Vidyasagar University Journal of Economics, Vol. XVII, 2012-13, ISSN – 0975-8003

Gender Parity Index in Primary Education in West Bengal

Sanjay Bhattacharya
Assistant Professor, Calcutta Institute of Engineering & Management, Kolkata

Abstract

[In India several education policies have been undertaken to ensure equal opportunities across the gender while determining the educational agenda for primary education. But gender prejudice continues to influence our behavior, choices and life outcomes. Within education, a 'hidden curriculum' which is a set of values, attitudes and norms that is implicitly conveyed to students by the teachers' actions and by the organizational processes operating inside schools, helps to spread gender difference. Societal obstacles to female education must be understood as a part of a much larger social framework as traditionally, a boy's education has been seen as an investment, increasing the earnings and social status of the family while different standards apply for girls. In this paper an effort is made in this connection to make an empirical estimation of the extent of gender disparity and the fall of disparity across the districts of West Bengal during 2001-02 – 2010-11.]

JEL Classification: I 21- Analysis of Education, I 24- Education and Inequality

Keywords: Primary Education, Gender disparity, Gender Parity Index, Education for All.

I. Introduction

In India several education policies have been undertaken to ensure equal opportunities across the gender while determining the educational agenda for primary education. But despite the recent educational success of girls and women's increased participation at the place of work, gender characteristics continues to influence our behavior, choices and life outcomes. In a family, the most commanding responsibility continues to be predominantly subjugated by men. Even within education, a 'hidden curriculum' as a set of values, attitudes and norms conveyed implicitly to students by the teachers' activities and by the executive processes operating inside schools, helps to spread gender differential. Thus it is essential to ensure, identify and track the effective equal opportunities for improving and equalizing cross-gender educational experiences and opportunities. The gender-orthodox structure among pupils impact detrimentally on learning practice and outcome and thus a timely and appropriate intervention in the primary school classroom is the unavoidable obligation of the hour to confirm equal opportunity across the gender.

West Bengal is a state with some remarkable and observable peculiarity. It was the only state in our country to have been ruled continuously since 1977 by a coalition Government for more than three decades and the political forces supposed to be motivated by a different vision of philosophical, political, social, economic and cultural conviction. Though the action of social changes in West Bengal has been observed in the discussed period of time but the problem of gender inequality in the state has revealed as a new dimension. Even after arriving at the new millennium, it is often maintained by a considerable portion of society irrespective of the men and

even the women, to glorify the male counterpart and at the same time appease the women, often in passive terms.

In this paper, different components in relation to gender-parity in primary education are discussed. We have taken the first census decade of the new millennium (2001-2011) in consideration for this discussion and we count comprehensively on the data source of the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) and District Information System for Education (DISE), United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India (MHRD, GOI). Section I deals with the brief discussion about some of the existing literature in relation to gender-parity at the national level. Section II analyses the theoretical understanding of Gender Parity Index, a significant parameter in relation to cross-gender equivalence of enrolment in primary education.Section III describes the extent of disparity across the gender in the domain of primary education in India. Section IV outlines the trend in Gender Parity Index across the districts in West Bengal. Concluding remarks are in Section V.

II: Brief review of Literatures

In the World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000, the terms "GENDER PARITY" reflected as one of the six EFA goals elucidated in the framework of the forum. In this present section we have cited some review of existing literatures which are remarkably important in the context of discussions about gender-parity. But in the perspective of West Bengal Primary education the available literature is very infrequent. At present we mention the review of following literatures.

VimalaRamchandran (2009) in her research paper entitled " Towards Gender Equality in Education" has mentioned that some Indian states have made remarkable progress in education, particularly eradicating illiteracy and universalization in participation of children in primary education, but some states stood far from the goal. She tried to investigate what are the impetuses needed to progress faster in moving towards the 2015 EFA deadline in all parts of the country. The paper dealt with both goal-wise as well as state-wise exercise of finding. Issues like heterogeneous gendered realities and multiple disadvantages, National strategies for bridging gender and social gaps and at same time uncomfortable social truths like bi-directionality of the relationship between health and education or existence of gender-biased domestic violence at home are discussed in this paper.

An important paper entitled "Gender Issues in Education" by a National Focus Group formed by NCERT (National Council of Educational Research and Training) (2006) observed that schooling actually reinforces the gendered inequality of socialization and social control. In fact schools themselves create boundaries that limit possibilities. It points out how the girls in Indian classrooms cannot be considered simply as a homogenous category by virtue of their sex; they are also differently impacted by heterogeneous contexts of class, caste, religion, as well as the rural urban rift. Other forces and trends, like globalization and the privatization of schooling, the declining standards of government schools, communalization of education, and the impact of public and domestic violence, that pose major challenges in relation to gender issues in education. A review of policies and existing realities reveals that these challenges are clearly not being addressed. The constrained style of current approaches to gender, equality and empowerment of girls, as well as the silence on issues of masculinity, has obstructed textbooks and curricula reform. It is necessary to change from seeing gender as mere difference to analyzing gender as domination. A commitment to equality involves developing in the learner the ability to question relations of power in society, as well as enabling her/him to overcome the disadvantages of discrimination.

Avinash Kumar (2014), in his paper "Gender Parity in Indian Schools: Changing Equations" had shown by analyzing national and state level data from 1990-91 to 2010-11 that the problem of gender parity in education is now far more complex than is commonly perceived. On the one hand, girls in some states and communities continue to face challenges in access to education but on the other hand, the gender parity ratios and drop-out percentages are now skewed against the boys in a significant number of states and union territories.

III. Operational Definition; Gender parity Index

The terms gender parity and gender equality are reflected in a combination in one of the six Education For All (E.F.A.) goals explained in the Dakar Framework for Action [2000][1]as follows:

(i) Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005 and

(ii) achieving gender equality in education by 2015 with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality

Elimination of gender disparity in primary and secondary education is also picked up as a target identified as essential one to fulfill the Millennium Development Goals of promoting Gender Equality and empowerment of women.

The Dakar Framework for Action has represented the most important international political commitment towards promoting "Education for All". In Article 7 [ii], a significant gender-based goal is articulated where the participants commit to eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005. We must take a note that Gender parity deals with *achieving equal participation of girls and boys in all forms of education based on their proportion in the relevant age-groups in the population.*

It must be taken in account that this goal is quantitative or numerical in nature and presently we would like to confine the analysis of this paper to the extent of quantitative goal only. But at the same time we must draw a discrete distinction between the concept of gender *parity and equality* as an education system with equal numbers of boys and girls participating, who may progress evenly through the system, may not in fact be based on gender equality. Achieving gender parity is just one step towards gender equality through education.

Following is the operational definition of the Gender Parity Index (GPI):

$$GPI = \frac{\text{Girl's enrolment in Primary Grades in the year "t"}}{\text{Boy's enrolment in primary grades in the same year}}$$

Gender parity reflects ***'formal' equality***, in terms of access to and participation in education. 'Formal' equality can also be understood as equality that is 'premised on the notion of the 'sameness' of men and women, where the male actor is held to be the norm. This is reflected in the way gender parity is used in measuring EFA progress, where the gender parity index computes the ratio of female-to-male value of a given indicator, with desired value being 1. Like all formal equality, GPI measures numerical 'gaps' between female and male outcomes.

As a quantitative or numerical concept, gender parity in education is easier to define, referring as it does to the equal participation of boys and girls in different aspects of education. Gender parity indicator is static, measuring the numbers of girls and boys with access to, and participating in

[1]The Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments, adopted by the World Education Forum held in Dakar, Senegal in April 2000 [Paris, UNESCO 2000]

education, at a particular moment of time; however, if viewed over different points in time, they can serve as dynamic indicators of change.

Gender parity in education, in **broader span**, depends upon several factors. These are:

(i) the numbers of boys and girls **enrolled** in education at each of the different levels of the education system, and at intake in grade 1 [particularly net enrolment and net intake, which measures the numbers of girls and boys enrolled as a proportion of the school-age population relevant for the level of schooling concerned, and grade 1 respectively]

(ii) The numbers of boys and girls who **survive** up to grade 5 [and thus the numbers that drop out]

(iii) Regularity of **attendance** of boys and girls [net attendance rate]

(iv) The numbers of girls and boys who **repeat** years of schooling

(v) the average years of schooling attained for boys and girls

(vi) the transitions of boys and girls between levels of education [Early Childhood Care & Education -primary; primary-secondary; secondary-tertiary/vocational]

(vii) The number of female and male teachers, which represents a concern with gender parity in the teaching profession, an indicator which reflects a direct concern with **parity in the supply of teaching**.

(viii) Literacy levels of boys and girls or men and women

IV: Gender Disparity in Primary Education in India

The primary education system in India has suffered from numerous shortcomings along with a horrible deficiency of the financial resources required to set up a nationwide network of schools. Traditionally, the education system has been characterized by` poor infrastructure, underpaid teaching staff, disillusioned parents and an unenthusiastic student population. In the context of India's obligation to the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of Universal Primary Education the major challenge is gender disparity—and the resulting financial and societal barricades that prevent contact of girls to primary education.

In a society as deeply subdivided as India, disparity in education can be observed through various distributions, such as caste, religion and gender etc. It is interesting, however, that even within such disadvantaged communities a consistent feature is the widespread gender disparity in educational attainment. For scheduled caste and scheduled tribe girls, the gender gap in education is almost 30 per cent at the primary level and 26 per cent at the upper primary stage. In India's most depressed regions, the probability of girls getting primary education is about 42 per cent

lower than boys[2], and it remains miserable even when other variables, such as religion and caste, are controlled by the Govt. Of India, through its flagship program Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) for the achievement of universal primary education with special attention to female education and the achievement of gender parity.

Societal obstacles to female education must be understood as a part of a much larger social framework, which has produced an ample institution of such disparity. Traditionally, a boy's education has been seen as an investment, increasing the earnings and social status of the family while different standards apply for girls. The benefits of a girls' education are generally seen as going to the family she marries into, thus providing little incentive to invest scarce resources both human and monetary to such activity. Such factors combine to reinforce attitudes inherently conflicting to female education.Apart from the above, financial factors play significant role in securing educational access, it is more prudent to say that they are by no means a definite estimate can be of use to gauge the possibilities of gender parity.

But if the problem was solely financial, there should have been a steady growth in primary education level with the 86th Education Amendment Act of 2002 which promised free and compulsory primary education to all children, and the escalating budgetary allocations for primary education following that. Yet the figures refuse to hike as rapidly as the studies projected, even though the financial problems were addressed. This is perhaps because of the undervaluing the social constraints for achieving the goal. A study by the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER, Working Paper 2013) at the United Nations University noted that though greater financial capacity in the family had a significantly positive effect on attendance for both genders, it affected girls' education rates almost twice as much as that of boys. Given slightly more comfortable financial conditions, the elasticity of girl's access to education is almost doubled in comparison to that of boys. Financial bottleneck appear to be a significant discouragement for girls' education in particular.

The Indian Government has not been insensitive to this observation. It is worthwhile to study the general aspects of Sarva SikshaAviyan (SSA) before addressing the specific programs for attaining gender equality. SSA has placed special emphasis on female education. Government initiatives in this regard can be divided into two loose categories-

(a) A program to create "pull factors" to enhance access and retention of girls in schools; and

(b) To create "push factors" in society to foster the conditions necessary to guarantee girls' education. Today, free textbooks are provided to all girls in school up to eighth grade, and back-to-school camps and bridge courses are organized for older girls.

[2] Gender Equity in Education: A Review of Trends and Factors, MadhumitaBandyopadhyay, RamyaSubrahmanian, CREATE PATHWAYS TO ACCESS, Research Monograph No 18, April 2008,NUEPA, Delhi)

However, it is not sufficient to make girls' education more affordable; it also must be made more important as a social choice. Government schemes now provide for early childhood care centers in or near schools to free girls from the burden of sibling-care responsibilities. Teacher sensitization programs are run to promote equitable learning opportunities. Steps are being taken to ensure recruitment of at least 50-per-cent female teaching staff. In Table 1, we have shown and compared the data of GPI in the major Indian States at primary education in the years of 2004-05 and 2010-11. The best result is seen in case of Meghalaya, while most of the educationally developed states like Kerala, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu have shown good GPI figures. North-eastern states like Assam, Tripura, Manipur has been consistent in attaining parity at GPI value. The backward states at the north and the west have also shown very promising indicators with innovative programs, such as that of Haryana state, which provides free bicycles to girls joining sixth grade, or Uttar Pradesh's enthusiastic campaign to mobilize local communities around school-related sports and cultural programs. In terms of improvement in GPI value over these two time phases, Bihar has shown the most remarkable improvement, i.e. achieving 0.94 in 2010-11 from 0.78 in 2004-05. States like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Punjab, Sikkim and Uttarakhand have experienced fall in GPI value in these two time threshold. These trends are evidence that the tide has turned. Though, as per the recent data (2011-12) eight Indian states like Kerala, Manipur and Andhra Pradesh, have reported achieving gender parity at the primary level already, but it will be more accurate and prudent to affirm that the conditions are being created, and India has progressed perceptibly towards a more girl-friendly educational environment.

V: Gender Parity Index in West Bengal: District-wise Analysis

In a broader width, Gender parity is examined through the analysis of literacy rates, school enrolment, pass and dropout rates, as well as years of schooling of the school going population. We have already said in Section III that India has witnessed appreciable improvement in GPI at primary education. From a meagre 0.76 in 1990-91 she has attained the figure of parity i.e. 1 in 2010-11. As far as the secondary data are concerned, the structured and reliable data across the districts of West Bengal are only available since 2005. So for the census decade of 1991-2001, we can only make some indicative statements for the districts of West Bengal.

Depending on the available District Information System for Education (DISE) data from District Report Card, we have prepared Table 2 where the GPI values of all the districts of West Bengal (including the academic district Siliguri) are described. It is worth noting here that for year 2001-02 and 2002-03 we have calculated the values of GPI following the formal operational definition from the sex-wise percentage data in primary education.The analysis of the data in Table 2 reveals that Darjeeling and Kolkata have experienced more than desired state of GPI on average (average GPI score 1.01 and 1.02 respectively for these two districts over the decade), but the average values across the districts are not very much different excluding Purulia, Bankura and to some extent Birbhum and Bardhaman. As far the degrees of dispersion across the years of 2001-2011 are concerned, Purulia, Siliguri (Academic district) and to some extent Uttar Dinajpur show high variability (after calculation on the data of Table 2, C.V. value across the decade:- Purulia-4.53, Siliguri- 3.82 and U.Dinajpur-2.87). On the other hand, Bardhaman, Birbhum and Dakshin Dinajpur exhibit low variability across the years and these districts are among those who experienced low average GPI score (average value of 0.96, 0.95 and 0.97 respectively). Though Bankura has experienced even lower average of GPI (0.93) but due to comparative high S.D. value it experienced higher value of C.V. across the decade. As a whole for the state, the desired value was restored during 2006-07, but then it fell down abruptly in 2007-08. But at the end of

the decade the adverse trend against gender parity was restored to a great extent and West Bengal ends up with 0.98 GPI value at 2010-11. But it is still a big concern in relation to gender-equity in primary enrolment in the state as 11 districts of the state are still falling short of state average in terms of GPI value.

Table 3 shows that there is a general decrease of variability among the districts along the years during the decade 2001-2011in West Bengal. It suggests that during the period the growth of GPI has experienced more and more equitable drift as the time dripped down. Though we may observe some minor jolts in the middle of the decade while the C.V. starts rising from 2007-2008. But by the end of the decade the adverse trend is restored and the decade ends with a C.V. value of 2.32%.Though, it is obviously creditable for the state and the planners that the disparity in GPI among the districts fell down considerably and at the end of our analysis period, achieved the all- time lowest value, But it must be admitted unequivocally that the overall GPI value of the State (from Table 2) is still falling short of the desired level (i.e. GPI = 1)

Now for further discussion we divide the West Bengal districts into three administrative divisions as follows:-

Burdwan Division	**Jalpaiguri division**	**Presidency division**
Bankura district	Cooch Behar	Howrah
Bardhaman district	Darjeeling	Kolkata
Birbhum district	Jalpaiguri	Murshidabad
Purba Medinipur	Malda	Nadia
Hooghly district	Uttar Dinajpur	Uttar 24 Parganas
Purulia district	Dakshin Dinajpur	Dakshin 24 Parganas
Paschim Medinipur		

In Tables 4 (A, B and C) we make a rearrangement of the GPI values according to the respective divisions. In Burdwan division the GPI has increased from 0.95 in 2002-03 (as in 2001-02 the figure for only three districts could be get into) to 0.96 in 2010-11. The degree of variability is reduced to a great extent in these districts. But it must be noted that the variability of GPI among the districts was minimum in 2006-07, but then it has increased consistently. The GPI value in this division was observed as 0.94, the minimum and 0.97 as the maximum. So this division exhibits comparatively poor score in terms of GPI (composite average 0.95), even compared to the state and national average.

On the other hand, The Jalpaiguri division has exhibited moderately improved value of GPI as compared to the GPI of Burdwan division. The consistent high values of GPI are achieved by Darjeeling and Malda among the districts of this division. The composite mean is by and large identical with National average of 2007-08. (i.e.0.98). But the issue that may be a concern before

the planners mostly is the degree of variability among the districts. In this decade, C.V. started from 3.61% and the decade ends with a value of 2.92%. It suggests that the disparity among the districts in terms of GPI has shown a declining trend during the period of 2001-02 to 2010-11.

The Presidency division exhibits more or less steady growth of GPI across the years and Kolkata, as expected, tops the list. The consistency of growth among all the districts can be questioned at the middle of the decade where the C.V.value rose to more than 3%, but eventually dropped down to 1.98% at the end of the decade. The trend of C.V. in Presidency division is just the opposite as observed in Burdwan Division, which may fascinate the researchers for further elaboration. But the steadiness can be experienced from the fact that the composite average GPI value (i.e. 0.99) is greater than the average national GPI value at 2007-08.

Fig 1 represents a very lucid picture of variability of GPI values across the three divisions of the state of West Bengal during 2001-2010. The Burdwan division shows a real improvement in terms of reduction of variability among the districts and the line drops down significantly. Presidency division, despite the good GPI value of Kolkata, has shown some increase in the mid-way of the decade of our analysis. But Jalpaiguri Division has shown some cyclical fluctuations of disparity in GPI among the districts of this division and the curve takes the shape of a "W". This is because Darjeeling district is consistently recorded improved GPI, while other districts of this division have shown some marginal improvement in spurts. Thus the disparity continues to be there, only the intensity has lessened to some extent. In spite of this, we can recognize an overall improvement throughout the state, especially in the latter half of the decade 2001-2011.

VI: Concluding Remarks

From the above discussion it is easily perceptible that both the country and the State West Bengal have taken significant strides towards ensuring the gender parity, at least as far as primary education is concerned. But it must be unambiguously accepted that before the start of New Millennium, the issue of attainment of gender parity was not bothered the planners much. West Bengal being blessed as a state with historically rich cultural heritage and ethos of female education, but the root level statistics of last century does not stand much inspiring. Even in this new Millennium, the districts of Presidency Division like Kolkata, Haora or district like Darjeeling, endowed with heritage of British Education culture, are standing as fore-runners in terms of gender-equitable enrollment in primary education. The fruits of early development are still pending to be dispersed among the historically disadvantaged districts like Bankura, Purulia or Uttar Dinajpur. But what is surprising that even after attaining 100% literacy, the state is still failing to achieve equitable enrolment rate for girl students, even in primary education level. A state with historicity of progressive tenets for female education like West Bengal is falling short of National average after the first decade of 21st Century. This calls for serious concerns of the state education planners and leaders.

But while dealing with GPI, one observation must be noted. The present method of GPI calculation requires sufficient information on the structure of education (i.e. theoretical entrance age and duration of grades), enrolments in each level of education and the populations of the age-groups corresponding to the given levels of education. Separate figures for males and females are required. A GPI of 1 indicates parity between the genders; a GPI that varies between 0 and 1 typically means a disparity in favor of males; whereas a GPI greater than 1 indicates a disparity in

favor of females. But GPI as an indicator itself suffers with some inherent limitation as a perfect measure of the accessibility of schooling for girls because it does not allow a determination of whether improvements in the ratio reflect increases in girls' school enrolment (desirable) or decreases in boys' enrolment (undesirable). It must be noted that in case of some metropolitan or even urban minority populations of West Bengal, it is more the decrease in boys' enrolment than the increase in girls' enrolment, is accountable for more equitable GPI values. It also does not show whether the overall level of participation in education is low or high.

Once again it must be remembered that Gender Parity only tells us the ratio of girls to boys at a particular educational backdrop. There is need for continued focus on girls' access to education in a number of states. From the report of the 12th Planning Commission we can observe that the girls account for the majority (73.5%) of the additional enrolment of children between 2006–07 and 2009–10. But there are, however, also hint at the need for specific attention to understand the peculiar challenges faced by boys and look for state or national level policy interventions to improve their retention and enrolment. Ignoring this need may cause the pendulum of gender parity to swing on to the other side in the coming decade.

Acknowledgement: This research paper has been prepared under the guidance of my research supervisor Dr. Prankrishna Pal,Associate Professor, Dept. of Economics,RabindraBharati University.

Bibliography

Bandyopadhyay,Madhumita and Subrahmaniam, Ramya (2008): *Gender Equity in Education: A Review of Trends and Factors*, Research Monograph No 18, Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity and NUEPA.

Bureau of Applied Economics & Statistics, Govt. of West Bengal (2012): *Economic Review 2011-12*, Govt of West Bengal

District Information System for Education (DISE), Different Years: *District Report Cards-West Bengal*, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD,GOI

District Information System for Education (DISE), Different Years: Elimentary Education in India- Where Do We Stand?, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD,GOI

District Information System for Education (DISE), Different Years: *Statistical Tables*, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD,GOI

GOI and UNDP (2009): *Gendering Human Development Indices: Recasting GDI and GEM for India 2009*, Ministry of Women and Child Development, GOI and UNDP

http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?q=india&d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A611%3BcountryID%3A356

http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/chronicle/home/archive/issues2007/themdgsareweontrack/genderdisparityinprimaryeducationtheexperienceinindia

Kumar Avinash (2014): *Gender Parity in Indian Schools: Changing Equation*, Retrieved June 2014 from
http://azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/pdf/Gender%20Parity%20in%20Indian%20Schools_Changing%20Equations.pdf

National Focus Group, NCERT (2006) : Gender Issues in Education, National Council of Educational research and Training, Sri AurobindoMarg, New Delhi

Planning Commission, (1997-98 , 2000-2001): *Annual Report,* GOI, New Delhi

Planning Commission, Govt. of India(2010): *West Bengal Development Report*, Academic Foundation, DariyaGanj, New Delhi

Planning Commission, Govt. of India (2007): *Eleventh Five Year Plan, Vol-II, Social Sector*

Ramachandran, Vimala (2009): *Towards Gender Equality in Education*, NUEPA, New Delhi

Sarva Shiksha Mission, Kolkata (2010): *DISE - Data Analysis 2009-10*, Kolkata, MIS-CELL, SSM, Kolkata

Shirname, Sangeeta,2007:*"Education for All" in India: Historical development, especially in the light of gender equality and impact on the present day situation*, Workshop on "Advancing social well-being and gender equity in a globalizing world: Dialogue between India and Finland" at Helsinki

Subrahmanian, Ramya (2004): *Gender Equality in Education: Definitions and Measurements*, Background paper for UNESCO GMR, UNESCO

Thomson, M. (n.d.) Why Do So Many Boys Not Care About School? Retrieved 7 June, 2014 from http://www.pbs.org/parents/experts/archive/2011/01/why-so-many-boys-dont-care abo.html

UNDP (2012): *INDIA FACTSHEET- Gender and Social Exclusion Indicators*, UNDP

UNESCO (2000): *The Dakar Framework for Action*, Dakar, Senegal, UNESCO

Table 1: GPI at Primary Level in Indian States in 2004-05and 2010-11

States	GPI at Primary Grades		States	GPI at Primary Grades	
	2004-05	2010-11		2004-05	2010-11
Andhra	0.98	0.95	M.P.	0.90	0.97
Arunachal	0.87	0.95	Maharastra	0.90	0.89
Assam	0.96	0.98	Manipur	-	0.99
Bihar	0.78	0.94	Meghalaya	1.01	1.02
Chandigarh	0.81	0.85	Mizoram	0.94	0.91
Chattisgarh	0.94	0.96	Nagaland	0.95	0.96
Delhi	0.87	0.88	Orissa	0.92	0.95
Goa	-	0.93	Punjab	0.85	0.80
Gujrat	0.87	0.86	Rajasthan	0.87	0.88
H.P.	0.91	0.91	Sikkim	0.98	0.94
Haryana	0.91	0.84	Tamilnadu	0.93	0.95
J & K	0.85	0.90	Tripura	0.91	0.96
Jharkhand	0.86	0.97	U.P.	0.92	0.98
Karnataka	0.94	0.93	Uttarakhand	0.97	0.91
Kerala	0.97	0.98	West Bengal	0.98	0.98
INDIA	0.96	1.00			

Source: State Report Cards, 2010-11 (p),2004-05 NUEPA, Delhi, http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?q=india&d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A611%3BcountryID%3A356

Table 2: GPI at Primary Level across the districts of West Bengal during 2001-2011

Districts	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11(p)
Bankura	0.90	0.91	0.93	0.91	0.95	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.94
Bardhaman		0.96	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.97
Birbhum	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95
DakshinDinajpur	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.97	0.96
Darjeeling		0.97	1.00	0.98	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.02	1.02	1.03
Haorah		1.02	1.01	1.02	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.98	0.97
Hugli		0.97	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.98	0.97
Jalpaiguri	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.98	0.94	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.98
Kochbehar	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.95
Kolkata		0.99	1.03	1.05	1.04	1.03	1.01	1.04	1.03	1.00
Maldah	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.02	0.98	0.98	0.99	1.01	1.00
Murshidabad	0.99	1.00	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.98
Nadia		1.00	0.99	0.98		0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.95
North 24 Pgs		0.99	1.01		1.00	0.96	0.97	0.98	0.99	0.99
PaschimMedinipur		0.95	0.97	0.95	0.98	0.98	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.95
Purbamedinipur		1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.97	0.97
Puruliya	0.83	0.87	0.91	0.91	0.97	0.95	0.93	0.96	0.96	0.96
Siliguri		0.95	0.99	0.97	1.04	0.98	0.93	0.90	0.98	0.98
South 24 Pgs	0.99	1.00	1.01	1.01	1.02	1.01	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uttar Dinajpur	0.90				0.95	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.98	0.99
West Bengal	**-**	**0.98**	**0.98**	**0.98**	**0.98**	**1.00**	**0.96**	**0.97**	**0.98**	**0.98**

Source: District Report Cards, DISE, Various Years.

Table 3: Year-wise variability of GPI across the districts of West Bengal (2001-2011)

Years	Average of all districts	S.D.	C.V.(%)
2001-02	0.95	0.05	5.46
2002-03	0.97	0.03	3.56
2003-04	0.98	0.03	2.93
2004-05	0.98	0.04	3.67
2005-06	0.99	0.03	2.94
2006-07	0.97	0.02	2.28
2007-08	0.96	0.02	2.41
2008-09	0.97	0.03	3.08
2009-10	0.98	0.02	2.36
2010-11(p)	0.97	0.02	2.32

Source: District Report Cards, 2001-2011 and Author's calculation

Table 4- A: GPI at Primary Level across the districts of Burdwan Division

	Bank	Bardh	Bir	Hugli	Pas. Medini	Pur. Medini	Puru	All	C.V(%)
2001-02	0.9		0.95				0.83	0.89	6.75
2002-03	0.91	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.95	1	0.87	0.95	4.52
2003-04	0.93	0.95	0.96	0.98	0.97	1	0.91	0.96	3.18
2004-05	0.91	0.95	0.94	0.99	0.95	0.99	0.91	0.95	3.47
2005-06	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.97	0.97	1.46
2006-07	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.99
2007-08	0.94	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.93	0.94	1.03
2008-09	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.96	1.16
2009-10	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.98	0.95	0.97	0.96	0.96	1.20
2010-11(p)	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.97	0.95	0.97	0.96	0.96	1.27

Source: District Report Cards, DISE, Various Years.

Table 4- B: GPI at Primary Level across the districts of Jalpaiguri Division

	D. Dinaj	Darj	Jalpai	Koch	Mal	U. Dinaj	All	C.V(%)
2001-02	0.98		0.96	0.98	0.98	0.9	0.96	3.61
2002-03	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.99	1		0.98	1.61
2003-04	0.98	1	0.97	0.98	1		0.99	1.36
2004-05	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97	1.01		0.98	1.67
2005-06	0.97	1.03	0.98	0.97	1.02	0.95	0.99	3.18
2006-07	0.97	1.01	0.94	0.96	0.98	0.96	0.97	2.44
2007-08	0.98	1.01	0.97	0.96	0.98	0.96	0.98	1.91
2008-09	0.96	1.02	0.96	0.96	0.99	0.95	0.97	2.73
2009-10	0.97	1.02	0.97	0.96	1.01	0.98	0.99	2.47
2010-11(p)	0.96	1.03	0.98	0.95	1	0.99	0.99	2.92

Source: District Report Cards, DISE, Various Years.

Table4-C: GPI at Primary Level across the districts of Presidency Division

	Murshi	Nadia	Hao	Kol	N 24 Pgs	S 24 Pgs	All	C.V(%)
2001-02	0.99					0.99	0.99	0.00
2002-03	1	1	1.02	0.99	0.99	1	1.00	1.10
2003-04	0.98	0.99	1.01	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.75
2004-05	0.99	0.98	1.02	1.05		1.01	1.01	2.71
2005-06	0.98		1	1.04	1	1.02	1.01	2.26
2006-07	0.96	0.96	0.98	1.03	0.96	1.01	0.98	3.06
2007-08	0.98	0.96	0.97	1.01	0.97	0.99	0.98	1.83
2008-09	0.99	0.96	0.98	1.04	0.98	1	0.99	2.74
2009-10	0.99	0.96	0.98	1.03	0.99	1	0.99	2.34
2010-11(p)	0.98	0.95	0.97	1	0.99	1	0.98	1.98

Source: District Report Cards, DISE, Various Years.