

## Area Planning with Reference to Educational Needs

SUCCESS in any planning effort lies in identifying the available resources and exploiting them to the maximum good of the community. The resources may be men or material. In India, man-power resources are abundant. Any planner would, therefore, be interested in measuring and improving the quality of the man-power. Such an improvement can be brought about by ensuring certain educational attainment of persons, since this sharpens human skills. The study of data on literacy and educational level is, therefore, of great importance for planning.

Information on literacy and educational level has been collected in censuses of India traditionally. According to the census a person who can both read and write with understanding in any language is literate. In the 1971 census also two questions, the first on literacy and the second on educational level of the literate, were canvassed.

In an earlier paper\*, the analysis of literacy data brought out the following conclusions:

1. While literacy has grown during 1961-71 the absolute number of illiterates in the population has continued to rise.
2. The rate of increase in literacy during the decade 1961-71 was less than that of the decade 1951-61.

---

\*Presented at the National meeting of Experts on Population Dynamics and Education held at New Delhi on 28-31 October 1974.

3. The decade witnessed relatively greater improvement in female literacy.
4. Literates without educational level constituted a large proportion. If only those who have completed 'primary and above\*' are considered as literate, the literacy rates are very low.
5. The spread of literacy seems to be faster in the states where it was high in 1961. This seems to be true also when the rates are considered for districts.
6. Despite the special measures the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes seem to lag behind the general population. Female literacy in particular is very low in these groups.
7. Most of the districts where illiteracy is high form contiguous blocks. It was suggested that if significant improvement is to be brought about in literacy level, concerted efforts should be made in the more backward areas.

In the present paper some further analysis of the data has been undertaken. Specifically the reliability of census data on literacy, and the literacy of general population vis-a-vis S. C./S. T. population have been examined in greater detail. This study is confined to rural areas only in view of the need for larger efforts there. We examine whether the group 'literacy without educational level' occurs at all places and if so, what is its incidence. Similarly, we identify the areas where the gap in literacy rate between the general population and S. C./S. T. is still high.

The second part of the study is confined to districts where female literacy rate is low (less than 5% and between 5% and 10%). In these districts the availability of schools has been examined on the basis of the data contained in the District Census Handbook (DCH). Since the DCH amenities table does not readily give the population figures of the village it is not possible to classify these villages by size of population. There is no doubt that such an analysis would throw more light on the feasibility of providing schools in such areas.

#### **Literates and their Proportion without Educational Level**

At the national level about 13.88% of males and 7.4% of females *do not* have any recognised educational level, though they are Literate- If only **pr**

mary level and above are considered to be literate then the literacy rate will be only 19.7% and 45.9% for males in rural and urban areas, against the literacy rate of 33.8% and 61.9% for males. The corresponding percentages for females will be 6.8% and 28.4% as against the literacy rate of 13.2 and 42.1. Table 1 shows similar figures for each state of India. It is seen that the

TABLE 1—'LITERATE' AND LITERATE WITHOUT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BY STATES PER 1000 POPULATION

State	R U	Total literate		Literate without educational level		Literates of minimum elementary standard	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
India	R	338	132	114	52	224	80
	U	613	421	154	136	459	285
Andhra Pradesh	R	273	109	69	33	204	76
	U	573	363	152	133	421	230
Assam	R	343	165	96	57	247	108
	U	645	509	113	117	537	392
Bihar	R	276	64	104	33	172	31
	U	554	319	148	125	406	194
Gujarat	R	389	172	218	115	171	57
	U	640	448	230	198	410	250
Haryana	R	326	92	102	33	224	59
	U	591	415	154	132	459	283
Himachal Pradesh	R	412	181	186	91	226	90
	U	668	522	142	143	526	379
Jammu and Kashmir	R	222	50	67	21	155	29
	U	466	284	83	66	383	218
Kerala	R	656	531	205	177	451	354
	U	720	606	167	158	553	448
Madhya Pradesh	R	270	61	121	33	149	28
	U	605	370	212	167	393	203

Table 1 (contd. on page 246)

Table 1 (contd. from page 245)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Maharashtra	R	432	178	150	81	282	97
	U	669	473	133	124	536	349
Manipur	R	430	164	196	89	234	75
	U	658	404	194	152	464	252
Meghalaya	R	277	189	96	82	181	107
	U	699	597	102	127	597	470
Mysore	R	354	145	55	27	299	118
	U	604	416	119	107	485	309
Nagaland	R	305	164	94	69	211	95
	U	661	495	215	224	446	271
Orissa	R	361	121	53	17	308	104
	U	599	360	195	161	404	199
Punjab	R	347	199	121	72	226	127
	U	586	454	141	126	445	313
Rajasthan	R	229	40	121	24	108	16
	U	555	297	178	123	377	174
Sikkim	R	221	65	82	32	139	33
	U	535	354	175	143	360	211
Tamil Nadu	R	451	190	186	90	265	100
	U	668	454	176	153	492	301
Tripura	R	364	173	2	1	362	172
	U	724	550	177	182	547	368
Uttar Pradesh	R	280	70	83	25	255	45
	U	521	333	150	123	371	210
West Bengal	R	358	150	117	60	241	90
	U	620	478	108	115	512	363

percentage of literates without educational level varies from 0.2% in Tripura to 21.8% in Gujarat for rural males. Except Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, the figures are higher

for urban males than for rural males. For females, only in Kerala the rural figures are higher than the urban.

When the states are ranked as in Table 2, by literacy rates and by literates of minimum elementary standard, i.e. excluding literate without educational level, a different picture emerges. In rural areas, Kerala retains its lead over other states. Rajasthan retains its last position. Significant changes occur in the position in Gujarat (Rural), Himachal Pradesh (Rural), Karnataka (Rural), Uttar Pradesh (Rural males). Gujarat with a male literacy (rural) of 38.9% ranks sixth and Bihar with a rate of 27.6% for males, ranks seventeenth. In particular, it is interesting to note that if only literates with at least elementary level are considered the rates of 17.3% for Bihar and 17.1% for Gujarat are so close. Similarly, Uttar Pradesh which is ranked fifteenth moves upto the seventh rank; Bihar, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim and West Bengal more or less retain their ranks. Karnataka improves its position considerably. In urban areas both Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh lose their positions.

Table 3 shows the distribution of districts by literacy rate and percentage-literate without educational level. (The rural areas of Tripura, Meghalaya and the union territories have been excluded.) The table brings out clearly the rural-urban differentials as well as male-female differentials. In urban areas none of the districts has male literacy below 30%, the level close to the all-India literacy rate for persons. In rural areas 145 out of 331 districts have male literacy below 30%. In 45 of the 332 districts urban literacy rate for females is below 30%. In rural areas only 13 of the 331 districts have female literacy rates above 30%. More than 50% of the districts have female literacy rates below 10%.

Percentage literate without educational level also presents an interesting picture. In a large number of districts 10 to 14 percent of persons are without educational level. Large proportions without educational level are found in urban areas. This may be due to the migration of the marginally educated rural folk to urban areas or adult education drive; it may be also due to the psychological fact that in an area of higher literacy one would like to report oneself as literate. This calls for probing enquiries, which may also apply literacy tests of 'literate without educational level'. It is also notable that even in areas where literacy is very low substantial proportion are reported as without educational level.

TABLE 2—STATES RANKED BY LITERACY RATES AND BY LITERACY AT MINIMUM EDUCATIONAL STANDARD

State	Rural				Urban			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Rank when literacy rate is considered	Rank when minimum educational standard is considered	Rank when literacy rate is considered	Rank when minimum educational standard is considered	Rank when literacy rate is considered	Rank when minimum educational standard is considered	Rank when literacy rate is considered	Rank when minimum educational standard is considered
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Andhra Pradesh	18	14	15	13	17	14	15	15
Assam	12	8	9	5	9	4	5	3
Bihar	17	16	19	19	19	16	19	21
Gujarat	6	17	8	16	10	15	10	14
Haryana	13	12	16	15	15	11	12	11
Himachal Pradesh	5	11	5	11	5	7	4	4
Jammu and Kashmir	21	18	21	20	22	19	21	16
Karnataka	10	4	13	4	13	9	11	9
Kerala	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Madhya Pradesh	19	19	20	21	12	18	14	19
Maharashtra	3	5	6	9	4	5	8	7
Manipur	4	10	10	14	8	10	13	13
Meghalaya	16	15	4	6	3	1	2	1
Nagaland	14	13	11	10	7	12	6	12
Orissa	8	3	14	7	14	17	16	20
Punjab	1	11	2	3	16	13	9	8
Rajasthan	20	21	22	22	18	20	20	22
Sikkim	22	20	18	18	20	22	17	17
Tamil Nadu	2	6	3	8	6	8	9	10
Tripura	7	2	7	2	1	3	3	5
Uttar Pradesh	15	7	17	17	21	21	18	18
West Bengal	9	9	12	12	11	6	7	6

**TABLE 3—DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS BY LITERACY RATE AND BY PERCENTAGE LITERATE WITH EDUCATIONAL LEVEL**

Literacy rate		Percentage literate without educational level											
		0-4		5-9		10-14		15-19		20+		Total	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0-4	R	62										62	
	U												
5-9	R	102		1	16							1	118
	U												
10-14	R	1	18	3	28	3						4	49
	U												
15-19	R	3	6	11	34	9	5					23	45
	U	2				3						5	
20-24	R	10	6	23	7	18	13	1	2			52	28
	U			4		6						10	
25-29	R	8	1	21	2	31	12	5	1			65	16
	U			3		26		1				30	
30+	R	20		15	1	54	2	51	7	46	3	186	13
	U			7	12	115	160	137	93	73	22	332	287
Total	R	42	195	74	88	112	35	57	10	46	3	331	331*
	U	2		7	19	115	195	137	94	73	22	332	332*

Excludes districts of Tripura and Meghalaya.

### Literacy of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes

The literacy rates for S.C./S.T. are lower than that of the general population, though there has been over time some improvement in their literacy rates. To examine this further, the percentage difference in literacy rate ( $100 \times \text{literate rate for general population minus literacy rate for S. C. or S. T. divided by the literacy rate for general population}$ ) has been worked out. This has been termed as index of difference. This index is 0 when both are equal and 100 when the literacy rate of S.C./S.T. is zero. As may be seen from Table 4, the gap is wider among females than males in both rural and urban areas. No distinct rural-urban pattern emerges. When the states are ranked according to the difference, the maximum gap occurs in Bihar in both rural and

TABLE 4—INDEX OF DIFFERENCE FOR LITERACY RATE BETWEEN GENERAL POPULATION S.C./S.T. STATE-WISE

State	Index for S. C. vs General population					Index for S.T. vs S.C. population	
	Rural		Urban		All areas persons	R	U
	M	F	M	F			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Andhra Pradesh	52.53	65.87	34.4	53.11	56.67	43.10	42.83
Assam	1.75	12.12	26.81	44.85	10.14	17.07	-59.46
Bihar	60.58	88.44	52.94	82.63	67.19	-83.73	-95.05
Gujarat	9.00	31.40	19.69	46.99	22.51	43.37	36.79
Haryana	39.36	72.39	48.87	80.82	53.16	—	—
Himachal Pradesh	35.90	50.33	30.03	48.26	41.19	11.86	-28.80
Jammu and Kashmir	17.88	30.20	36.70	58.24	35.65	—	—
Karnataka	53.90	73.03	30.12	49.52	56.64	-26.98	6.10
Kerala	30.02	39.08	19.54	28.18	33.43	36.79	1.99
Madhya Pradesh	34.04	57.87	34.96	63.97	43.48	28.87	22.04
Maharashtra	25.12	47.98	24.10	48.73	35.54	47.15	33.05
Manipur	17.28	4.21	30.33	37.20	19.64	-5.00	-50.72
Meghalaya	-19.75	35.24	64.96	80.52	30.92	-3.86	-222.31
Orissa	29.70	59.83	41.94	72.83	40.42	39.23	19.49
Punjab	37.55	63.02	48.41	71.76	52.17	—	—
Rajasthan	41.66	86.25	38.67	81.38	52.15	14.66	4.51
Tamil Nadu	34.83	52.89	32.26	49.87	44.76	55.82	47.50
Tripura	19.12	46.18	36.60	56.64	33.84	27.13	-101.13
Uttar Pradesh	43.68	75.14	36.64	64.71	53.00	46.32	-24.16
West Bengal	30.22	45.13	45.16	56.26	46.39	48.99	20.13

urban areas for males as well as females. This is followed by Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan for rural males; Rajasthan,

Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka and Haryana for rural females. The difference is generally low in Kerala (urban), Gujarat and Assam. The gap between S. C. S. T. is also the highest in Bihar.

In general, the literacy rates for S. C. and S. T. tend to increase or decrease with that of general population. To examine this hypothesis, districts were ranked within each state according to the general literacy rate and literacy rate of scheduled castes and the rank correlation worked out. The significance of the rank correlation was tested by means of  $t^*$  test. The rank correlations for males and females are shown in Table 5, together with the level of significance of the correlation. In general, the districts which have high literacy rate, also show high literacy rate for S. C./S. T.

To study the pattern of literacy, districts were arranged in ascending order of literacy rate and then divided into four groups with equal number of districts. The Table 6 brings out in brief the distribution of literates in rural areas of various districts of the country. Each quartile accounts for roughly 25% of the total population. However, they share literate population quite unequally. While the lowest quartile has only 13.9% of the literates, the uppermost claims 38.5%. The male literacy rate in the former category is only 20.8% as against 48.4% in the later category. Understandably, the range of literacy rates is also wider in these two categories. The shares of S.C./S.T. are similar to those of the general population.

Similar analysis for females brings out sharply into focus the relative backwardness of females. The upper limit of the first three quartile is 5%, 9% and 16% for females as against 25%, 31% and 39% for males. Roughly three-fifths of the districts have literacy rate below 16%. The literacy rate for females varies from 5.40% in the lowest group to 26.66% in the highest. The literacy of the S. C. and S. T. in these groups shows that the gap between the groups is wider for females.

The table also shows the distribution of literate women in various districts. The top 78 districts accounting for 26.7% of the female population account for 52.6% of literate women. The next 78 districts account for 24.3% and 22.7% of the population and literates respectively showing some balance. The lowest two groups accounting for 29.1% and 20% of the female population claim only 16.7% and 8% of the literate women. Such an uneven distribution of female

literacy has its significance for differential growth of the population within the country.

TABLE 5—RANK CORRELATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE—RURAL

State	No. of Districts	Rank Correlation	
		Male	Female
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh	21	0.88	0.91
Assam	10	0.19*	0.15*
Bihar	17	0.62	0.34*
Gujarat	19	0.45*	0.61
Haryana	7	0.79	0.89
Himachal Pradesh	10	0.78	0.87
Jammu and Kashmir	10	0.22*	0.24*
Karnataka	19	0.65	0.83
Kerala	10	0.90	0.89
Madhya Pradesh	43	0.69	0.73
Maharashtra	22	0.60	0.81
Manipur	5	0.60*	-0.75*
Nagaland	3	0.50*	-0.50*
Orissa	11	0.60	0.76
Punjab	11	0.84	0.89
Rajasthan	26	0.73	0.82
Tamil Nadu	13	0.81	0.75
Uttar Pradesh	54	0.86	0.77
West Bengal	15	0.29*	0.23*

\*Value of rank correlation is not significant.

### Analysis of the Problems of Literacy in low Literacy Districts

In this section distribution of literates by age groups, availability of schools

TABLE 6—DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS BY LITERACY RATES—RURAL

Range	No. of Districts	Literacy rate for			Percentage of Population			Contribution of the districts to literates		
		General	S.C.	S.T.	General	S.C.	S.T.	General	S.C.	S.T.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<b>Males</b>										
8-25	86	20.8	10.7	29.1	22.49	22.44	34.19	13.93	11.77	19.17
26-31	81	28.0	16.0	18.7	25.79	29.62	27.12	21.49	23.08	31.25
32-39	82	35.1	21.9	17.7	24.96	24.88	22.69	26.04	26.66	24.74
40-79	82	48.4	34.2	25.3	26.76	23.06	16.00	38.54	38.49	24.84
Total	331				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>Females</b>										
1-5	87	5.40	0.87	1.04	19.95	20.38	34.99	7.98	3.59	9.01
6-9	88	7.75	2.20	3.78	29.12	32.12	28.59	16.70	14.26	26.79
10-16	78	12.63	5.78	5.66	24.27	26.14	17.82	22.70	30.50	24.99
17-66	78	26.66	11.98	8.50	26.66	21.36	18.60	52.62	51.65	39.21
Total	331				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

and the population served by a school have been examined. The literacy figures have been presented in the census for each district by age groups 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, 25-34 and 35+- In the age group 5-9 the literacy figures can at best be only an indicator. Large variations between districts may occur due to age of admission of child to school as well as the enumerator's/respondent's impression about the literacy level of the child. It is reasonable to hope that from age group 10-14 onwards the literacy figure would not be subject to such limitations. One would expect that in a period when educational facilities are expanding more children in age group 10-14 would be literate than in age group 15-19. Surprisingly, out of the 153 districts examined, in only 29 districts for males and in 111 districts for females is the literacy rate in age group 10-14 equal to or higher than that for 15-19. One explanation for this could be the differential distortion in reporting of age by each sex. The other possibility is the special attention paid to female literacy in certain states. Since literacy rates by age are important for any evaluation, it would be worth attempting an investigation into the factors responsible for these differentials.

Table 7 shows the distribution of districts by literacy rate for males and females in each age-group. The table relates to an entire district including urban areas. The low literacy level of below 25% even in the age group 10-14 observed in 108 districts for females and 4 districts for males is a feature that calls for attention. To show the contrast with advanced districts, the literacy rate in Ernakulam and Alleppy of Kerala are presented in Table 8.

Since in most of the districts examined illiterates predominate in each group, a vigorous non-formal educational drive with a view to imparting basic literacy would seem an appropriate step. Such an effort could supplement the programme of universal education for all school going age-group. As pointed out later, ensuring that all children in school going ages are admitted to schools, may pose some administrative problems due to small size of villages in many of the states. This is precisely why a non-formal educational plan could form a part of the total educational system. Even if vigorous steps are taken now, it may take a minimum of 40 to 50 years before some of these districts attain the level of Ernakulam and Alleppy.

The following summary table (Table 9) showing maximum and minimum of the proportion of villages in the district having no primary school brings out that in most of the districts, schools were not available in a number of villages.

TABLE 7—DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS BY AGE-WISE LITERACY RATES

Literacy per 1000 population	Age groups											
	5-9		10-14		15-19		20-24		25-34		35+	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0-50	1	18	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	17	—	107
50-100	4	81	—	7	—	7	—	34	—	85	—	40
100-150	30	39	—	29	—	39	—	63	—	35	6	4
150-200	60	11	1	40	—	42	1	32	5	10	19	2
200-250	43	3	2	31	3	28	2	13	5	4	43	—
250-300	11	1	4	23	2	24	6	5	19	1	43	—
300-350	3	—	11	13	5	8	7	3	31	1	20	—
350-400	—	—	18	6	14	2	14	1	33	—	13	—
400-450	1	—	26	—	25	—	31	—	27	—	5	—
450-500	—	—	25	3	20	1	27	1	14	—	3	—
500+	—	—	65	—	84	2	65	—	19	—	1	—
Total	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153

TABLE 8—LITERACY RATE/1000 BY AGE GROUP

Age Group	Ernakulam		Alleppy	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
5-9	535	543	609	602
10-14	941	931	967	959
15-19	947	915	968	946
20-24	927	849	955	898
25-34	884	739	921	796
35+	742	480	826	562

TABLE 9—RANGE OF THE PROPORTION OF VILLAGES HAVING NO SCHOOL—STATEWISE—FOR SELECTED DISTRICTS

State	No. of districts for which analysts has been undertaken	Range of the proportion of villages having no schools	
1. Andhra Pradesh	14	8.80 (Kurnool)	67.28 (Vishakhapatnam)
2. Bihar	13	31.06 (Darbhanga)	70.46 (Santal-Parganas)
3. Jammu and Kashmir	6	28.09 (Ladakh)	55.43 (Udhampur)
4. Madhya Pradesh	23	38.15 (Datia)	68.85 (Jabalpur)
5. Maharashtra	4	8.98 (Nanded)	15.33 (Aurangabad)
6. Karnataka	4	17.41 (Gulbarga)	31.75 (Bellary)
7. Orissa	7	33.37 (Sundergarh)	69.87 (Baudh-Khondmals)
8. Haryana	2	25.97 (Hissar)	38.48 (Gurgaon)
9. Rajasthan	22	28.64 (Sikar)	66.83 (Jhalawar)
10. Uttar Pradesh	33	26.24 (Hamirpur)	75.97 (Azamgarh)
11. West Bengal	4	31.27 (Purulia)	57.49 (West-Dinajpur)

Santal Parganas in Bihar and Azamgarh in Uttar Pradesh are two extreme examples where schools were not available in 7064 and 3755 villages out of 12,175 and 5628 villages, respectively. One of the reasons for this may be the large number of small villages below 1000 in the states of Bihar, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. At the national level roughly 13% to 14% of children are found to be in the age group 6-10. On this basis, to sustain an elementary school with a minimum number of students say 150, roughly 1000 population will be required. Distribution of villages by size class of population shown in Table 10, brings out that the states of Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tripura, and Uttar Pradesh have less than 20% of the villages in the size group 1000 and above. More than 55% of the villages have population less than 500. This may be compared with 44.2%, 99.5% and 59.4% of the villages with population 1000 and above in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu, respectively. Such small villages account for uneven distribution of population. How far such a distribution of population in small villages contributes to the lack of infrastructural facilities like a primary school would require detailed examination. Alternatively, special strategy would have to be thought of to bring education to villages with small population. The provision of such infrastructural facilities in such areas may call for the use of modern technology like education by satellite, etc.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

1. In a large number of districts, substantial proportion of literates are without educational level. When only literates with minimum educational standard are considered the relative positions of states change. Special studies of these aspects to help better formulation of programmes seem essential.
2. The gap in the literacy level of the S. C. and S. T. persists.
3. When districts are arranged by literacy level, a wide gap is seen between the educationally advanced and backward districts. The inequality in the distribution of literates is more pronounced for females.
4. In a large number of districts, literacy is still low even in age groups 10-14 and 15-19. This supports the view that systems of non-formal

TABLE 10—DISTRIBUTION OF 10,000 VILLAGES AND POPULATION AMONG DIFFERENT SIZE CLASS OF VILLAGES AND THE AVERAGE POPULATION PER VILLAGE

States	Proportion of villages with population				Average Population of villages				Proportion of population in villages			
	<200	200-499	500-999	1000+	<200	200-499	500-999	1000+	<200	200-499	500-999	1000+
Andhra Pradesh	1966	1610	1998	4426	90	341	735	2418	137	425	1140	8298
Assam	2527	3035	2693	1745	103	341	711	1675	425	1687	3121	4767
Bihar	2581	3032	2254	2133	105	333	709	2169	362	1346	2129	6163
Gujarat	1124	2381	2868	3627	115	348	724	2060	123	789	1978	7710
Haryana	918	2080	2836	4166	109	354	727	2271	82	600	1680	7638
Himachal Pradesh	7106	2201	509	184	84	305	672	1568	3150	3531	1799	1520
Jammu and Kashmir	2688	3383	2393	1536	116	336	698	1734	537	1965	2890	4608
Karnataka	1841	2973	2640	2546	108	342	710	2033	240	1231	2267	6262
Kerala	16	16	16	9952	123	—	—	—	N	1	3	9996
Madhya Pradesh	2787	3848	2330	1035	110	334	693	1656	622	2610	3283	3485
Maharashtra	1412	2540	2943	3105	109	348	718	2109	158	910	2180	6752
Manipur	5005	2446	1218	1331	101	316	696	1972	1052	1615	1770	5563
Meghalaya	6965	2385	517	133	91	300	668	1444	3363	3788	1831	1018
Nagaland	3479	3385	1760	1376	112	331	678	1557	806	2310	2464	4420
Orissa	3947	3239	1877	937	96	329	698	1627	889	2489	3061	3561

Punjab	1548	2717	2925	2800	106	347	715	1833	193	1112	2476	6219
Rajasthan	2633	3306	2347	1714	107	335	707	1941	441	1737	2603	5219
Tamil Nadu	628	1259	2176	5937	105	356	745	2716	36	245	889	8830
Tripura	6336	2050	1001	613	85	320	698	1719	1826	2228	2369	3577
Uttar Pradesh	2430	3096	2514	1960	103	337	710	1872	372	1548	2645	5435
West Bengal	1997	2878	2386	2739	111	337	711	2143	252	1109	1938	6701

---

N=Negligible

education are useful.

5. Schools are not available in a large number of villages, especially in the states of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. A large proportion of villages in these states have population below 1000. So extension of educational facilities to these areas requires particular attention and the use of non-conventional methods of education.