good (Private)
Visakhapatnam	98.33	30.93
Vizianagaram	98.83	99.67
YSR (Kadapa)	25.7	98
Wayanad	51.0	47.0
Ramanathapuram	10.0	38.0
Virudhunagar	42.0	52.0
Asifabad	100.0	0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	4.9	32.3
Bhoopalapalli	93.6	63.8

9.1.1.4 Transport facilities

Lack of transportation options can lead to lower school enrollment rates, particularly among girls who may face safety concerns while traveling to school. A study conducted in rural India found that providing access to transportation increased school enrollment rates, especially among girls, and led to improved academic performance (Bhatnagar & Das, 2020). Therefore, improving transportation infrastructure can play an important role in ensuring that children have access to education, especially in rural areas.

Here is % age of students who reported that transportation facilities are available for their schools.

Table 9.8 Availability of Transport facility in schools

District	%age of transportation facilities are available in their schools. (Government)	%age of transportation facilities are available in their schools. (Private)
Visakhapatnam	3.4	26.6
Vizianagaram	10.0	95.0
YSR (Kadapa)	0.0	70.0
Wayanad	61.6	98.4
Ramanathapuram	10.0	90.0
Virudhunagar	13.3	95.0
Asifabad	1.6	90.0
Bhadradri Kothagudem	11.6	73.4
Bhoopalapalli	0.0	100.0

The government schools do not have dedicated school buses but have active collaborations with local RTE which provide free bus passes to the school students. However, through qualitative data it has been understood that children face a lot of difficulties getting a seat in the RTC bus both in the morning and evening timings. It was also added that the local RTC buses are usually busy in the morning and evening.

In some schools, the headmaster has adapted the school timetable so that the children do not find it hard to get the seat. A similar initiative will ease the travel part for children. Alongside, addition of request stops and extension of stop until the school is important so that students don't need to walk long distance from bus stop to the school

9.1.1.5 Sanitation facilities

Sanitation is one key factor that decides if the girl will continue in the school or not. There are several studies that reported that lack of proper sanitation facilities at school have resulted in dropouts of schools (reference). According to the ASER report 2022, the fraction of schools with usable girls' toilets increased from 66.4% in 2018 to 68.4% in 2022.

According to a UNESCO report, approximately 36% of schools in the world do not have access to safe water and sanitation facilities, and 23% of schools lack basic handwashing facilities. This lack of infrastructure can be a major barrier to school enrollment, especially for girls.

There is ample evidence that shows that safe infrastructure can improve school enrollment rates. For example, a study conducted in India found that the provision of separate toilets for girls in schools led to a significant increase in their enrollment rates.

To ensure safe infrastructure in schools, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) includes a target to ensure that all schools have safe water and sanitation facilities by 2030. To achieve this target, various initiatives have been launched in different countries. For example, the Swachh Vidyalaya Abhiyan (Clean School Campaign) was launched in India in 2014 to provide access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene facilities in schools across the country. The initiative has been successful in improving the infrastructure of schools and increasing school enrollment rates.

Here is the %age of students who reported the basic hygiene of the restrooms is good

Table 9.9 Basic Hygiene of Restrooms

District	%age of students who reported the basic hygiene of the restrooms is good (Government)	%age of students who reported the basic hygiene of the restrooms is good (Private)
Visakhapatnam	95.42	84.17
Vizianagaram	94.58	99.17
YSR (Kadapa)	98.3	75.0
Wayanad	59.0	43.3
Ramanathapuram	61.6	57.91
Virudhunagar	48.0	55.0
Asifabad	79.1	56.6
Bhadradi Kothagudem	35.0	43.0
Bhoopalapalli	0	45.8

We tried to understand the provision of proper menstrual hygiene related infrastructure. It has been observed that the government schools have better infrastructure related to menstrual hygiene than private schools. However, the school support staff are not aware of how to use the infrastructure and hence it is not used (as understood from KII).

9.1.2 ACCESSIBILITY

9.1.2 .1 Discrimination free environment and Inclusion

One study conducted by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) found that girls in many developing countries face discrimination in education, with fewer opportunities to attend school, lower quality of education, and higher dropout rates than boys.⁴ In the study we have tried to examine discrimination free environments in 4 areas - gender, caste, religion and disability. Rather than limiting to a binary question on asking if the discrimination is present in the school, we tried to understand the discrimination based on the perspective of students on discrimination, participation and engagement of students in different roles at school, access to facilities at the school and interpersonal relationship of students.

In some districts we have seen that though the students feel that there is no discrimination but have reported that they were not given a chance as leaders and not given access to sport equipment and can't relate with other students because of gender. This is often due to cultural and societal attitudes that view girls as less important or less capable than boys.

Here is the level of agreement scores on the scale of 1- 10 for the statement on 'Girls are discriminated based on gender' and 'Girls play and have access to sports equipments'

⁴ UNICEF (2016). Gender Discrimination in Education: The Violation of Rights of Women and Girls. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.org/education/gender-discrimination-education-violation-rights-women-and-girls>

Table 9.10 Gender Discrimination free environment

District	Girls are discriminated based on gender (Government)	Girls are discriminated based on gender (Private)	Girls play and have access to sports equipments (Government)	Girls play and have access to sports equipments (Private)
Visakhapatnam	3.67	3.57	9	7.97
Vizianagaram	5.63	4.67	9.33	9.8
YSR (Kadapa)	5.3	6.03	8.7	8.73
Wayanad	4.6	4.27	8.93	8.07
Ramanathapuram	4.47	4.1	8.1	8.6
Virudhunagar	3.7	4.53	8.23	9.2
Asifabad	2.13	2	8.87	8
Bhadradri Kothagudem	2	2.03	8.13	8.3
Bhoopalapalli	2.17	2.73	8.57	8.7

The opinions on caste discrimination are reportedly different for each district. At the prospective level, the students have indicated that there is no caste discrimination which is also expressed by the teacher and government officials in the KIIs and FGDs. When asked about participation and ability to relate with others, we have seen mixed responses. This indicates that there are no active conversations happening on the caste, the students at some instances have seen differences in treatment of students based on caste. However, the beliefs of students on the ability of lower caste students to study and complete education are reported to be good across all the districts.

A study done by Bansal et al, found that girls from lower castes face significant discrimination in accessing education. They are often denied access to quality schools and teachers, and are more likely to experience gender-based violence and harassment in schools.⁵

Here is the level of agreement scores on the scale of 1- 10 for the statement on ‘Teachers give marks based on caste of student’ and ‘Lower caste students study well’

⁵ Bansal, S., Agarwal, M., & Sharma, S. K. (2015). Caste Discrimination and its Impact on Girl Child Education in India. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(4), 161-167.

Table 9.11 Caste Discrimination free environment

District	Teachers give marks based on caste of student (Government)	Teachers give marks based on caste of student (Private)	Lower caste students study well (Government)	Lower caste students study well (Private)
Visakhapatnam	8.07	8.03	4.80	3.50
Vizianagaram	8.93	9.07	7.07	4.13
YSR (Kadapa)	7.93	8.97	6.90	6.93
Wayanad	4.17	3.07	6.67	6.93
Ramanathapuram	4.73	4.3	7.8	8.53
Virudhunagar	3.67	3.37	9.2	8.7
Asifabad	8.9	8.03	2.13	2.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	8.17	8.33	2.0	2.13
Bhoopalapalli	8.83	8.7	2.27	2.5

On religion, there are some government schools which reported lower on the tolerance level of teachers towards religion. Similar to above, on the binary question students indicate that there is no religion based discrimination, however, there are instances where reported lower on the ability to follow religious customs at school.

Here is the level of agreement scores on the scale of 1- 10 for the statement on ‘Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)’ and ‘Religious Tolerance among teachers’

Table no. 9.12 Religion discrimination free environment

District	Religious customs allowed (Government)	Religious customs allowed (Private)	Religious Tolerance among teachers (Government)	Religious Tolerance among teachers (Private)
Visakhapatnam	6.63	5.9	6.3	7.0
Vizianagaram	8.37	8.63	8.57	8.43
YSR (Kadapa)	8.37	8.87	7.93	8.43
Wayanad	9.27	8.97	7.6	6.0
Ramanathapuram	7.7	7.23	7.6	7.5
Virudhunagar	7.47	8.27	8.5	8.2
Asifabad	8.77	8.07	5.37	2.1
Bhadradri Kothagudem	8.4	8.23	2.13	2.27
Bhoopalapalli	8.47	8.87	2.13	2.43

Similarly on the disability we have seen a mixed response. The students believe that disabled students can do well at education and also indicate that the school does not have discrimination based on gender. However, they reported that access to facilities at the school are limited and sometimes disabled students find it hard to relate with others. In the FGDs and KIIs we have observed that the first response from the parents, teachers and government officials has always been about sending the disabled students to special schools rather than talking about facilities that can be included in the current schools.

9.1.2.2 Distance to school

One of the key mandates that has been taken through Right to Education is to ensure that the school facilities are within the habitation of the children so that everyone gets enrolled into school. Having a school within or closer to the habitation avoids the challenge of traveling which is one of the reasons for students to discontinue or dropout (reference). According to the 8th All India Education Survey, 87.58% of the schools are within the radius of 3 kilometers of habitation. (2022)

Below is the %age of students who reported that their schools are below 3 kilometer

Table no. 9.13 Distance to school - less than 3 KM

District	%age of students who reported that their schools are Less than 3 KM (Government)	%age of students who reported that their schools are Less than 3 KM (Private)
Visakhapatnam	66.8	13.4
Vizianagaram	18.4	18.4
YSR (Kadapa)	60.0	80.0
Wayanad	61.6	53.2
Ramanathapuram	88.0	66.6
Virudhunagar	85.0	76.8
Asifabad	70.0	93.4
Bhadradi Kothagudem	48.4	65.0
Bhoopalapalli	60.0	43.4

Compared to the government schools, the private schools have students coming from far away distances (like more than 10 kilometers). As understood through focus groups and key informant discussions, the availability of transportation facilities to the school is one of the reasons (quote from FGD or KII). Though the government schools provide free buspasses in some states, sending children in a dedicated school bus was expressed as a safer option by the parents.

9.1.2.3 Nutritious meals

We didn't compare the nutritious meals between the government and private as the private schools do not have any provision of mid-day meals. We have compared the accessibility to nutritious meals between the government schools. The nutritious meals are examined at 3 levels - quantity, quality and discrimination to access.

%age of students who reported that meals quantity is Ideal and more as per each district

Table no. 9.14 Quantity of Mid-Day Meals

District	%age of students who reported that meals quantity is Ideal	%age of students who reported that meals quantity is More
Visakhapatnam	55.0	45.0
Vizianagaram	37.9	62.1
YSR (Kadapa)	63.3	30.0
Wayanad	69.6	28.6
Ramanathapuram	50.0	39.3
Virudhunagar	25.5	61.8
Asifabad	48.3	43.3
Bhadradi Kothagudem	78.3	0
Bhoopalapalli	87.7	0

According to the latest reports, the quality of mid-day meals in schools across India remains a concern. A study conducted by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) in 2021 found that many schools are not providing meals that meet the prescribed nutritional standards. The study found that only 42% of schools provided meals with the recommended calorie intake, while only 62% provided meals with the recommended protein intake. Additionally, the study found that only 61% of schools provided meals that were cooked in a hygienic manner.⁶

⁶ Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2021). Report on Performance of Mid-Day Meal Scheme. Government of India.

%age of students who reported that food quality is good and very good

Table No. 9.15 Quality of Mid-Day Meals

District	Good	Hygienically
Visakhapatnam	96.6	95.0
Vizianagaram	94.8	94.8
YSR (Kadapa)	91.6	95.0
Wayanad	73.2	98.2
Ramanathapuram		
Virudhunagar	74.8	78.2
Asifabad	50.0	50.0
Bhadradri Kothagudem	3.3	10.0
Bhoopalapalli	0	100

According to recent reports, discrimination during the serving of mid-day meals continues to be a problem in India. A report by the Centre for Equity Studies (CES) in 2021 found that children from Dalit, Adivasi, and Muslim communities faced discrimination while being served mid-day meals in schools.⁷ The report highlighted instances of children from marginalized communities being made to sit separately and being served meals after other students. The report also found that in some cases, teachers discriminated against children from marginalized communities by not allowing them to serve food or participate in the preparation of meals.

The CES report is consistent with previous studies and reports that have highlighted discrimination during the serving of mid-day meals. A study by the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) in 2016 found that children from marginalized communities faced discrimination while being served mid-day meals.⁸ The study found that in some cases, children from Dalit and Adivasi communities were made to sit separately and were not allowed to serve food.

⁷ Center for Equity Studies. (2021). Discrimination in Mid-Day Meals: A Study in Five States.

⁸ National Commission for Protection of Child Rights. (2016). Status of Mid Day Meal Scheme in India. Government of India.

%age of students who reported there is no discrimination in serving the food

Table No. 9.16 No Discrimination in serving food at Mid-Day Meal

District	% of No Caste discrimination	% of No Gender discrimination
Visakhapatnam	100	98.3
Vizianagaram	89.7	87.9
YSR (Kadapa)	83.3	73.3
Wayanad	100	100
Ramanathapuram		
Virudhunagar	90.3	86.5
Asifabad	100.0	100.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	100.0	100.0
Bhoopalapalli	92.9	94.7

(include interpretation if the discrimination is reported higher in any district or not)

9.1.3 ACCEPTABILITY

9.1.3.1 General Acceptability: acceptability of school & friends

Under this we examined the level of acceptability of school and friends by the girl students. There is ample evidence from research that talks about social acceptance and peer pressure influence on students to be part of the school. Social acceptance and peer pressure are significant factors that affect the education of girls in school. The pressure to conform to the expectations of peers and the larger society often leads to girls dropping out of school, limiting their opportunities for personal and professional growth.

Several studies have shown that social acceptance by peers has a significant impact on the educational outcomes of girls. For instance, a study conducted by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in Bangladesh found that girls who were accepted by their peers were more likely to attend school regularly and perform better academically (UNICEF, 2013)⁹.

⁹ UNICEF. (2013). Social acceptance and rejection: The social dynamics of education in Bangladesh. Dhaka: UNICEF.

Conversely, social isolation and rejection by peers have been found to have a negative impact on the educational outcomes of girls. A study conducted by the Center for Global Development found that girls who experienced bullying and social rejection were more likely to drop out of school, have lower levels of self-esteem, and exhibit risky behavior (Kaffenberger & Pritchett, 2017)¹⁰.

Here is the level of agreement scores on the scale of 1- 10 for the statement on ‘bullied by looks’ and ‘feeling lonely in the school’

Table No. 9.17 Significant statements of acceptability of school & friends

District	I am bullied based on my looks (Government)	I am bullied based on my looks (Private)	I feel lonely in school (Government)	I feel lonely in school (Private)
Visakhapatnam	5.57	6.47	4.97	3.57
Vizianagaram	8.47	8.50	5.50	4.30
YSR (Kadapa)	5.87	6.70	6.33	5.27
Wayanad	3.77	3.87	3.43	3.70
Ramanathapuram	3.93	5.20	5.10	4.37
Virudhunagar	4.83	3.83	4.50	4.63
Asifabad	4.43	2.10	2.00	2.10
Bhadradi Kothagudem	2.00	2.10	2.00	2.00
Bhoopalapalli	2.47	2.47	2.13	2.13

There are still a percentage of girls who feel lonely being in the school which is an indication that some students feel excluded and not accepted by other children. The level of agreement on bullying also seems different in each district. There is a strong need for the school administration to bring in practices that enable students to interact with each other. Bringing in peer mentoring in the school where senior students can support the junior class students on coping up with social, emotional and academic challenges will be helpful for the students to have a dependable person at the school. This also helps the students to support and care for each other. The social acceptance level will increase among the students which will lead to regular attendance and better academic outputs.

¹⁰ Kaffenberger, M., & Pritchett, L. (2017). More than just friends? School peers and adult HIV risk in Zambia. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.

9.1.3.2 Quality of education - Acceptability of Teachers

The relationship between teachers and students plays a significant role in shaping the educational outcomes of girls. Teachers' attitudes and behaviors towards girls can affect their academic performance, their self-esteem, and their motivation to learn.

Several studies have shown that the acceptability of girls by their teachers positively influences their educational outcomes. For instance, a study conducted by the World Bank in Pakistan found that girls who perceived their teachers as supportive and caring were more likely to attend school regularly, complete their education, and perform better academically (World Bank, 2013)¹¹.

In this study we examined the supportiveness and caring nature of teachers. Here is the level of agreement on the scale of 1 - 10 by students

Table No. 9.18 Significant statements of Acceptability of Teachers

District	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing (Government)	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing (Private)	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours (Government)	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours (Private)
Visakhapatnam	8.37	8.47	8.43	8.50
Vizianagaram	9.37	9.37	9.07	9.40
YSR (Kadapa)	8.67	9.30	8.37	9.37
Wayanad	8.20	7.47	8.30	8.57
Ramanathapuram	8.83	9.94	8.40	9.27
Virudhunagar	9.27	9.73	8.53	9.13
Asifabad	8.20	8.00	7.27	8.03
Bhadradi Kothagudem	8.27	8.37	8.53	8.83
Bhoopalapalli	8.77	8.87	8.30	8.43

¹¹ World Bank. (2013). Pakistan: Girls' Education – Making a Difference. Islamabad: World Bank.

Similarly, a study conducted by the Population Council in Ethiopia found that girls who received positive feedback and encouragement from their teachers were more likely to have higher levels of self-esteem and motivation to learn, leading to better educational outcomes (Fentahun, 2014)¹².

In this study, we also examined if the students are inspired by the teachers. Here is the level of agreement by the girls students on the scale of 1 - 10

Table No 9.19 Significant statements of Acceptability of Teachers (Contd..)

District	My teachers inspire me (Government)	My teachers inspire me (Private)	I accept my teachers (Government)	I accept my teachers (Private)
Visakhapatnam	8.97	8.73	9.27	9.10
Vizianagaram	9.60	9.33	9.63	9.43
YSR (Kadapa)	8.77	9.27	8.83	9.33
Wayanad	8.33	7.17	8.63	7.40
Ramanathapuram	9.97	8.77	9.07	9.13
Virudhunagar	8.83	9.20	9.07	9.63
Asifabad	8.50	8.10	8.47	8.03
Bhadradi Kothagudem	8.60	8.73	8.60	8.73
Bhoopalapalli	8.47	8.77	8.97	9.03

Conversely, negative attitudes and behaviors by teachers towards girls have been found to have a detrimental effect on their education. A study conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Nigeria found that girls who experienced gender discrimination and bias from their teachers were more likely to drop out of school and have lower academic performance (UNESCO, 2015)¹³.

Here is the level of agreement on the presence of gender discrimination in school as reported by the students.

¹² Fentahun, N. (2014). Factors Affecting Girls' Academic Achievement in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Population Council.

¹³ UNESCO. (2015). Gender-based violence in schools: A global problem. Paris: UNESCO.

Table No. 9.20 Level of agreement on the presence of gender discrimination in school

District	Girls are treated well by teachers (Government)	Girls are treated well by teachers (Private)	Girls are discriminated based on gender (Government)	Girls are discriminated based on gender (Private)
Visakhapatnam	9.27	8.63	3.67	3.57
Vizianagaram	9.43	9.37	5.63	4.67
YSR (Kadapa)	8.40	9.10	5.30	6.03
Wayanad	8.77	7.97	4.60	4.27
Ramanathapuram	9.17	9.50	4.47	4.10
Virudhunagar	9.30	9.67	3.70	4.53
Asifabad	8.87	8.00	2.13	2.00
Bhadradri Kothagudem	8.30	8.13	2.10	2.07
Bhoopalapalli	8.37	8.53	2.17	2.73

9.1.3.3 Relevance of education - Acceptability of Girl's Education

The attitudes of high school girls towards education in India can significantly impact their academic performance, motivation to learn, and future opportunities. Understanding the factors that shape these attitudes can help improve educational outcomes for girls in the country.

Several studies have investigated the attitudes of high school girls towards education in India. For instance, a study conducted by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) found that high school girls who had positive attitudes towards learning and schooling were more likely to have higher academic achievement and a desire to continue their education (NCERT, 2015)¹⁴.

Similarly, a study conducted in Gujarat, India found that high school girls who perceived education as important and valuable were more likely to have higher academic achievement and pursue higher education (Jain & Sunita, 2013)¹⁵.

¹⁴ NCERT. (2015). Attitude towards learning and school: A study of Class IX students. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.

¹⁵ Jain, K., & Sunita, K. (2013). Attitude of high school students towards education. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 3(3), 230-234.

In this study, we examined the perspectives of girl children on education to understand how much they accept and believe that education empowers them, makes them creative, and lets them get into a job. The perspectives and opinions that are built by the young students through experience that they undergo in their social settings - family, school, peers, etc.

Here is the level of agreement of girl students on education

Table No. 9.21 Level of agreement of girl students on education

District	Education helps me learn new skills (Government)	Education helps me learn new skills (Private)	Education helps me face challenges in life (Government)	Education helps me face challenges in life (Private)
Visakhapatnam	9.53	8.63	9.70	9.20
Vizianagaram	9.80	9.77	9.87	9.87
YSR (Kadapa)	8.50	9.40	8.60	9.13
Wayanad	9.47	9.27	9.23	9.00
Ramanathapuram	9.07	9.63	9.10	9.50
Virudhunagar	9.70	9.87	9.77	9.87
Asifabad	8.97	8.13	8.97	8.13
Bhadradri Kothagudem	8.67	8.70	8.27	8.77
Bhoopalapalli	8.90	8.87	9.03	9.23

9.1.4 ADAPTABILITY

9.1.4.1 Online and digital tool for learning

Research conducted by various organizations and academic institutions sheds light on the status of online mode of education in Indian schools. According to a survey by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in 2020, only 27% of Indian schools had the infrastructure and resources to support online learning¹⁶. Similarly, a study by the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Bombay found that 90% of surveyed schools faced challenges in implementing online learning due to inadequate infrastructure, lack of teacher training, and limited access to technology¹⁷. A survey by ASER Centre in 2020 also found that only 11% of rural households in India had access to a computer, and only 24% had access to the internet, posing a major challenge for the implementation of online learning in rural areas¹⁸.

Finally, a study by Tata Trusts in 2020¹⁹ found that teachers in Indian schools faced challenges in adapting to online teaching methods due to lack of training, technical know-how, and resources. While the Indian government is pushing for digital education, and various online platforms and resources are available, it is clear that the implementation of online learning in Indian schools still faces significant challenges related to infrastructure, accessibility, and teacher training.

In the current study we understood the perspective of the students on adaptability of online mode of education and blended mode of education. Here %age of students who responded that online mode and blended mode of education is adaptable by the school.

¹⁶ National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) survey:
https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/Announcements/COVID-19/NCERT_Survey_Report.pdf

¹⁷ Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Bombay study:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344858770_A_Survey_on_Challenges_Faced_by_Schools_in_the_Implementation_of_Online_Education_During_COVID-19

¹⁸ ASER Centre survey:
<https://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/ASER%20Reports/ASER%202020/ASER%202020%20National%20Findings.pdf>

¹⁹ Tata Trusts study:
https://www.tatatrusts.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Adapting-to-Digital-Learning_Covid-19-Response-Report.pdf

Table No. 9.22 Adaptability of online mode and blended mode of education

District	Online mode of education (Government)	Online mode of education (Private)	Blended mode of education (Government)	Blended mode of education (Private)
Visakhapatnam	35.0	20.0	50.0	80.0
Vizianagaram	31.6	48.4	15.0	43.4
YSR (Kadapa)	25.0	28.4	28.4	28.4
Wayanad	18.4	25.0	11.6	50.0
Ramanathapuram	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virudhunagar	28.4	35.0	38.4	26.4
Asifabad	96.6	100.0	83.4	98.4
Bhadradi Kothagudem	35.0	20.0	50.0	80.0
Bhoopalapalli	100.0	90.0	100.0	80.0

9.1.4.2 Skill development

Skill development is an essential component of education, especially at the high school level, as it helps students acquire practical and relevant skills that can prepare them for higher education and employment. Several research papers in India have highlighted the importance of skill development at the high school level.

A study by the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC) and KPMG India found that there is a significant skill gap in the Indian workforce, and skill development initiatives should be focused on the school education system (NSDC & KPMG, 2016)²⁰. The study recommended that the high school curriculum should include vocational education and training programs that provide practical skills in areas such as manufacturing, engineering, hospitality, and healthcare.

Similarly, a report by the National Institution for Transforming India (NITI Aayog) emphasized the need for a shift in the education system's focus from rote learning to skill development. The report

²⁰ National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC) and KPMG India study:
[https://www.nsdcindia.org/sites/default/files/files/KPMGReport%20Skill%20Gap%20India%20\(NSDC\).pdf](https://www.nsdcindia.org/sites/default/files/files/KPMGReport%20Skill%20Gap%20India%20(NSDC).pdf)

recommended that the high school curriculum should be revised to include skill-based training programs that focus on problem-solving, critical thinking, and entrepreneurship (NITI Aayog, 2017)²¹.

In the current study we understood if skill development is emphasized or not. If it is taught at the school, then we also understand through an open-ended question on different skills that they are taught at the school. Here is the %age of students who indicated that skill based learning is happening at the school.

Table No. 9.23 Skill Development based on Education

District	Education for skill development (Government)	Education for skill development (Private)
Visakhapatnam	51.6	21.6
Vizianagaram	30.0	30.0
YSR (Kadapa)	65.0	83.4
Wayanad	73.4	70.0
Ramanathapuram	0.0	0.0
Virudhunagar	90.0	96.6
Asifabad	76.6	100.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	51.6	21.6
Bhoopalapalli	100.0	100.0

9.1.4.3 Gender equality

Gender equality is a fundamental human right and an essential component of a fair and just society. It refers to equal rights, opportunities, and treatment for people of all genders, regardless of their gender identity or expression. There have been several studies on attitudes towards gender equality among high school students in India. A study done by Sekher, 2015²² surveyed 1,200 adolescents (600 boys and 600 girls) from different socio-economic backgrounds and found that attitudes

²¹ National Institution for Transforming India (NITI Aayog) report:

https://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/document_publication/Three_Year_Action_Agenda.pdf

²² Sekher, T.V. (2015). Gender Attitudes among Indian Adolescents: Exploring the Influence of Schooling and Exposure to Mass Media. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(2), 212-227.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02673843.2013.833008>

towards gender equality were influenced by schooling and exposure to mass media. The study found that students who had more education and exposure to mass media had more positive attitudes towards gender equality.

Another study titled "Attitudes Towards Gender Equality Among Secondary School Students in Kerala, India" (Kumar and Thomas, 2016)²³ surveyed 350 students (175 boys and 175 girls) from secondary schools in Kerala. The study found that both boys and girls had a positive attitude towards gender equality, with girls having slightly more positive attitudes than boys. The study also found that students who had more education had more positive attitudes towards gender equality.

In the current study we also tried to understand the beliefs of girl students on gender equality. Here is the %age of students who indicated that gender equality is adaptable and gender equality will contribute to societal development.

Table No. 9.24 Adaptability of Gender Equality in Schools

District	Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School (Government)	Gender Equality Adaptable In Your School (Private)	Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development (Government)	Gender Equality Contributes To Societal Development (Private)
Visakhapatnam	86.6	93.4	96.6	98.4
Vizianagaram	96.6	100.0	98.4	100.0
YSR (Kadapa)	98.0	106.0	80.0	78.4
Wayanad	85.0	80.0	91.6	98.4
Ramanathapuram	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virudhunagar	96.6	93.6	100.0	100.0
Asifabad	100.0	100.0	98.4	100.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	86.6	93.4	96.6	98.4
Bhoopalapalli	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

²³ Kumar, S., & Thomas, S. (2016). Attitudes Towards Gender Equality Among Secondary School Students in Kerala, India. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 25(4), 395-408.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09589236.2015.1126288>

9.1.4.4 Inclusion of Third gender

In India, the inclusion of the third gender in high schools has been a subject of discussion for many years. The third gender, also known as the Hijra community, is recognized as a separate gender identity in India. India has several policies and legal frameworks that recognize and protect the rights of the third gender. In 2014²⁴ The Supreme Court of India recognized the third gender as a separate legal identity and directed the government to provide equal rights and opportunities to this community. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, also provides for inclusive education for all children, including those from marginalized communities.

While there are policies and legal frameworks in place, the implementation of inclusive education for the third gender in high schools in India is still a challenge. Some of the challenges include a lack of awareness and sensitivity among teachers and students, a lack of infrastructure and resources, and social stigma and discrimination. The National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)²⁵ has included a chapter on the third gender in its social science textbook for class VIII. Some schools in India have also started to include the third gender in their admission forms and other official documents. Inclusive education for the third gender in high schools in India can have a positive impact on the community. It can help to reduce social stigma and discrimination, increase awareness and understanding among students, and provide opportunities for the third gender to access education and other resources.

²⁴ The Supreme Court of India. (2014). National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India. https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2013/35071/35071_2013_31_1501_22249_Judgement_15-Apr-2014.pdf

²⁵ National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2017). Social Science Textbook for Class VIII. <https://ncert.nic.in/textbook/pdf/essh7dd.pdf>

When probed on inclusion of third gender, the girls have given mixed responses. Here is %age of students who responded yes to inclusion of third gender.

Table No. 9.25 Acceptability of Third Gender in School

District	Third gender be accepted in schools (Government)	Third gender be accepted in schools (Private)
Visakhapatnam	45.0	10.0
Vizianagaram	33.4	18.4
YSR (Kadapa)	73.4	73.4
Wayanad	93.4	95.0
Ramanathapuram	0.0	0.0
Virudhunagar	100.0	98.4
Asifabad	100.0	100.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	100.0	98.4
Bhoopalapalli	100.0	93.4

The opinions of the students are in relation to the level of acceptance of the third gender by the state. We have seen a higher %age of acceptances in states like Tamil Nadu where the policies around the third gender are well established.

9.1.5 RIGHT TO EDUCATION (RTE)

Education is one of the fundamental rights of every individual, and it plays a significant role in shaping a person's life. The Right to Education Act 2009 made education a fundamental right for every child between the ages of 6 and 14 years. The Act also mandates that every school, whether government or private, should reserve 25% of its seats for children from economically weaker sections. However, despite the enactment of this law, many students in India are still not aware of their right to education.

A survey conducted by the Centre for Civil Society in 2013 found that only 38% of students in Delhi were aware of the Right to Education Act. Another survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Office in 2014 revealed that around 32% of children between the ages of 6 and 14 were not attending

school. This indicates a lack of awareness and understanding about the importance of education and the right to education among children and their parents.

We also see a similar trend in terms of the awareness of students on different aspects of Right to Education (RTE). Here is %age of students who mentioned that they are not aware that education is free until the age of 14.

Table No. 9.26 Awareness about free education till 14 years of age.

District	Free education till 14 years of age (Government)	Free education till 14 years of age (Private)
Visakhapatnam	25.0	91.6
Vizianagaram	18.4	95.0
YSR (Kadapa)	100.0	81.6
Wayanad	3.4	58.4
Ramanathapuram	0.0	0.0
Virudhunagar	45.0	26.6
Asifabad	0.0	0.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	100.0	100.0
Bhoopalapalli	100.0	100.0

A survey conducted by the NGO Pratham in 2018 found that while there has been an improvement in enrollment rates in schools, the learning outcomes of students continue to be poor. The survey also revealed that many students were not aware of the different schemes and programs available to them, such as scholarships and free textbooks, which could help them access education.

We also saw a similar trend among the students that they are not aware of different schemes provided by the government. Here is %age of students who said that they are aware of various schemes provided by the government.

Table No. 9.27 Awareness about various education related schemes provided by Government

	%age of students with awareness (government)	%age of students with awareness (private)
Visakhapatnam	75.0	73.4
Vizianagaram	78.4	81.6
YSR (Kadapa)	98.4	98.4
Wayanad	68.4	15.0
Ramanathapuram	8.4	10.0
Virudhunagar	16.6	21.6
Asifabad	1.6	0.0
Bhadradi Kothagudem	1.6	1.6
Bhoopalapalli	8.4	8.4

CHAPTER X

RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION

RECOMMENDATIONS

Ministry of Education

1. Increase the availability of high schools and higher secondary schools in aspirational districts.
2. Improve transportation facilities for government schools in aspirational districts.
3. Review and ensure mandates on school building infrastructure are followed, especially by private schools.
4. Promote disability inclusion in schools by improving disabled-friendly infrastructure.
5. Train teachers to effectively use teaching-learning materials for better student engagement.
6. Promote online mode of education and improve infrastructure to support online learning.
7. Ensure 21st-century skill development (especially in STEM) is included in the school curriculum.
8. Review teaching methodologies and assessment frameworks implementation under the Right To Education (RTE) Act.

Ministry of Women & Child Development

1. Improve sanitation facilities in schools by ensuring more usable toilets, especially for girls.
2. Create awareness of bullying among students, teachers, and parents; ensure a grievance policy is in place to handle bullying in schools.
3. Promote and implement peer mentoring in schools to improve students' emotional and school well-being.
4. Develop and promote extracurricular activities and clubs that empower girls and build their leadership skills.

State Education Department

1. Monitor and review the 25% free seat allocation in private schools to students from low-income families under the RTE Act.
2. Create awareness among students and parents on the Right To Education Act and its available provisions.
3. Implement gender-sensitive teacher training programs to address gender biases and stereotypes in the classroom.
4. Encourage community-based initiatives to address cultural and social barriers to girl child education.
5. Establish and promote scholarship programs for girls, especially in STEM fields, to encourage higher education and career opportunities.

National Human Rights Commission

1. Advocate for the inclusion of human rights education in the school curriculum to foster a culture of respect and understanding.
2. Monitor the implementation of RTE Act provisions and ensure that the rights of girl children are protected and promoted.

3. Encourage research and data collection on the status of girl child education in India to inform policy-making and track progress.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Increase the availability of high schools in the aspirational districts so that more girls can access education until high school

From the study, we understood that the availability of high schools is lower in the aspirational districts which are in line with national-level statistics. As per the All India School Education Survey, only 26.2% of the high schools are in the village. In this study, we have observed districts like Vizianagaram, Bhadradri Kothagudem, and Bhoopalapally have less number of government schools within the village or panchayat. In these 3 districts, only 15% - 30% of the government school students reported that the school is within the village. In other districts, 30% - 70% of government school students reported that school is within the village. As government schools are not available, we see more private schools in these districts, about 45 - 92% of the students across districts have reported having a private school in their village.

Studies indicated high enrollment rates when the schools are within the community. As the school is not present in the village, girls who complete primary education often discontinue school. To ensure girl children are educated and complete until high school, it is recommended that a detailed assessment is done to understand the student's strengths in the district and a high school facility can be set up in the village. Setting up a new school involves costs which can be minimized by adding high school facilities to the existing primary school setup. Improving the availability of government schools will make education more available and accessible to girls thus improving the enrollment rate of the aspirational districts.

Increase the availability of higher secondary schools in the aspirational districts so that girls can complete higher secondary education (11th & 12th or Intermediate)

As per the All India School Education Survey (AISES), 66.3% of the primary schools are available in the village and 91% of the primary schools are within a radius of 3 kilometres of the village. Concerning high schools, only 26.2% of the high schools are in the village and 87.58% of the high schools are within a radius of 3 kilometres of the village. This shows that the availability of high school education facilities is less than that of primary school education facilities. A similar trend is also seen in the study, the number of higher secondary schools is lower than the number of high schools. Only 11- 53% of government school students from the states of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana have reported the availability of higher secondary schools in their village or panchayat. Similarly 8 - 48% of private school students from the same states have reported the availability of higher secondary schools in their village or panchayat. On the other hand, in Tamil Nadu and Kerala, 66- 90% of the students from both government and private schools have reported that higher secondary education is available in their village or panchayat.

Empowerment of girls and improvement of girl child education should not be limited only to high school education, steps need to be taken to make higher secondary education more available and

accessible. Lacking education facilities indicates that girls have lesser chances of completing higher secondary education. Studies have shown that the dropout rate is higher when the school facility is not within accessible distance. It is recommended that a detailed assessment can be done to understand the strength of passed-out high school students in the district and higher secondary education (11th and 12th) facilities can be established in the district. Considering the higher secondary education board (11th and 12th or Intermediate) is separate (Board of Intermediate) from the high school education board it would be hard to implement this recommendation. We recommend that states expedite and intensify the establishment of model schools where the schools facility is up to 12th standard. Similarly, as mentioned above the government can identify the current high schools and include the higher secondary education facilities to be cost-effective. It is also recommended that the model school structure is adopted by the private schools as well so that higher secondary education is more available for the girl students.

Having a higher secondary education facility enables more girls to complete higher secondary education which makes them eligible to step into university education and also procure good employment opportunities.

Improve the transportation facilities, especially for government schools

In the current study, In the states of Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Telangana only 3 - 13% of government school students have reported that the school has a transportation facility while 26 - 100% of the private schools students have reported that the school has a transportation facility. From the discussion with the teachers and government officials, it has been understood that the government provides free bus passes for the students. In states like Telangana, the bus pass is free for girl students. At the same time, the boys have to pay Rs.300. However, the students reported that they do not feel safe and comfortable travelling in public transport because of various reasons including - crowded buses, no seats available to sit, the bus doesn't stop at the school, the bus stop is far away from school and home, bad experiences while travelling in the local bus. On another hand, parents also do not encourage the students to travel in local buses as they feel it is not safe for the children.

It is recommended that these states allocate a dedicated bus for school transportation so that children feel safe to travel. The existing local buses only can be used with a dedicated trip in the morning and evening to school where the bus drops the students in the school. It also suggested taking learnings from states like Kerala, 60% of the government school students reported having transportation facilities. Kerala has a scheme called 'Gothra Saradhi' implemented through local panchayats. Under this scheme, transportation facilities are arranged for the students in the village to go to school. The local body takes account of school children's strength in the village and decides on the type of vehicle (car, minivan, or van). This scheme has been successful and Kerala reported improvement in attendance in the schools after implementing this scheme. This is something that can be adapted by other states and the implementation is easy as the owner is in the hands of the local government. Having dedicated transportation makes school education more accessible and improves the attendance of students at school.

Review and ensure mandates on the school building infrastructure like windows, ventilation, lighting, etc. are followed especially by private schools

In the current study, we have understood that the private school's infrastructure especially in relation to classroom setup - students reported that they do not have proper windows, ventilation and lighting. While 85 - 100% of government school students have reported that classroom infrastructure is good, only 23 - 95% of the private school students reported that classroom infrastructure is good. We have seen that states like Andhra Pradesh have better infrastructure, in all the 3 districts 100% of the government schools' students reported classroom infrastructure is good. Districts like Virudhunagar (Tamil Nadu) and Bhupalpally (Telangana) reported lower, only 16% - 31% of the students reported that classroom infrastructure is good.

Classroom design can impact the ability of teachers to deliver effective instruction and students' ability to learn. Studies have shown that classrooms with natural light, good ventilation, and appropriate acoustics can improve student engagement and academic achievement. Therefore it is recommended for states like Tamil Nadu, Telangana and Kerala to take necessary measures to improve the classroom infrastructure. As mentioned above, the school management committees can be involved to assess and review the infrastructure and make recommendations to the government. It is also suggested that these states adapt and take learnings from programs like Nadu-Nedu (School renovation program of Andhra Pradesh) to implement similar programs in their states. To review the private schools, a local committee consisting of local government officials, teachers from the school and parents from the school can be assigned the task to review the school infrastructure and provide recommendations to school management.

Promote disability inclusion in the existing schools by improving disabled-friendly infrastructure and bringing in attitudinal changes among teachers and officials.

Girls in many developing countries face discrimination in education, with fewer opportunities to attend school, lower quality of education, and higher dropout rates than boys. In the qualitative study, when probed on disability inclusion - teachers, parents and headmasters spoke only about sending disabled students to special schools and none of them spoke about measures that can be taken to make the current schools more disabled-inclusive. In the quantitative study, between 76% - 100% of the students in government schools have reported that they have ramps while the private schools have reported between 0 - 100%. Private schools in 3 districts viz. Visakhapatnam, Vizianagaram, and Asifabad have reported 0 i.e. no ramps and no handrails.

It is recommended that a review of disabled-friendly infrastructure is done in the district and a mandate can be provided to schools to include in the disabled-friendly infrastructure. Having such facilities at the school will make the schools in the community more accessible to the disabled and increase the enrollment of disabled students. For any new school that is coming up, the building plan can be assessed in detail on the disability infrastructure. Rather than spending on building completely separate schools, the existing schools can be made more accessible and inclusive for the disabled.

Train teachers to effectively use teaching-learning materials that enable the students to learn qualitatively and improve the learning engagement of students.

Across the states, we have mixed responses with respect to the usage of teaching aids by teachers. On a scale of 1- 10, students from Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Kerala have agreed between 5 - 7 that the teacher uses teaching aids to teach. Studies have shown that the learning engagement of students has been better when teaching aids are used. It is also evident that the children can learn concepts easily through teaching aids like flipcharts, visual aids, etc.

The use of teaching aids has been promoted in schools, however, it is recommended that teachers are provided periodic training and updates the learning material as per the students to make education more adaptable to the students. As reported by Illam Thedi Kalvi project, the volunteers have been creative in making the teaching-learning materials and that has improved the engagement of the students. A committee can be formed to assess the implementation of teaching methodologies and continuous reporting on the online portal on creating and using teaching aids will help to track the quality of teaching.

Promote online mode of education and improve infrastructure to support online learning; thus making education more accessible and adaptable to the current technological era.

In the current study, students from Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, and Kerala have reported a lower the ability of the school to adapt online education. Only 18 - 35% of the students have reported that the online mode of education is adaptable by the school. This is in line with the national reports, a survey by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in 2020, only 27% of Indian schools had the infrastructure and resources to support online learning.

Considering the current technological era, where mobile phones and the internet have become more available, accessible, adaptable and acceptable; it is the need of the hour to leverage technology to make education more available, accessible, adaptable and acceptable. Some programs have shown evidence of how technology can improve learning engagement. It is recommended that an assessment is done to understand the adaptability of the online mode of education by the school and ensure the necessary infrastructure is set up in the school. It is also recommended that an online learning management system for higher classes can be set up that makes the students to access the content as needed. This improves the overall learning engagement among the students and inculcates the behaviours of continuous learning.

Ensure 21st-century skill development (especially in STEM) is included in the school curriculum so that the younger generation is skilled enough to choose the new-age jobs

In the current study, only 21% - 73% of the students have reported that skill education is provided at the school. A report by the National Institution for Transforming India (NITI Aayog) emphasized the need for a shift in the education system's focus from rote learning to skill development. The report recommended that the high school curriculum should be revised to include skill-based training programs that focus on problem-solving, critical thinking, and entrepreneurship.

Considering the changes in industry trends, school education needs to prepare students for the future jobs. It is recommended that teachers are capacitated to deliver 21-st century skill development among the students. Organizations or institutions specialized in 21-st century skill education and STEM education can be onboarded to develop a learning framework and modules that can be delivered by the teachers. Making children better at decision-making, problem-solving, and critical thinking and also teaching them Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics concepts at an early age will help them to become career-ready.

Review the teaching methodologies and assessment frameworks implementation suggested under Right To Education (RTE) act to ensure the overall quality of education in improving

In the qualitative study, only Telangana and Andhra Pradesh reported using the Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) framework of assessment, while the other states didn't report on the CCE. In the states that reported on CCE, there is strong opposition to the assessment framework from senior teachers (by age not by position). The learning methods as per the teachers should be just listening to the classes, reading the back of the textbook questions and writing exams; whereas CCE focuses on the ability of the student to correlate the concept to real-life situations.

It is recommended that teacher training is strengthened to capacitate the teachers on the new frameworks. An assessment of the implementation of the framework can be done in the district. To ensure that the RTE Act is implemented effectively, there is a need to establish mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. This can be achieved by setting up independent bodies to monitor the implementation of the Act at the state and district levels.

MINISTRY OF WOMEN & CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Improve sanitation facilities in the school by ensuring there are more usable toilets, especially for girls

According to the ASER report 2022, the fraction of schools with usable girls' toilets increased from 66.4% in 2018 to 68.4% in 2022. In the current study, in states like Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Telangana between 0 - 60% students only reported that the toilet's basic hygiene (i.e. toilets with running water, taps, buckets, mugs, cleanliness - that makes the toilet usable) is good. In Andhra Pradesh, between 95 - 98% of the government school students have reported that basic hygiene is good. This has been possible by Andhra Pradesh state through the Nadu-Nedu program, which aims to transform government schools into vibrant and attractive learning spaces. The program focuses on improving the infrastructure, facilities, and amenities in schools, including providing clean drinking water, toilets, and playgrounds.

There is research evidence indicating that the provision of separate toilets for girls in schools led to a significant increase in their enrollment rates. Therefore, it is recommended that steps are taken towards making the toilets more usable. The school management committees can take charge to review the current usability level of the girls' toilets and report the same to the state government. The government through existing provisions can take lead in rebuilding the toilets and the local government can be

involved in the implementation process. A committee can be formed by the government to review the status of usable toilets in private schools and necessary instructions are provided as mandates to the schools to improve their sanitation levels.

Create awareness of bullying among the students, teachers and parents; ensure a grievance policy is in place to handle bullying in the school

In the current study, students have reported that there is bullying in the school based on looks. On a scale of 1 - 10, government school students from Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu agreed between 4 - 8 that they are bullied in the school, while Telangana and Kerala government school students agreed between 2 - 4. A similar trend has been seen in private schools as well. Girls who experienced bullying and social rejection were more likely to drop out of school, have lower levels of self-esteem, and exhibit risky behaviour.

It is recommended to bring in policies against bullying in the school, train students on the code of conduct (discipline) to be followed, and train teachers to train these students on sensitive topics like this. To create awareness among students, teachers and parents on bullying schools can use ICT materials. Also, a grievance mechanism needs to be brought in so that students who face bullying file a complaint and get the issue addressed. It is also very important that the school management committee takes lead on this, has meetings with students, especially girls and also clears the grievances within the stipulated time. Within the school management committee, a separate discipline committee can be formed to address these issues. It has been evident from this study data that having such committees will reduce bullying. For example, Kerala has such committees and students reported lower bullying in the school.

The school becomes a safe place for the girl by ensuring that bullying is not present at the school. This makes the students feel accepted and have better self-esteem. On other hand, as students group up they stand against such practices making a better society.

Promote and implement peer mentoring in the schools to improve students emotional and school well-being.

In the study, Girls have reported that they feel lonely in school. On a scale of 1-10, Students from Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu have agreed between 4 - 7 to the statement that they feel lonely. Several studies have shown that social acceptance by peers has a significant impact on the educational outcomes of girls. Girls who are accepted by their peers are more likely to attend school regularly.

It is recommended that a peer mentoring program where higher class students (9th & 10th standard) mentor the lower class students (7th & 8th standard). The higher-class students can support the lower-class students with respect to their academics and well-being. This will create a support system for the students and they can reach out on any issues that they face with school the seniors and get a first-level perspective from them. The higher-class students can be provided with simple notes and materials that capacitate them on how to support the juniors. This improves the interpersonal skills and empathy-driven communication in the higher class students.

Develop and promote extracurricular activities and clubs that empower girls and build their leadership skills.

In the current study, we have observed that girl children's participation in extracurricular activities needs to be encouraged. The need for prospects of leadership and personal growth needs is seen due to the lack of sensitisation of its importance. It was observed that nearly 70% of students lack an understanding of the necessary skills for personal growth. This gap can be overcome by creating extracurricular activities and organizations that are expressly designed to empower girls and develop their leadership abilities in school settings.

It is recommended to prioritize the development and promotion of extracurricular activities and clubs in school settings that specifically empower girls and foster their leadership skills. By creating a supportive framework and collaborating with educational institutions, we can integrate these activities into the school curriculum. Adequate funding and resources should be allocated to ensure accessibility for girls from all socioeconomic backgrounds. Training programs and capacity-building initiatives should be organized for teachers and mentors to effectively guide and support girls in these activities. Collaboration with NGOs and civil society organizations will bring valuable expertise and help design impactful programs. Additionally, launching national awareness campaigns will raise awareness about the importance of these activities in empowering girls and building their leadership abilities. Through these efforts, we can create an inclusive educational environment that enables girls to thrive and contribute to the development of our nation.

STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Monitor and review the 25% free seat allocation in private schools to students from low-income families under the Right To Education (RTE) Act

In the current study, we have observed that 88% - 100% of the students are not aware of the 25% free seat allocation in private schools to students from low-income families. Through the qualitative study, it has been understood that private schools do not strictly follow the 25% seat allocation. One of the primary concerns regarding the 25% reservation in private schools is related to the financial burden on private schools. The reimbursement of fees by the government to these schools is often delayed, leading to a financial burden on the schools.

It is recommended that a proper monitoring mechanism is in place to review the 25% reservation in private schools. A committee can be formed at the district level, to conduct this review and the committee should suggest recommendations to the school to implement the same. The reimbursement process can be strengthened to motivate and encourage private schools to practice the 25% seat allocation. This will make education more available and accessible to the girl students from low-income families.

Create awareness among students and parents on the Right To Education Act and available provisions so that education is availed by the community as a right than as a service

From the quantitative study, it has been understood that only 16 - 33% of the students were aware of the Right To Education Act. In the qualitative study, we observed that teachers and school committees are not aware of RTE and the available provision under it.

It is recommended that awareness programs can be conducted by the nodal office and district officer in the schools for the students and teachers. Relevant ICT material can be created and circulated to all the teachers, students and parents. To ensure that the RTE Act is implemented effectively, there is a need to involve parents, teachers, and community members in the process. This can be achieved by establishing school management committees that include representatives from the community. Improved awareness among the community will encourage parents and students to access education as their right rather than a service.

Implement gender-sensitive teacher training programs to address gender biases and stereotypes in the classroom.

The current study shows that the presence of discrimination in any form will lead to dropouts and decrease enrollment in schools. Especially for the girl students, this can become another layer of a hurdle to accessing education. Culturally, the concept of discrimination on gender and caste is deeply rooted in us and at times, unknowingly teachers can make statements or exhibit their behavior displaying favoritism towards gender or caste. It is recommended that sensitization programs are conducted for the teachers on sensitive topics like gender and caste. The training should include more practical and day-to-day references where we practice gender discrimination and caste discrimination unknowingly. It can also suggest a set of pointers on how to engage in conversation on topics like gender and caste. Teachers can be provided with do's and don'ts in their behaviour or teaching practice to avoid any display of discrimination. As mentioned, this makes the schools more inclusive and makes the children feel safe in the school, thus improving the school enrollment rate.

Encourage community-based initiatives to address cultural and social barriers to girl child education.

It is critical to recognise the cultural and societal challenges that continue to exist, impeding the full realization of girls' access to education. To address these issues, it is critical to support community-based activities aimed at removing cultural and social obstacles. Collaboration with local community leaders, organizations, and parents may be used to promote awareness about the significance of female child education and to fight negative conventions and practices that limit girls' access to school. We can provide chances for debate, refute stereotypes, and promote gender equality in education by cultivating a supportive community climate. Furthermore, collaborating with community stakeholders can help in the development of culturally relevant and contextually appropriate interventions, ensuring that girls receive the necessary support and motivation to overcome hurdles and continue their education.

Establish and promote scholarship programs for girls, especially in STEM fields, to encourage higher education and career opportunities.

One of the most reported skill development requirements by the students in this study is to get training in computers, coding, engineering and science. It is recommended to establish and promote scholarship programs specifically designed for girls, with a particular focus on STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics). These scholarship programs can provide financial support to girls, enabling them to pursue higher education and explore career paths in traditionally male-dominated fields. By encouraging girls' participation in STEM, we can bridge the gender gap, promote equal opportunities, and empower girls to become future leaders and contributors to the nation's development. Additionally, these scholarship programs should include mentoring and networking opportunities to provide guidance and support to girls throughout their educational journey and career progression. By implementing such scholarship programs, we can foster a supportive environment that recognizes and nurtures the potential of girls, ultimately leading to greater gender equality and socioeconomic growth in our states.

NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Advocate for the inclusion of human rights education in the school curriculum to foster a culture of respect and understanding.

It is recommended to develop a detailed framework for the implementation of human rights education in the school curriculum. This framework should encompass age-appropriate and gender-sensitive content that fosters a culture of respect, understanding, and empathy among students. It should emphasize the principles of equality, non-discrimination, and gender justice, while also addressing issues such as child marriage, gender-based violence, and barriers to education faced by girls. The framework should ensure that human rights education is integrated across various subjects, promoting a holistic understanding of human rights principles and their practical application in everyday life. Additionally, it is crucial to provide training and capacity building for teachers to effectively deliver human rights education in the classroom. By advocating for the inclusion of human rights education in the school curriculum, we can empower girls with the knowledge and awareness of their rights, promote gender equality, and foster a more inclusive and equitable society.

Monitor the implementation of RTE Act provisions and ensure that the rights of girl children are protected and promoted.

Despite the legal provisions in place, there are still challenges in the effective implementation of the RTE Act, particularly in relation to the rights of girl children. To address this, it is crucial to establish a robust monitoring framework that actively tracks and assesses the implementation of RTE Act provisions specifically targeted towards the education of girls. This framework should include regular inspections, evaluations, and reporting mechanisms to identify gaps, challenges, and instances of discrimination or violation of rights. Additionally, it is essential to collaborate with relevant stakeholders, such as educational institutions, civil society organizations, and communities, to enhance transparency and accountability in the implementation process. By actively monitoring the implementation of RTE Act provisions and ensuring the protection and promotion of the rights of girl

children, we can create an environment that enables them to access quality education, overcome barriers, and thrive in their educational journey.

Encourage research and data collection on the status of girl child education in India to inform policy-making and track progress.

It is recommended to establish partnerships with educational institutions, research organizations, and relevant stakeholders to conduct thorough research studies and data collection exercises. This framework should include the development of standardized data collection methodologies, the establishment of a centralized database, and the periodic publication of research reports and findings. Moreover, it is essential to ensure the accessibility and dissemination of this data to policymakers, educators, and civil society organizations to inform evidence-based policy-making and track progress in promoting girl child education. By encouraging research and data collection, we can gain valuable insights, identify trends, and design

CONCLUSION

This research report analysed the existing situation of girl-child education in India and made recommendations based on Katarina Tomaevski's 4-A framework. The research identified a number of issues that need to be addressed, including the availability of high schools and higher secondary schools, transportation, school building infrastructure, disability inclusion, methods of teaching, online education, and 21st-century skill development. According to the results and suggestions, there are substantial gaps and problems in providing a quality education for girl children in the aspirational districts.

One of the study's significant results was the inadequate number of high schools, particularly in aspirational districts. The lack of educational opportunities contributes to greater dropout rates following primary education. The study advises undertaking extensive assessments of student strengths in each district and developing high school facilities inside communities to solve this. Extending current elementary schools to incorporate high school facilities will also assist alleviate the shortage. Efforts should also be made to enhance the availability of upper secondary schools so that females can finish their education till the 11th and 12th grades. Creating model schools and encouraging private schools to follow suit will improve higher secondary school possibilities for girl students.

Transport facilities have arisen as a key concern, particularly for government institutions. Inadequate transit alternatives endanger children's safety and discourage parents from taking their children to school. To address this issue, authorities should fund specialised buses for school transportation to ensure safe and comfortable travel for children. Taking some inspiration from successful efforts such as Kerala's "Gothra Saradhi" programme, integrating local governments in providing transport facilities can significantly boost student attendance and accessibility.

Disparities in school infrastructure, particularly between government and private schools, were also noticeable. States must evaluate and implement rules on school building infrastructure, with a focus on private schools, in order to establish an ideal learning environment. Taking cues from programmes like Andhra Pradesh's "Nadu-Nedu," states like Tamil Nadu, Telangana, and Kerala may focus on school

renovations and infrastructural improvements. Involving local committees made up of government officials, teachers, and parents can help to improve the assessment process and provide recommendations for infrastructure upgrades.

The study emphasised the need to include students with disabilities in the educational system. There is currently a lack of emphasis on making existing schools more inclusive of disabled students. The research suggests undertaking an evaluation of disabled-friendly infrastructure in districts and requiring the inclusion of such amenities in schools. Rather than constructing new schools, efforts should be made to make current ones more accessible. This strategy will increase the number of impaired students enrolled and promote inclusive education.

Effective teaching-learning practises were discovered to differ amongst teachers. The relevance of utilising teaching aids to promote student engagement and learning outcomes was emphasised in the study. To improve teaching practises, the research advises providing teachers with periodic training on using teaching aids and customising instruction to student's needs. Creating a committee to analyse teaching approaches and offering ongoing assistance via an online portal can help monitor and enhance teaching quality. The study also indicated that online education had limited flexibility, with just a small fraction of students indicating good implementation. To solve this, schools should examine their readiness for online education and ensure that the essential infrastructure is in place. Creating an online learning management system for higher classes can improve accessibility and adaptability, making education more accessible.

In conclusion, while this project report emphasises various recommendations to promote girl child education, considerable gaps and challenges remain. More study is needed to assess the long-term impact of the suggested interventions and to develop new techniques for improving the quality and accessibility of education for girls. Future research should also look at intensive and exclusive studies on the social and cultural challenges that prevent girls from attending school, as well as the role of community involvement in supporting girls' education.

REFERENCES

1. Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) 2019, Pratham,
https://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/ASER%20Reports/ASER%202019/ASER_2019.pdf
2. Report of the High-Level Group on Education for All, Government of India, 2011,
https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/EFA%20REPORT.pdf
3. Barriers to Education in India,” India Today, 2020, <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/featurephilia/story/barriers-to-education-in-india-1684208-2020-06-18>
4. UNESCO Bangkok. (2017). A framework for quality education. Retrieved from
<https://bangkok.unesco.org/content/framework-quality-education>
5. The Hindu. (2022). Aspirational Districts Programme yielding positive results: PM. Retrieved from
<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/aspirational-districts-programme-yielding-positive-results-pm/article38162025.ece>
6. UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/>
7. World Bank. (2020). Poverty and Shared Prosperity. Retrieved from
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-poverty-education-and-g>
8. NITI Aayog. (2021). Aspirational Districts Dashboard 2020-21. Retrieved from
https://niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2021-07/Aspirational_Districts_Dashboard_2020-21_0.pdf
9. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2018). Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan. Retrieved from
<https://samagra.mhrd.gov.in/>
10. "Gender Parity and Inequality in Education: A Review of the Literature" by Yasmine Belkaid and Elizabeth King: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042816301748>
11. "Education for All and Gender Equality: Progress and Challenges" by UNESCO:
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000254209>
12. "Gender Equality and Education: An Overview of the Evidence on the Relationship between Gender Equality in Education and Economic Growth" by the Brookings Institution:

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/gender-equality-and-education-an-overview-of-the-evidence-on-the-relationship-between-gender-equality-in-education-and-economic-growth/>

13. United Nations Girls' Education Initiative. (n.d.). About UNGEI. Retrieved from <https://www.ungei.org/about-ungei>
14. Malala Fund. (n.d.). Our work. Retrieved from <https://malala.org/our-work>
15. "Accessible India Campaign." Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. <http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/content/page/accessible-india-campaign.php>
16. "Guidelines for a Barrier Free Built Environment for Persons with Disabilities." Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/Barrier_Free_Environment_Guidelines.pdf
17. "Classroom Design and Learning: How Classroom Design Affects Student Engagement and Learning Outcomes." OpenEd.com. <https://www.openedu.com/classroom-design-and-learning-how-classroom-design-affects-student-engagement-and-learning-outcomes/>
18. UNICEF (2016). Gender Discrimination in Education: The Violation of Rights of Women and Girls. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.org/education/gender-discrimination-education-violation-rights-women-and-girls>
19. Bansal, S., Agarwal, M., & Sharma, S. K. (2015). Caste Discrimination and its Impact on Girl Child Education in India. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(4), 161-167.
20. Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2021). Report on Performance of Mid-Day Meal Scheme. Government of India.
21. Center for Equity Studies. (2021). Discrimination in Mid-Day Meals: A Study in Five States
22. National Commission for Protection of Child Rights. (2016). Status of Mid Day Meal Scheme in India. Government of India.
23. UNICEF. (2013). Social acceptance and rejection: The social dynamics of education in Bangladesh. Dhaka: UNICEF.
24. Kaffenberger, M., & Pritchett, L. (2017). More than just friends? School peers and adult HIV risk in Zambia. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.

25. Kaffenberger, M., & Pritchett, L. (2017). More than just friends? School peers and adult HIV risk in Zambia. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.
26. Fentahun, N. (2014). Factors Affecting Girls' Academic Achievement in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Population Council.
27. UNESCO. (2015). Gender-based violence in schools: A global problem. Paris: UNESCO.
28. NCERT. (2015). Attitude towards learning and school: A study of Class IX students. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.
29. Jain, K., & Sunita, K. (2013). Attitude of high school students towards education. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(3), 230-234.
30. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) survey:
https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/Announcements/COVID-19/NCERT_Survey_Report.pdf
31. Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Bombay study:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344858770_A_Survey_on_Challenges_Faced_by_Schools_in_the_Implementation_of_Online_Education_During_COVID-19
32. ASER Centre survey:
<https://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/ASER%20Reports/ASER%202020/ASER%202020%20National%20Findings.pdf>
33. Tata Trusts study: <https://www.tatatrusters.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Adapting-to-Digital-Learning-Covid-19-Response-Report.pdf>
34. National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC) and KPMG India study:
[https://www.nsdcindia.org/sites/default/files/files/KPMGReport%20Skill%20Gap%20India%20\(NSDC\).pdf](https://www.nsdcindia.org/sites/default/files/files/KPMGReport%20Skill%20Gap%20India%20(NSDC).pdf)
35. National Institution for Transforming India (NITI Aayog) report:
https://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/document_publication/Three_Year_Action_Agenda.pdf
36. Sekher, T.V. (2015). Gender Attitudes among Indian Adolescents: Exploring the Influence of Schooling and Exposure to Mass Media. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(2), 212-227.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02673843.2013.833008>

37. Kumar, S., & Thomas, S. (2016). Attitudes Towards Gender Equality Among Secondary School Students in Kerala, India. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 25(4), 395-408.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09589236.2015.1126288>
38. The Supreme Court of India. (2014). National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India.
https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2013/35071/35071_2013_31_1501_22249_Judgement_15-Apr-2014.pdf
39. National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2017). Social Science Textbook for Class VIII.
<https://ncert.nic.in/textbook/pdf/essh7dd.pdf>
40. Government of India. (2009). The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009.
Retrieved from [http://righttoeducation.in/sites/default/files/Right to Education Act English.pdf](http://righttoeducation.in/sites/default/files/Right_to_Education_Act_English.pdf)
41. Ministry of Education. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Retrieved from
https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
42. Centre for Civil Society. (2013). The state of government schools in Delhi: A survey report. Retrieved from
<https://ccs.in/attachments/article/232/State%20of%20Govt%20Schools%20in%20Delhi%20Survey%20Report%20-%20Oct%202013.pdf>
43. National Sample Survey Office. (2014). Key Indicators of Social Consumption in India: Education.
Retrieved from http://mospi.nic.in/sites/default/files/publication_reports/KI_68_33_education.pdf
44. Pratham. (2018). Annual Status of Education Report. Retrieved from
<http://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/ASER%202018/ASER%202018%20National%20PPT%20Final.pdf>
45. UNESCO. (2021). Education and gender equality. Retrieved from
<https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-and-gender-equality>
46. World Bank. (2021). Girls' education. Retrieved from
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/girlseducation>
47. United Nations. (2015). Sustainable Development Goals. Retrieved from
<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>
48. National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2017). Social Science Textbook for Class VIII.
<https://ncert.nic.in/textbook/pdf/essh7dd.pdf>

49. All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) study: https://www.aicte-india.org/sites/default/files/Internship_report_Secured.pdf
50. National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) report: https://www.ncert.nic.in/pdf/publication/guidance_counselling.pdf
51. National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People (NCPEDP) study: <http://www.ncpedp.org/sites/default/files/Third%20Gender%20in%20Schools%20-%20A%20Study.pdf>
52. Saini, A., & Kaur, M. (2019). Gender Bias in Education: An Indian Perspective. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(1), 1516-1519.
53. Bhatnagar, N., & Das, S. (2020). Access to transportation and its impact on school enrolment and academic performance in rural India. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 63(2), 347-367.
54. Yadav, A., Singh, A., & Yadav, R. (2017). School bus transportation safety: A study of traffic accidents in Delhi. *International Journal of Transportation Safety and Security*, 9(2), 26-39.
55. "Classroom Infrastructure and Learning Outcomes in Rural Government Schools in India." Centre for Policy Research, India. <https://cprindia.org/news/6752>
56. "Technology in the Classroom: A Promising Future for Learning." EdTechReview. <https://edtechreview.in/trends-insights/insights/388-technology-in-the-classroom-a-promising-future-for-learning>
57. Ministry of Education. (2021). Right to Education Act. Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.in/right-education-act>
58. Annual Status of Education Report. (2020). Retrieved from <https://asercentre.org/National-Reports>
59. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. (2021). Retrieved from <https://ssam.gov.in/>
60. Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan. (2021). Retrieved from <https://rmsa.gov.in/>
61. Akshaya Patra Foundation. (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.akshayapatra.org/>
62. Amartya Sen, "The Importance of Education in Development," World Bank Education Forum, 2000, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1602431>

63. "Investment in Education Key to India's Growth," The Economic Times, 2020, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/policy/investment-in-education-key-to-indias-growth/articleshow/73146016.cms>
64. "Barriers to Education in India," India Today, 2020, <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/featurephilia/story/barriers-to-education-in-india-1684208-2020-06-18>
65. Yadav, N., & Yadav, R. (2021). School Safety Measures in India: A Review of Literature. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 6(10), 33-38.

ANNEXURES

TOOLS OF DATA COLLECTION

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FOCUSED GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE



**Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education
in the Aspirational Districts of South India**
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



Dear Potential Participant,

National Human Rights Commission, Government of India & Department of Social Work, Madras Christian College is inviting you to participate in a study on the “4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of South India (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala) - A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private schools” Knowledge gained from this study can be useful to identify factors influencing Girl Child Education and strengthen policies and formulate new policies to promote Girl Child Education. Data gathered in this study will be reported in form of a Study Report to the National Human Rights Commission & the Department of Social Work, Madras Christian College, and no identifying information will be reported. Participation will involve sharing experiences with the interviewer about Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Adaptability of the Right to Girl Child Education. There are no anticipated significant risks associated with involvement in this research. The anonymity of participants will be protected.

Your signature on this consent form will, indicate that you have read and understood the above information and that you agree to participate in the study.

Signature of

Participant Date:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE NO.

Q No	DISTRICT PROFILE							
Q1	State							
	Andhra Pradesh	1	Kerala	2	Telangana	3	Tamil Nadu	4
Q2	District							
	Visakhapatnam	1	Wayanad	4	Asifabad	5	Ramanathapuram	8
	Vizianagaram	2			Bhoopalapally	6	Virudhunagar	9
	YSR	3			Bhadradi-Kothagudem	7		
Q3	Taluk / Mandal:							
Q4	Town / Village:							

SCHOOL PROFILE							
Q5	Name of School:						
Q6	School Address:						
Q7	Postal Pin Code:						
Q8	Location of School	Rural	1	Sub Urban	2	Urban	3
		Tribal	4				
Q9	School Administration	Government	1	Government Aided	2	Private	3
Q10	Year of Inception:						
Q11	No. of Years of Functioning						
Q12	Classification of School	Secondary	1	Higher Secondary	2	Other	3
Q13	Medium of Instruction	Regional Language	1	English	2	Other	3
Q14	Student's Strength:		Q15	Teacher's Strength:			
Q16	No. of Male Students:		Q17	No. of Male Teachers:			
Q18	No. of Female Students:		Q19	No. of Female Teachers:			
Q20	Teacher-Student Ratio :	(Total no. of Students / Total no. of Teachers) : 1					
Q21	Support Staff Strength:						
Q22	Ownership of School Building	Own	1	Rented	2	Lease	3
		Government	4				
Q23	Differently abled students in your school?	Yes		1	No	2	
Q24	Infrastructure disabled student-friendly?	Yes		1	No	2	
Q25	Active School Management Committee (SMC)?	Yes		1	No	2	
Q26	National Cadet Corps	Yes		1	No	2	
Q27	National Service Scheme	Yes		1	No	2	
Q28	Student Grievance Redressal System	Yes		1	No	2	
Q29	Admission under RTE?	Yes		1	No	2	
Q30	Admission Screening Procedures	Yes		1	No	2	

STUDENT PROFILE							
Q31	Full Name*						
Q32	Class / Standard	VIII	1	IX	2	X	3
Q33	Area of Residence	Rural	1	Sub Urban	2	Urban	3
		Tribal	4				
Q34	Residential Address*						
	Street, Village / Town, Taluk/ Mandai						

Q35	Postal Pin Code:						
Q36	Are you Differently Abled?	Yes	1	No	2		
Q36a	Have you attained puberty	Yes	1	No	2		
Q37	Religion	Hindu	1	Christian	2	Muslim	3
		Sikh	4	Jain	5	Other	6
Q38	Mother Tongue	Tamil	1	Telugu	2	Malayalam	3
		Hindi	4	Kanada	5	Other	6
Q39	Caste Category	General	1	OBC	2	SC	3
		ST	4				
Q40	Name of Caste :						

	FAMILY PROFILE						
Q41	Type of Family	Nuclear	1	Joint	2	Extended	3
		Other	4				
Q42	No of Family Members	Less than 3	1	3-5	2	6-8	3
	<i>Living in same house including you</i>	Above 8	4				
Q43	No of Siblings	Single Child	1	One	2	Two	3
		Three	4	Four	5	Above Four	6
Q44	Birth Order	First Born	1	Middle Child	2	Last Born	3
Q45	Occupation of Head of the family :						
Q46	Sector of Occupation	Government	1	Private	2	Unorganised	3
Q47	Annual Income :						
Q48	Parents's Marital Status	Married	1	Separated	2	Divorced	3
		Widow / Widower	4	Other	5		
Q49	Name of Point of Contact (<i>Enter full name of Father , Mother or Guardian</i>) :						
Q50	Contact Number* :						
Q51	Ration card Category	All Commodities	1	Sugar + Commodities	2	No Commodities	3
Q52	Colour of Ration Card						

Q53	FAMILY CONSTELLATION				
Relationship with Child : 1- Father, 2- Mother, 3- Brother, 4- Sister, 5- Other Education : 1- illtrate, 2- Below10th, 3- 10th, 4- 12th, 5- Diploma, 6- UG, 7- PG, 8- Other Occupation : 1- Private, 2- Daily Wages, 3- Self Empolyed, 4- Public, 5- Unempolyed, 6- Student, 7 -NA					
S.no	Relationship with Child	Age	Education	Occupation	Monthly Income

	ACCESSIBILITY							
	SCHOOL & TRAVEL							
A80	Is your current school in the same village / town as your residence?			Yes	1	No	2	
A81	School facility in your Village Panchayat / Town to continue your higher secondary education?			Yes	1	No	2	
A82	Distance to School you plan to attend for your Higher Secondary Education.	Less than 1 KM	1	1 KM - 3 KM	2	4 KM - 6 KM	3	
		7 KM - 9 KM	4	Above 10 KM	5			
A83	Distance to School	Less than 1 KM	1	1 KM - 3 KM	2	4 KM - 6 KM	3	
		7 KM - 9 KM	4	Above 10 KM	5			
A84	Distance to nearest Boarding Point / Bus Stop from Home? (in KM)							
A85	Distance to nearest Boarding Point / Bus Stop from School? (in KM)							
A86	Does your School have its own transport facility			Yes	1	No	2	
A87	Mode of Travel to School	Walk	1	Bicycle	2	Public Bus	3	
		School Transport	4	Train	5	Auto	6	
		Share Auto	7	Dropped by Parent	8	Private Hired Vehicle	9	
If option 3,5,7 is selected, Answer Questions A88 to A91 if other options are selected Skip to A92								
A88	Frequency of Public transport	Rare	1	Sometimes	2	Often	3	
A89	Crowd in Public Transport	No Crowd	1	Less Crowded	2	Over Crowded	3	
A90	Availability of Seat in Public Transport	Never	1	Rarely	2	Sometimes	3	
		Always	4					
A91	Timing of Transport (Bus/Auto)	Unpredictable	1	Late	2	On-Time	3	
A92	Are you provided Bus Pass to travel to School?			Yes	1	No	2	
A93	Do you feel safe during your travel to and from school?			Yes	1	No	2	
A94	Sexually uncomfortable experiences in crowded transport while traveling to and from school ?			Yes	1	No	2	
A95	Are you discriminated based on your mode of travel?			Yes	1	No	2	
A96	How do you feel physically after travelling to and from school?							
A97	Travel experience during mensuration?							
	WATER & NUTRITIOUS MEAL							
A98	Does your school provide Clean Drinking Water			Yes	1	No	2	
If Yes, Answer Questions A99 If No, Skip to Question A100								
A99	What is the source of Drinking Water	Tap Water	1	RO Water	2	Water Can	3	
		Water Dispenser	4	Hand pump	5			
A100	Does your school provide tumbler/ glass to drink water ?			Yes	1	No	2	
A101	Does your school provide Mid Day Meal?			Yes	1	No	2	

	<i>If Yes, Answer Questions A102 to A113 If No, Skip to Question A114</i>						
A102	Quality of food served in school	Very Bad	1	Bad	2	Neutral	3
		Good	4	Very Good	5		
A103	Quantity of food served in school	Less	1	Ideal	2	More	3
A104	Are you provided egg during mid-day meal?			Yes	1	No	2
A105	Who serves food during mid-day meal?	Cook	1	Helpers	2	Students	3
		Teachers	4	Others Specify - 5			
A106	No. of servings of food during mid-day meal?	Only Once	1	Twice	2	Unlimited	3
A107	Who gets food served first?						
A108	Is the kitchen in hygienic condition?			Yes	1	No	2
A109	Is the food cooked hygienically?			Yes	1	No	2
A110	Is there gender discrimination in serving food?			Yes	1	No	2
A111	Is there caste discrimination in serving food?			Yes	1	No	2
A112	Is there gender discrimination in quantity food?			Yes	1	No	2
A113	Is there caste discrimination in quantity food?			Yes	1	No	2
A114	Does your school have a canteen?			Yes	1	No	2
	<i>If Yes, Answer Questions A115 to A119 If No, Skip to Question A120</i>						
A115	Do you get food (Meals) in your canteen?			Yes	1	No	2
A116	What food item do you buy the most in canteen						
A117	Is the food prepared in your canteen hygienic?			Yes	1	No	2
A118	Is the food items in your canteen affordable for all?			Yes	1	No	2
A119	What is the average cost per meal in your canteen?						

MARK ANSWERS IN CODES AS PER INSTRUCTION :						
Circle the appropriate option : 1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree						
	EQUAL ACCESS					
A120	Discrimination based on Gender	1	2	3	4	5
A121	Discrimination based on Caste	1	2	3	4	5
A122	Discrimination based on Religion	1	2	3	4	5
	EQUAL ACCESS - GENDER					
A123	My school is a safe place for a girl to study	1	2	3	4	5
A124	Girls are discriminated based on gender	1	2	3	4	5
A125	Girls play and have access to sports equipments	1	2	3	4	5
A126	Girls have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	1	2	3	4	5
A127	Girls can relate to all her classmates without discrimination	1	2	3	4	5
A128	Girls are treated well by teachers	1	2	3	4	5
A129	Girls can share problems and seek help from teachers	1	2	3	4	5

	EQUAL ACCESS - CASTE					
A130	School accepts students from all castes	1	2	3	4	5
A131	Lower caste students have access to school facilities	1	2	3	4	5
A132	Lower caste students have equal opportunity in class leadership roles	1	2	3	4	5
A133	Lower caste students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	1	2	3	4	5
A131	Lower caste students are treated well by teachers	1	2	3	4	5
A132	Lower caste students are treated well by other students	1	2	3	4	5
A134	Teachers give marks based on caste of student	1	2	3	4	5
A135	Lower caste students study well	1	2	3	4	5
A136	Lower caste students complete their school education	1	2	3	4	5
	EQUAL ACCESS - RELIGION					
A137	School accepts students from all religion	1	2	3	4	5
A138	Students can relate to all classmates without discrimination based on religion	1	2	3	4	5
A139	Students are treated well without discrimination based on religion	1	2	3	4	5
A140	Freedom to follow any religion	1	2	3	4	5
A141	Religious customs allowed (Hijab/Santoor/Cross/etc)	1	2	3	4	5
A142	Religious Tolerance among teachers	1	2	3	4	5
	EQUAL ACCESS - DIFFERENTLY ABLED					
A143	Special Attention is given to Students with Learning Difficulties	Yes	1	No	2	
A144	Does your school has Differently Abled Students?	Yes	1	No	2	
	If Yes, Answer Questions A145 to A151 If No, Skip to Question A152					
A145	Discrimination based on Disability	1	2	3	4	5
A146	Differently Abled students have access to school facilities	1	2	3	4	5
A147	Differently Abled students can relate to all classmates without discrimination	1	2	3	4	5
A148	Differently Abled students are treated well by teachers	1	2	3	4	5
A149	Differently Abled students are treated well by other students	1	2	3	4	5
A150	Differently Abled students study well	1	2	3	4	5
A151	Differently Abled students complete their school education	1	2	3	4	5

MARK ANSWERS IN CODES AS PER INSTRUCTION :						
Circle the appropriate option : 1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree						
	ACCEPTABILITY					
	ACCEPTABILITY OF SCHOOL & FRIENDS					
A152	I feel happy to study in this school	1	2	3	4	5
A153	This is how I wish a school should be	1	2	3	4	5
A154	I feel secured when in school	1	2	3	4	5
A155	My parents feel secured to send me to school	1	2	3	4	5
A156	I feel proud to study in this school	1	2	3	4	5
A157	My classmates respect me for who I am	1	2	3	4	5

A158	I feel lonely in school	1	2	3	4	5
A159	I like to go to school everyday	1	2	3	4	5
A160	I can practice my religious customs freely in school	1	2	3	4	5
A161	I can identify myself with my caste freely in school	1	2	3	4	5
A162	I can share that I am on my period to my friends	1	2	3	4	5
A163	I am bullied based on my looks	1	2	3	4	5
A164	I can talk to boys	1	2	3	4	5
QUALITY OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Teachers						
A165	My teachers take students feedback on classes	1	2	3	4	5
A166	My teachers are concerned and enquire on my wellbeing	1	2	3	4	5
A167	Concepts taught are relevant	1	2	3	4	5
A168	I accept my teachers	1	2	3	4	5
A169	My teachers inspire me	1	2	3	4	5
A170	Teachers are sensitive to girls during their mensuration days	1	2	3	4	5
A171	Concepts are explained in regional language for understanding	1	2	3	4	5
A172	Teachers are accessible to clarify doubts	1	2	3	4	5
A173	Teachers have time to support beyond class hours	1	2	3	4	5
A174	Textbooks available in regional language	1	2	3	4	5
A175	Teaching aids are used (AV, pictures, flipcharts etc)	1	2	3	4	5
A176	Teachers update academic progress to Parents	1	2	3	4	5
A177	Regular Parents - Teachers meeting is conducted	1	2	3	4	5
A178	Students have access to regular academic progress report	1	2	3	4	5
RELEVANCE OF EDUCATION - Acceptability of Girl's Education						
A179	Girls should be educated	1	2	3	4	5
A180	Girls should go to jobs after education	1	2	3	4	5
A181	Education empowers me	1	2	3	4	5
A182	Education helps develop my personality	1	2	3	4	5
A183	Education helps me learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5
A184	Education helps me become creative	1	2	3	4	5
A185	Education improves quality of life	1	2	3	4	5
A186	Education helps me face challenges in life	1	2	3	4	5

ADAPTABILITY						
GENDER EQUALITY						
A187	Are girls given equal opportunity as boys in school?		Yes		1	No 2
A188	Is the concept of gender equality adaptable in your school?		Yes		1	No 2
A189	In which type of school, gender equality is adaptable?	Same Sex Schools	1	Co-Ed School	2	Both 3
		None	4			
A190	Is having teachers of opposite gender in same sex school adaptable?		Yes		1	No 2

A191	Does adopting gender equality contribute to societal development?	Yes	1	No	2
A192	Should individuals of the third gender be accepted in schools?	Yes	1	No	2
A193	Issues faced as a girl in school				
A194	Suggestions to promote gender equality in schools				
CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY					
A195	Should the current Education system be changed?	Yes	1	No	2
A196	Do you know about New Education Policy (NEP) 2020?	Yes	1	No	2
A197	Is the current school timing adaptable?	Yes	1	No	2
A198	If No, What timing would be suitable?				
A199	Is the online mode of education adaptable?	Yes	1	No	2
A200	Is the blended mode of education adaptable?	Yes	1	No	2
A201	Do you know about the schemes for education given by your state?	Yes	1	No	2
A202	If Yes, Mention the Schemes				
A203	Is Digital classroom teaching adaptable?	Yes	1	No	2
A204	Is Skill development-based education essential?	Yes	1	No	2
A205	If Yes, Mention few Skills				
A206	Suggestions to make Education more adaptable to changing needs of society				

RTE IMPLICATIONS					
A207	Do you know about Right to Education (RTE) ?	Yes	1	No	2
A208	Is RTE enforced in your School?	Yes	1	No	2
A209	Does RTE promote Gender equality?	Yes	1	No	2
RTE Provisions (Answer based on observation or experience)					
A210	Free education till 14 years of age	Yes	1	No	2
A211	Capitation fees during admission	Yes	1	No	2
A212	Admission screening procedures	Yes	1	No	2
A213	Denial of admission	Yes	1	No	2
A214	Physical punishment	Yes	1	No	2
A215	Mental Harrasment	Yes	1	No	2
A216	25% reservation in private schools	Yes	1	No	2

AVAILABILITY			
MARK ANSWERS IN CODES AS PER INSTRUCTION :			
a) Availability : Yes - 1, No - 2			
b) Standard : Very Poor - 1, Poor - 2, Good - 3, Very Good - 4			
A NO.	AVAILABILITY	a) Y/N 1/2	b) STD 1 - 4
SAFE INFRASTRUCTURE			
A1	Safe Buildings		
A2	Proper Roofing		
A3	Proper Flooring		
A4	Electricity		
A5	Safe Switch Boards		
A6	Hand Rails for Stairs		
A7	Compound Wall		
A8	Fire Extinguisher		
A9	First Aid Box		
A10	Properly Laid Road		
A11	Speed Breaker Near the Entrance of School		
A12	School Zone Signboard on the Road		
A13	CCTV		
INFRASTRUCTURE			
A14	Classroom		
A15	Blackboard		
A16	Bench		
A17	Fan		
A18	Light		
A19	Door		
A20	Window		
A21	Ventilation		
A22	Auditorium		

A23	Kitchen		
A24	Playground		
A25	Ramps		
A26	Hand Rails		
SANITATION			
A27	Gender Specific Restrooms		
A28	Proper Flooring		
A29	Taps		
A30	Running water in taps		
A31	Doors		
A32	Latches/Lock on doors		
A33	Windows with privacy blinds		
A34	Exhaust fan		
A35	Lights		
A36	Buckets		
A37	Jugs		
A38	Mensural Pads		
A39	Pad Dispenser		
A40	Pad Incinerator		
A41	Pad Disposal bin		
A42	Wash basin		
A43	Mirror		
A44	Toilet Cleaning Staff		
A45	Wash area with taps		
A46	Privacy wall in front of restrooms		
A47	Girls lounge		
ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE			
A48	Biology Lab		
A49	Biological Specimens		
A50	Physics Lab		
A51	Physics Instruments		
A52	Chemistry Lab		

A53	Chemicals & Equipments		
A54	Sports Equipments		
A55	Library		
A56	Computer Lab		
A57	Computers		
A58	Projector		
A59	Smart Classroom		
ACADEMIC RESOURCES			
A60	Textbooks		
A61	Notebooks		
A62	Uniform		
A63	Stationary		
A64	Bag		
A65	Scholarship		
A66	Extra Tution		
A67	Bicycle		
A68	Device for Online Learning		
A69	Internet Access for Online Learning		
A70	Extra Curricular Activities		
TEACHERS & STAFF			
A71	Teacher for your Class		
A72	Teacher for each subject		
A73	Male Teachers		
A74	Female Teachers		
A75	Physical Education Teacher		
A76	School Counsellor		
A77	Kitchen Staff / Cook		
A78	Security		
A79	Janitor / Cleaning Staff		

Date:

Signature of Interviewer



**Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education
in the Aspirational Districts of South India**
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PARTICIPATION CONSENT

State		District			
Taluk		Village			
Date		Day		Time	
Venue					

S.No	Participant Name	Representation	Signature

Facilitator:

Moderator:



**Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education
in the Aspirational Districts of South India**
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

General Introduction:

Good morning/afternoon, my/our name is/are _____. We are deputed by the National Human Rights Commission, Government of India to conduct this study on 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of South India - A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools

We are here to know your opinions and views of Girl Child Education in your District to bring out the current status of girl child education in line with the 4A's (Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Adaptability) Framework which will project a comprehensive overview on the critical human rights dimensions in education.

The information provided will be used by the National Human Rights Commission & Department of Social Work, Madras Christian College to assess, and report the status of girl child education in the Aspirational Districts and to identify gaps in policies and their implementation, and to come out with actionable recommendations on the existing education policies for the promotion of the right to girl child education

- Participation in this discussion is free and there is no obligation to respond, you can stop at any point.
- No personal data will be shared with others and the information provided will be analysed anonymously and used confidentially.
- Your views are valuable and important and will contribute to ensuring the effort to improve the status of Girl Child Education and policy evaluation.

Our group discussion will last around 30-40 minutes.

Do you have any questions? Are you willing to participate in the group?

Consent:

Do you provide consent to document, use, store and share the information provided for reporting and communication purposes?



Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of South India

(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)

A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Availability of resources for the education of girl children.

1.1 What steps are taken for the availability of,

- Safe infrastructure? (Stairs, safety rail, first aid, CCTV & fire extinguisher)
- Academic resources? (Classroom, Textbook, Labs, Scholarship)
- Safe transport and Sanitation? (Toilet facilities, water availability and sanitary pad dispenser and disposal)

2. Measures are taken to increase the accessibility of girl child education

2.1 Average distance that most students travel from? (Distance, bus pass and bus availability, train pass),

- Mode of transport (Bus availability, Autos, Private Vehicle)

2.3 What are the hindrance to the accessibility of education?

- Cultural practices - Caste, religion, early marriage, parents' education- lack of awareness)
- What are the measures taken to avoid this hindrance?

2.5 What can we do to have an Inclusive education

(Disability, Special classes, for slow learners and students with learning difficulties)

2.6 Nutritious-Meal (Improved Nutrition? Quality mid-day meals /lunch?)

3. Acceptability of education among girl children through the quality and relevance

3.1 What is the standard of the education system?

- Is it relevant with the current industrial & economic situation?
- Does the education system promote gender equality?

3.4 What are the outcome of education and the difference seen in the students? (Life skill, critical thinking, self determination, awareness about Rights)

4 Adaptability of the existing educational system for girl children

4.1 What are the changing needs of society

- Girls child exposure & empowerment
- Expectations from a student finishing schooling?
- Digital literacy & Skill based learning?
- Career Guidance for higher education?

4.2 What is your perspective on the implementation of the National Education Policy 2020?

4.3 What was the role of school administration to adapt to the online education system? (Online, digital classroom, smart classroom)

5. Right to Education Act

5.1 Is RTE act still needed?

- What kind of changes can we bring into the act?
- What are the steps you have taken to make people aware of free and compulsory education?
- How do you ensure admission, attendance and completion of primary education?

5.4 How does RTE influences the rights and education of girl students?

5.5 How well are the schools maintained according to the standard given by the RTE?

6. School Developmental functioning

6.1 How supportive is Local governance/SMC in the functioning of school

- What is the frequency of PTA/SMC meetings
- What are the measures taken to promote girl's education in your area?

6.3 What are the steps taken to remove socio-economic disability barriers, and gender barriers?

- How does the grievance redressal system in your school work?

6.6 Is there Public Private Partnership (PPP) in school development (For Government Schools)

6. Gaps in policies and recommendations

6.1 What are the various policies in place to promote education?

6.2 What are the gaps in the existing educational policies, special focus to girl child?

6.3 What are your recommendations or suggestions for the promotion of the right to girl child education.

7. Education Programmes of the Government

7.1 What is your opinion on freebies given to Government school students? (Bicycles, Laptops, etc.,)

7.2 What are the programmes initiated by the

- Union Government to improve education? (Beti Bacho, Beti Padoos etc)
- State Government to improve education? (Illam Thedi Kalvi, etc)
- Will these schemes help improve the enrolment ratio and continued education?

8. Suggestion & Grievances

8.1 What are your grievances or suggestion for effective school administration & support from the District education office?



**Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education
in the Aspirational Districts of South India**
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW CONSENT

General Introduction:

Good morning/afternoon, my/our name is/are _____. We are deputed by the National Human Rights Commission, Government of India to conduct this study on 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education in the Aspirational Districts of South India - A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools

We are here to know your opinions and views of Girl Child Education in your District to bring out the current status of girl child education in line with the 4A's (Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Adaptability) Framework which will project a comprehensive overview on the critical human rights dimensions in education. The information provided will be used by the National Human Rights Commission & Department of Social Work, Madras Christian College to assess, and report the status of girl child education in the Aspirational Districts and to identify gaps in policies and their implementation, and to come out with actionable recommendations on the existing education policies for the promotion of the right to girl child education

- Participation in this interview is free and there is no obligation to respond, you can stop at any point.
- No personal data will be shared with others and the information provided will be analysed anonymously and used confidentially.
- Your views are valuable and important and will contribute to ensuring the effort to improve the status of Girl Child Education and policy evaluation.
- Our interview will last around 20-30 minutes.

Consent:

Do you provide consent to document, use, store and share the information provided for reporting and communication purposes?

Name:

Signature:

Date:



**Study on the 4A's Framework in Right to Girl Child Education
in the Aspirational Districts of South India**
(Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu and Kerala)
A Comparative Analysis of Government and Private Schools



IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What is the District Education Office's role & functions in ensuring Girl Child Education?
2. What is the Gross Enrolment Ratio?
3. Drop-out Ratio?
4. What are the Education Schemes and Programmes implemented in your District?
5. What is the frequency of visits to schools by the DEO Office?
6. How can schools be upgraded to promote girl child education?
7. What are the steps taken to provide a gender discrimination-free environment?
8. Discrimination based on Caste, Gender, Religion, Disability
9. What are the measures taken for inclusive education (Differently-abled) in schools in your district?
10. What are the measures taken for transportation for schools in the remote villages for the student's accessibility to the school?
 - Timings, Overcrowded routes (in public transport), Safety, Sexual misconduct
11. Are adolescent girl children educated on Mensural Hygiene?
 - Availability of Sanitary pads, Dispenser, Hygienic Disposal
12. What level of support do Mid-Day Meals ensure continued education? *(Not Applicable Nor for Pvt School)*
13. What are there any specific steps taken to improve the Aspirational District status?
14. What are the various policies educational programmes & schemes implemented in your district?
15. What are the gaps in the policies and their implementation, specific to girl's child education?
16. What are the remedial steps taken to overcome the gaps?
17. How are the girl children adapting to the existing education system and with the changing needs of society?
18. What steps are being taken to ensure quality education on par with private schools? *(Not Applicable Nor for Pvt School)*
19. Do you use Public Private Partnership (PPP) for school infrastructure development & maintenance? *(Not Applicable Nor for Pvt School)*
20. Role of Niti Aayog in improving the quality of education in Aspirational districts

Name:

Signature of Interviewer:

Date: