



SJMS 2022

EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Dr. Sunil Ganguly

Associate Professor in Physical Education,
Union College, West Bengal

Abstract: Education is a regular practice which brings positive changes in human life and behaviour. We can also define education as a practice of obtaining knowledge complete study on imparting the knowledge by way of instructions or some other practical process. Education carries a natural and lasting modification in an individual's intellectual and capability to achieve the targeted goal. It facilitates us to investigate our own attention and thoughts and makes it ready to express it in various forms. Education is the chief thing that encourages us to distinguish between right and incorrect because in the absence of education, we can't do what we essential or we can't achieve our objective. Straightforwardly, we can say, "education is the way to progress". It is additionally the way to our fate as achievements can only be accomplished when individuals have information, abilities, and frame of mind. In this method, education resembles a medium through which we can subordinate with various persons and offers our opinions.

Keywords: Education, Inequality, Economic Status, Poverty, Illiteracy

INTRODUCTION

Education is free and open to all but Bowles and Ginh's claim that some have much greater chances than others. Bowles and Ginh's argue that capitalist societies are not meritocratic and deny that they can do so inside a capitalist framework they believe that class background is the most imp factor influencing stages of accomplishment. Karl Marx's theory Capitalism never completely established idea of education. But he and Fredrick Engels about the class struggle. They advocated education for all, but they were mainly concerned with the type of education that was given to the children of working class and ruling class but Bourgeoisie maintain dominated. Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act or Right to Education with effect from 1st April 2010 under Article 21 A introduced by the 86th

Amendment of the composition seeks to provide free and compulsory education to all children in the age group six to fourteen years as a fundamental right in such a way as the state may by law regulate. A major rational behind the implementation of the Right to Education Act has been to check the dropout rate. Dropout has been well-defined as the proportion of children that cease to continue enrolled in the schooling method. Dropout rate is a worldwide phenomenon of education system in India, spread over all heights of teaching in all parts of the country. Many children, who enter school, are unable to comprehensive secondary education. Even with the existence of number of educational programs and policies, dropout is still being a social evil leads to educational backwardness. In general the rate of school dropout is high in slum areas because slum dwellers are mostly illiterate and education has no place for them. The study is conducted in slum areas in Guwahati city of Assam

DISCUSSION

Table no. 1

Age Group

Age	Frequency	Percentage
15-20	7	50%
21-25	5	36%
26-30	2	14%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no. 1 indicates that the maximum respondents are from 15-20 age group i.e. 50%, and 36% are from 21-25 age group, 14% respondents are from 26-30 age group i.e. minimum.

Table no.2

Sex Category

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	6	43%
Female	8	57%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

The above table no. 2 indicates that male respondents is 43% and the female respondents is 57% i.e. female respondents is more than male respondents.

Table no. 3

Educational Qualification

Education Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Illiterate	5	36%
Primary education	4	29%
High school	3	21%
Secondary education	2	14%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no. 3 indicated that maximum respondents are illiterate i.e. 36%. And 29% of the respondents completed primary education, 21% of the respondents completed high school and 14% of the respondents completed secondary school.

Table no. 4

Size of Family

Size of Family	Frequency	Percentage
Nuclear	7	50%
Joint	7	50%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no. 4 indicates that the size of the family of the respondents i.e. nuclear family and joint family. 50% of the respondents belongs to nuclear family and 50% of the respondents belongs to joint family.

Table no. 5

Total Educated Member

Educated members in the family	Frequency	Percentage
0 members	4	29%
1 members	5	35%
2 members	4	29%
3 members	1	7%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no.5 indicates that families with zero members education are of 29%, families with one educated members are of 35%, families with two educated members are of 29% and the families with three educated members are 7%. This table indicates that the educated members among the respondents families are very less.

Table no 6

Total Earner

Total earner	Frequency	Percentage
1 earner	7	50%
2 earner	4	29%
3 earner	2	14%
4 earner	1	7%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no. 6 indicates total earner in the family. 50% of the family have only 1 earner, 29% of the family have 2 earner, 14% of the family have 3 earner and only 7% of the family have 4 earner. This table indicates that maximum earner in most of the family is 1 earner i.e. 50%.

Table no. 7**Monthly Income**

Monthly income	Frequency	Percentage
1000-10000	6	43%
11000-20000	5	36%
21000-30000	3	21%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

From table no. 7 we can see that maximum respondents families monthly income is from 1000-10000 which is 43%, and from 11000-20000 is 36%, from 20000-30000 is 21%.

Table no.8**Satisfaction Level of Education**

Satisfaction of education	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	43%
No	8	57%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

From table no. 8, 43% respondents are satisfied with their education and maximum respondents are not satisfied with their education i.e. 57% as they want to have further education but due to some unwanted reason they are not able to continue their education.

Table no. 9

Reason for discontinue education

Students after not continuing education	Frequency	Percentage
Employed	5	36%
Unemployed	9	64%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

Table no. 9 indicate that 36% students are employed after not continuing their education and 60% are not employed.

Table no. 10

Child education

Are children continuing further education	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	43%
No	8	57%
Total	14	100%

Source: Field Study

From the above table no. 10 we can see that 43% children are continuing their education and 57% are not continuing their education. Maximum children are not continuing their education.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The area of our study among dropout student of slum area which is located in Guwahati. The student and other respondents were very simple, kind hearted, amicable and hospitable persons. The major findings are as follows:

- 1) In terms of age, we found that mostly the respondents were from 15 to 20 years of age i.e. 50%
- 2) In terms of sex category , mostly of the respondents are female i.e. 57%

- 3) In terms of education qualification maximum are illiterate i.e. 36%
- 4) In terms of size of the family there are both nuclear and joint family i.e. 50%
- 5) In terms of educated members in the family only one member is educated, especially male member i.e. 35%
- 6) In terms of total earner in the family is only one earner(husband) i.e. 50%
- 7) In terms of monthly income from the respondents family from 1,000 to 10,000 is the maximum i.e. 43%
- 8) In the matter of satisfaction on education most of them are not satisfied as they want to continue their education but due to some unfavourable circumstances they stopped their education. 57%
- 9) In terms of students after not continuing education unemployed are maximum i.e. 60%
- 10) In the matter of education maximum children's are not continuing the further education i.e. 57%

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it can be said that the alarming rates of dropouts, especially of slum children from schools was because of a variety of reasons; our hypothesis was only partially true. In the hope to change the same, we suggested some recommendations which must be taken up by governments, different authorities as well like minded people for further research. Our belief of educating one person creating a ripple effect and leading to an impact from a micro to macro level can only be accomplished once opportunities and proper conditions are given to slum children. Education is always a profitable investment for the country; after analysing our appeals and solutions, we aspire to influence a change in the current education and dropout scenario, and in the lives of children living in slums.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ariga, K., G. Brunello, R. Iwahashi, and L. Rocco (2006): "On the Efficiency Costs of De-Tracking Secondary Schools". IZA Discussion Paper No. 2534.
- [2] Baker, F. (2001): The Basics of Item Response Theory. ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- [3] Bedard, K. and C. Ferrall (2003): "Wage and Test Score Dispersion: Some International Evidence" Economics of Education Review, 22: 31-43.
- [4] Besley D., E. Kuh and R. Welsch (1980): Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources of Colinearity, New York, Wiley.
- [5] Birdsall, N. (1996): "Public Spending on Higher Education in Developing Countries: Too Much or Too Little?" Economics of Education Review, 15(4): 407-19
- [6] Blau, Francine and Lawrence Kahn (2005): "Do Cognitive Test Scores Explain Higher US Wage Inequality?" Review of Economics and Statistics, 87: 184-193.
- [7] Bourguignon, François, Francisco H.G. Ferreira and Marta Menéndez (2007): "Inequality of Opportunity in Brazil", Review of Income Wealth, 53 (4): 585-618.
- [8] Brown, G., J. Micklewright, S.V. Schnepf, and R. Waldmann, (2007), "International Surveys of Educational Achievement: How Robust are the Findings?" Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 170 (3): 623-646
- [9] Brunello, G., K. Ariga and M. Giannini (2006): "The Optimal Timing of School Tracking", in P. Peterson and L.Wößmann, (eds), Schools and the Equal Opportunity Problem, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.