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## CHAPTER V

## SCHEDULED CASTE IN PALKKAD DISTRICT

The District Palakkad is considered to be one of the prominent largest districts in Kerala. It is located at the central part of the state. The population of Scheduled caste in Palakkad is greater compared to that of all other districts of Kerala. And this district has bordered by Malappuram district in the North-West side, Thrissur district in the South-West side, Nilgiris district in in the North-East side and Coimbatore district of Tamilnadu in the East. By the latest census report, the district Palakkad is urbanized by a percentage of $24.4 \%$. In 2006, the district is reported one of the most backward districts, by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj. The present Palakkad district is an administrative unit, and it was formed in the year 1957 on $1^{\text {st }}$ January.

This chapter deals with all the peculiarities and particulars of Palakkad district. It covers the socio-economic aspects of the Scheduled caste households including demographic information, summary of education qualifications of parents’ and children' separately. This analysis, focuses on various of the educational attainment, the caste wise and area wise educational attainment of parents' and children, educational attainment of both in relation to the availability of nearby educational institutions, education levels and the related expenditure incurred by the surveyed community, educational attainment in relation to the family income, stream of education of the parents and children, first degree as well as the highest degree holder of the family, overall educational attainment, along with the details on computer literacy, technical and professional education attained, the study also focuses on Scheduled Caste awareness regarding the constitutional provisions to uplift themselves, free computer availed from government by the scheduled caste students details, availed study room grants availed from the government, regarding the services enjoyed and availed from the educational institution by the scheduled caste students, employment details in overall, employment details of both parents and children separately, unemployment details, educated unemployment details and relationship between education and employment of both the parents and children...etc.


## BASIC INFORMATION OF PALAKKAD DISTRICT

As per the census of 2011, the district has scheduled caste households of 92,121. And it has 91 grama panchayat, 6 Municipalities, 13 Block panchayat and 1 Zila panchayat. In total the districts have about 111 local bodies.

Table 5.1

## Basic information of Palakkad District

| Area | $4480 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{km}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Population | $2,809,934$ |
| Female | $1,450,456$ |
| Male | $1,359,478$ |
| Sc Population | 403,833 |
| Female | 206,382 |
| Male | 197,451 |

## Source: SC Development Report

The table 4.1 represents the basic details of Palakkad district. It shows the district is having an area of 4480 square kilometer and is having a total population of $2,809,934$. The distribution of population is biased in favor of female population that is about $1,450,456$, and comprises of $1,359,478$ persons. The scheduled caste population in the district is 403,833 . And out of these about 206,382 are females and 197,451 are males.

The following tables provide an outline related to the ratio of Scheduled caste in Palakkad Districts in various local bodies, especially Block wise details. The detail covers number of colonies, number of families, total number of male and total number of females in Palakkad District. Since the Block covers the municipalities of the district, the separate details regarding the same is taken into consideration in this chapter. By having a look at the following tables, we can realize the concentration of Scheduled caste families in various Block. And it also helps to realize in which of these having a higher concentration of them. For such explanations, here the area subdivided into 13 Blocks, and from those 13 blocks about 20 Scheduled caste households were selected randomly. But the thing is that, they are not living in separate area, rather by various colonies. This is an interesting finding from the study.

And this is the reason behind such backwardness. They were far distant from the rest of the population, thereby, they were having certain ignorance regarding what actually have been happening in the real world. They would like to lead an isolated life instead of trying to be a group that falls in the main stream also.

Table 5.2.1

List of Scheduled caste colonies in Palakkad District

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{SI} \\ \mathrm{NO} \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Anakkara | 63 | 1137 | 2307 | 2342 | 4649 |
|  |  | Chalissery | 45 | 674 | 1562 | 1558 | 3120 |
|  |  | Kappur | 67 | 760 | 1774 | 1740 | 3514 |
|  |  | Nagalasseri | 54 | 1061 | 2327 | 2428 | 4755 |
|  |  | Pattithara | 94 | 1191 | 2361 | 2597 | 5228 |
|  |  | Thirumittakkode | 52 | 646 | 1294 | 1340 | 2634 |
|  |  | Thrithala | 62 | 819 | 1894 | 1914 | 3808 |
|  | Total |  | 437 | 6288 | 13789 | 13919 | 27708 |

Table 5.2.2

| SI NO | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | Koppam | 44 | 432 | 947 | 1011 | 958 |
|  |  | Kulukkallur | 47 | 693 | 1628 | 1688 | 3316 |
|  |  | Muthuthala | 66 | 1108 | 2326 | 2357 | 4683 |
|  |  | Ongallur | 43 | 730 | 1656 | 1705 | 3361 |
|  |  | Pattambi | 34 | 549 | 1269 | 1308 | 2577 |
|  |  | Paruthur | 40 | 494 | 1099 | 1129 | 2228 |
|  |  | Thiruvegappura | 46 | 586 | 1366 | 1418 | 2784 |
|  |  | Vilayur | 39 | 537 | 1129 | 1220 | 2349 |
|  | Total |  | 359 | 5129 | 11420 | 11836 | 23256 |

Table 5.2.3

| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{SI} \\ \mathrm{NO} \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 |  | Ambhalappara | 65 | 977 | 2133 | 2161 | 4294 |
|  |  | Ananganadi | 63 | 815 | 1685 | 1819 | 3904 |
|  |  | Chalavara | 78 | 1074 | 2203 | 2431 | 4634 |
|  |  | Lakkidi Peruru | 55 | 924 | 1868 | 2048 | 3916 |
|  |  | Vaniyamkulam | 82 | 1342 | 2488 | 2615 | 5103 |
|  |  | Nellaya | 36 | 664 | 1520 | 1617 | 3137 |
|  |  | Vallappuzha | 49 | 491 | 1063 | 1138 | 2201 |
|  |  | Thrikkadeeri | 38 | 582 | 1207 | 1315 | 2522 |
|  | Total |  | 466 | 6869 | 14167 | 15144 | 29311 |

Table 5.2.4

| SI N O | Block | Panchayat | No of <br> Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  | Cherpulasseri | 39 | 707 | 1580 | 1603 | 3181 |
|  |  | Kadambhazhippuram | 59 | 828 | 1668 | 1794 | 3462 |
|  |  | Karimpuzha | 52 | 672 | 1384 | 1471 | 2855 |
|  |  | Pookkottukkavu | 48 | 766 | 1547 | 1696 | 3243 |
|  |  | Srikrishnapuram | 41 | 634 | 1273 | 1410 | 2683 |
|  |  | Vellinezhi | 40 | 634 | 1298 | 1349 | 2647 |
|  |  | Karakurissi | 41 | 715 | 1429 | 1528 | 2957 |
|  | Total |  | 320 | 4956 | 10179 | 10849 | 21028 |

Table 5.2.5

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 |  | Alanallur | 62 | 1025 | 2278 | 2226 | 4504 |
|  |  | Kottoppadam | 33 | 397 | 873 | 902 | 1775 |
|  |  | Kumaramputhur | 41 | 636 | 1322 | 1437 | 2759 |
|  |  | Kanjirappuzha | 30 | 490 | 1009 | 1098 | 2107 |
|  |  | Mannarkkad | 15 | 251 | 608 | 640 | 1248 |
|  |  | Thachanattukara | 34 | 472 | 1047 | 1099 | 2146 |
|  |  | Thachampara | 23 | 440 | 889 | 981 | 1870 |
|  |  | Thenkara | 27 | 367 | 798 | 880 | 1678 |
|  | Total |  | 290 | 4431 | 9541 | 10018 | 19559 |

Table 5.2.6

| SI NO | Block | Panchayat | No of <br> Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | Attappady | Agali | 24 | 316 | 632 | 616 | 1248 |
|  |  | Puthoor | 7 | 169 | 291 | 285 | 576 |
|  |  | Sholayur | 7 | 196 | 334 | 382 | 716 |
|  | Total |  | 38 | 681 | 1257 | 1283 | 2540 |

Table 5.2.7

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  | Keralassery | 29 | 499 | 1112 | 1088 | 2200 |
|  |  | Kongad | 61 | 1005 | 2087 | 2112 | 4199 |
|  |  | Mankara | 42 | 755 | 1582 | 1583 | 3165 |
|  |  | Mannur | 33 | 725 | 1304 | 1358 | 2662 |
|  |  | Mundur | 50 | 1082 | 2480 | 2460 | 4940 |
|  |  | Parali | 59 | 1245 | 2702 | 2701 | 5403 |
|  |  | Pirayiri | 31 | 749 | 1661 | 1675 | 3336 |
|  | Total |  | 305 | 6060 | 12928 | 12977 | 25905 |

Table5.2.8

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 |  | Kottayi | 74 | 1221 | 2581 | 2733 | 5314 |
|  |  | Kuthanur | 34 | 683 | 1486 | 1489 | 2975 |
|  |  | Kuzhalmannam | 69 | 1340 | 2690 | 2771 | 5461 |
|  |  | Mathur | 60 | 1049 | 2173 | 2186 | 4359 |
|  |  | Peringottukurissi | 71 | 1082 | 2300 | 2419 | 4719 |
|  |  | Thenkurissi | 36 | 913 | 1981 | 2036 | 4017 |
|  | Total |  | 413 | 7518 | 15955 | 16488 | 32443 |

Table 5.2.9

| SI <br> NO | Block | Panchayat | No of <br> Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 |  | Eruthembathi | 34 | 568 | 1035 | 1096 | 2131 |
|  |  | Kozhinjapara | 31 | 415 | 729 | 770 | 1499 |
|  | Nalleppilly | 49 | 787 | 1634 | 1672 | 3306 |  |
|  | Perumatty | 39 | 662 | 1434 | 1375 | 2809 |  |
|  | Vadakarapathy | 16 | 283 | 552 | 541 | 1093 |  |
|  | Elappully | 76 | 1359 | 2937 | 2984 | 5921 |  |
|  |  | Polpully | 38 | 604 | 1283 | 1357 | 2640 |
|  | Total |  | 283 | 4678 | 9604 | 9795 | 19399 |

Table5.2.10

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 |  | Kollemkode | 42 | 982 | 2157 | 2312 | 4469 |
|  |  | Koduvayur | 44 | 777 | 1697 | 1638 | 3335 |
|  |  | Muthalamada | 45 | 1048 | 2282 | 2486 | 4768 |
|  |  | Puthunagaram | 28 | 449 | 1092 | 1078 | 2170 |
|  |  | Vadavannur | 40 | 762 | 1800 | 1785 | 3585 |
|  |  | Pattanchery | 54 | 792 | 1814 | 1885 | 3699 |
|  |  | Peruvembu | 29 | 513 | 1176 | 1236 | 2412 |
|  | Total |  | 282 | 5323 | 12018 | 12420 | 24438 |

Table 5．2．11

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 冗ign首Z | Ayilur | 41 | 622 | 1304 | 1389 | 2693 |
|  |  | Nelliyampathy | 22 | 278 | 631 | 598 | 1229 |
|  |  | Elavancherry | 35 | 662 | 1491 | 1450 | 2941 |
|  |  | Pallassana | 58 | 1053 | 2488 | 2590 | 5078 |
|  |  | Melarkode | 47 | 680 | 1504 | 1536 | 3040 |
|  |  | Nenmara | 45 | 735 | 1743 | 1703 | 3446 |
|  |  | Vandazhy | 38 | 658 | 1459 | 1467 | 2926 |
|  | Total |  | 286 | 4688 | 10620 | 10733 | 21353 |

Table 5．2．12

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of <br> Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 帚 } \\ & \text { 会 } \end{aligned}$ | Alathur | 40 | 589 | 1326 | 1382 | 2708 |
|  |  | Erimayur | 73 | 1261 | 2816 | 2686 | 5502 |
|  |  | Kavassery | 54 | 787 | 1726 | 1810 | 3536 |
|  |  | Kizhakkencherry | 44 | 922 | 2013 | 2041 | 4054 |
|  |  | Puthukode | 25 | 383 | 864 | 882 | 1746 |
|  |  | Tharur | 43 | 951 | 1421 | 1414 | 2835 |
|  |  | Vadakkencherry | 52 | 1011 | 2184 | 2250 | 4434 |
|  |  | Kannambra | 44 | 635 | 1323 | 1435 | 2758 |
|  | Total |  | 375 | 6239 | 13673 | 13900 | 27573 |

Table 5．2．13

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SI } \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | Block | Panchayat | No of Colonies | No of Families | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 |  | Akathethara | 27 | 438 | 938 | 1001 | 1939 |
|  |  | Malampuzha | 20 | 308 | 658 | 645 | 1303 |
|  |  | Marutharoad | 45 | 737 | 1502 | 1543 | 3045 |
|  |  | Puthupariyaram | 45 | 658 | 1343 | 1409 | 2752 |
|  |  | Puthusseri | 40 | 716 | 1443 | 1563 | 3006 |
|  |  | Kodumbu | 33 | 841 | 1877 | 1992 | 3869 |
|  | Total |  | 210 | 3698 | 7761 | 8153 | 15914 |

Table 5.2.14

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ottappalam <br> Municipality |  | 71 | 1058 | 2196 | 2318 | 4514 |
|  | Shornur <br> Municipality |  | 85 | 1455 | 2978 | 3198 | 6176 |
| Chittur <br> Thathamangalam <br> Municipality |  | 46 | 775 | 1642 | 1716 | 3358 |  |
| Palakkad <br> Municipality |  | 44 | 1669 | 3347 | 3554 | 6901 |  |
|  | Total |  | 4310 | 71515 | 153075 | 158301 | 311376 |

## PRIMARY DATA ANALYSIS

This section deals with the analysis of data based on various objectives like the socioeconomic conditions of SC, educational attainment of SC, and structure and pattern of human capital formation of SC.

Table 5.3
Socio Economic Status of the Sample

| Facilities | No | Yes | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radio | $174(66.9 \%)$ | $86(33.1 \%)$ | 260 |
| TV | $21(8.1 \%)$ | $239(91.9 \%)$ | 260 |
| News Paper | $185(71.2 \%)$ | $75(28.8 \%)$ | 260 |
| Mobile Phone | $1(0.4 \%)$ | $259(99.6 \%)$ | 260 |
| Laptop | $214(82.3 \%)$ | $46(17.7 \%)$ | 260 |
| Fridge | $191(73.5 \%)$ | $69(26.5 \%)$ | 260 |
| LPG | $10(3.8 \%)$ | $250(96.2 \%)$ | 260 |
| Air Conditioner | $252(96.9 \%)$ | $8(3.1 \%)$ | 260 |
| Two-Wheeler | $182(70.0 \%)$ | $78(30.0 \%)$ | 260 |
| Four-Wheeler | $244(93.8 \%)$ | $16(6.2 \%)$ | 260 |
| Water | 0 | $260(100 \%)$ | 260 |

## Source: Primary data.

The table explains the socio-economic status of the Scheduled caste in the study area. The necessity regarding the consideration of the socio-economic status is that, it is considered to be an important indicator of the population in a society. Since the scheduled caste are far distant from the main stream, it can uniquely represent the extent to which the scheduled caste has moved in their development experience. For explaining the same, a lot of variables were taken into account. Specifically, the variables like Radio, TV, News -paper, Mobile Phone, Lap Top, Fridge, LPG, Air Conditioner, Two -Wheeler, Four- Wheeler, Toilet, own house, water facility...etc. the sample consisted of 260 households. In the sample, only 86 households are having Radio facility, 239 households having Television, 75 houses having News-Paper, 259 hoses have Mobile phones, 46 houses having Lap-Top, 69 houses having Fridge, 250 houses having LPG, 8 houses having Air conditioner, 78 having Two-wheeler, 16 having Four -wheeler, and 260 households having the accessibility of drinking water facility. The graphical explanations of the socio-economic conditions are the following;

## Graph 5.3 (a)

Socio-Economic Background.


## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.4

Other socio-economic indicators

| Other Socioeconomic/ Category | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Type of House |  |
| Thatched | 20 (7.7\%) |
| Bricks | 125 (48.1\%) |
| Concrete | 115 (44.2\%) |
| Toilet |  |
| No | 2 (0.8\%) |
| Yes | 258 (99.2\%) |
| Nature of House |  |
| Ancestral |  |
| No | 221 (85.0\%) |
| Yes | 39 (15.0\%) |
| Built on Governmental Assistance |  |
| No | 99 (38.1\%) |
| Yes | 161 (61.9\%) |
| EMS | 94 (58.8\%) |
| IAY | 66 (41.3\%) |
| Tiles and sanitary |  |
| No | 211 (81.2\%) |
| Yes | 49 (18.8\%) |
| Agricultural farm |  |
| No | 254 (97.7\%) |
| Yes | 6 (2.3\%) |
| 5 cents | 2 (0.8\%) |
| 10 cents | 1 (0.4\%) |
| 20 cents | 1 (0.4\%) |
| 1 acre | 2 (0.8\%) |
| Faming activity |  |
| Cattle rearing | 2 (0.8\%) |
| Poultry farming | 2 (0.8\%) |

## Source: Primary Data

The table also clearly presents some other relevant aspects of the socio-economic status of the scheduled caste. This too plays a vital role for their better standard of living. It shows that, regarding the type of house under consideration, the variables are Thatched roof, Bricks and concrete. From the analysis it's clear that majority of the houses are built by using Bricks. Whose values are 125 out of 260 households, and its percentage is 48.1 . Next come the house which are concrete in nature. It is 115 out of
260. That is about $44.2 \%$. In the case of thatched roof, about 20 households are in primitive thatched roof nature. That is about $7.7 \%$. Regarding the toilet facility, about 2 houses are still not having such facility. Regarding the nature of houses, especially whether it is ancestral or not, shows that majority households are not ancestral. About 221 houses are not belonging to this category, the rest 39 was built by the grandparents. By considering the scheme from which the house was built by the families, about 161 was built by using the governmental assistance. Especially EMS and IAY scheme. The beneficiary belonging to EMS schemes are 94 (58.8\%), in IAY schemes, it is about 66(41.3\%). The rest of 99 houses were not built by using any governmental assistance. Regarding Tiles and Sanitary, about 49 houses having such facility and 211 houses were not having such facility. Regarding the possession of agricultural fields, only 6 households were holding farms. Out of it, about 2 families have an agricultural field of 5 cents, 1 having 10 cents, 1 having 20 cents, and 2 families having 1 acres of land for agricultural purposes. Other farming activities in which these households are engaged include cattle rearing and poultry farming, only 2 households, that is about $0.8 \%$ engaged in those activities, and a bulk production cannot be see in the sample. The overall graphical representations are the following.

## Graph 5.4 (a)

## Toilet



## Source: Primary Data

Graph 5.4(b)

Housing Details
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Agricultural Farm


## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.5

## Demographic Information

| Factors |  | Count | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | BPL | 217 | $83.5 \%$ |
|  | APL | 25 | $9.6 \%$ |
|  | General | 18 | $6.9 \%$ |
|  | Rural | 224 | $86.2 \%$ |
|  | Urban | 36 | $13.8 \%$ |
| Community | Chakkiliyan | 15 | $5.8 \%$ |
|  | Cheruman | 36 | $13.8 \%$ |
|  | Kanakkan | 40 | $15.4 \%$ |
|  | Kavara | 14 | $5.4 \%$ |
|  | Mannan | 26 | $10.0 \%$ |
|  | Nayadi | 31 | $11.9 \%$ |
|  | Panan | 56 | $21.5 \%$ |
|  | Paravan | 2 | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | Pulayan | 23 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Generation of family on education | Thotti | 15 | $5.8 \%$ |
|  | Velan | 2 | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 1 | 186 | $71.5 \%$ |
|  | 2 | 51 | $19.6 \%$ |
|  | 3 | 2 | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | None | 21 | $8.1 \%$ |

## Source: Primary data

Other indicators of the status of scheduled caste are considered in this section. From the table, it is clear that, the category of BPL is greater than APL and General. It constituted a percentage of 83.5 . The rest 16.5 covers the APL and General Category. More clearly about $9.6 \%$ belongs to the APL category and only $6.9 \%$ belongs to General category. It means that the participation of scheduled castes in higher income earning opportunities are lesser. Next considers the area in which the sample population belongs. About 36 households i.e. $13.8 \%$ residing in urban area and 86.2 \% belonging to Rural area. The major sub castes under consideration for the study are; Chakkiliyan by 15 households, Cheruman about 36 house households, Kanakkan
by 40 households, Kavara about 14, Mannan about 26, Nayadi 31, Panan 56, Paravan by 2, Pulayan 23, Thotti 15 and Velan by 2 Households. And by considering the education generation in which the family belongs shows that the lion share of the total sample belongs to first generation. That's about 186 households, 51 households belonging to the second generation, 2 are belonging to third, and 21 households belonging to no such generations, which means they are educationally back ward in every respect. The graphical presentations are the following;

## Graph 5.5 (a)

## BPL/APL/GENERAL



## Source: Primary data

From the diagram, it clearly indicates that the major populations are belonging to the BPL category.

Graph 5.5(b)

## Area



## Source: Primary data

In area wise the sample populations major share belonging to the Rural area and only a small percentage belonging to the urban area.

Graph 5.5 (c)

## Community wise distribution



## Source: Primary data

Graph 5.5 (d)

## Education Generation



## Source: Primary data

The graph reveals that, majority of the families are belonging to first generation in educational attainment. It means, only the present generation has got to exposure to secure educational degrees and qualifications. About $71.5 \%$ of the surveyed households belongs to first generation category.

Table 5.6

## Summary of Education Qualifications of the parent's versus category

| Educational Qualification | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) |  | APL (N=25) |  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) |  | Total ( $\mathrm{N}=260$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother |
| LP | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (16.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (24.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (15.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (22.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| UP | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (22.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53 \\ (24.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (20.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 53 \\ (20.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (22.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| High School | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (18.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (6.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ (16.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (6.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| SSLC | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (8.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (10.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (16.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (8.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (10.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Higher Secondary | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (5.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (8.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (16.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (22.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (6.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (10.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Graduation | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (4.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (2.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (20.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (24.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (44.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (50.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (8.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (8.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| PostGraduation | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (3.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (4.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Uneducated | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (15.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (17.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (13.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (15.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| NA | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (8.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (7.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Source: Primary Data

Abbreviation: $\mathrm{N}=$ Number of families in each category; LP = Lower primary; UP $=$ Upper primary, BPL=Below Poverty Line; APL = Above poverty line; $\mathrm{NA}=$ Not applicable.

The parental education qualification is an important indicator of the educational attainment of the family as a whole. In the case of BPL Households about $16.6 \%$ of the male parents held a qualification of LP, $22.6 \%$ having UP, $8.3 \%$ having SSLC, 5.1\% having Higher secondary, $4.1 \%$ having Graduation, $0.5 \%$ having Post Graduation and about 8.3 percentage are uneducated. In case of Female Parents, the distributions are; $24.9 \%$ having LP, $24.4 \%$ having UP, $6.5 \%$ having High school education, $10.6 \%$ having SSLC, $8.8 \%$ having Higher Secondary, $2.8 \%$ having Graduation, $3.7 \%$ having Post graduation and $17.1 \%$ belonging to the category of Un educated. In the case of Uneducated component, the female parents are considered to
be worser than male parents. Along with that, about 18 households do not have the Male parents and 3 Households do not have Female Parents. In the APL category, about $12 \%$ of Male parents having LP, $12 \%$ having UP, $12 \%$ having High School education, $16 \%$ having SSLC, $16 \%$ having Higher Secondary, and $20 \%$ having Graduation. Along with that $4 \%$ of the male parents are un educated, in the case of Female parents in APL, the educational attainment is same in LP, High School and Higher Secondary. i.e. about $12 \%$. About 20 of the female parents having UP education and $24 \%$ having Graduation. Along with that, about $4 \%$ of the parents are belonging to the Un educated category. In General category, the educational attainment of Male parents is $5.6 \%$ in LP, $5.6 \%$ in UP, $5.6 \%$ in SSLC, $16.7 \%$ in Higher Secondary, $44.4 \%$ in Graduation, $11.1 \%$ in Post -Graduation and $11.1 \%$ in Doctoral Degree. In Female parents about $5.6 \%$ belongs to LP, $22.2 \%$ belongs to Higher Secondary, $50 \%$ belongs to Graduation, $16.7 \%$ belongs to Post Graduation and $5.6 \%$ belongs to Un educated. In short, the overall education status of the total population in the area are; $15.4 \%$ of the male parents and $22.3 \%$ of the female parents having an education of LP, about $20.4 \%$ of male parents and $22.3 \%$ of the female parents holding Upper Primary, in the case of High School, 16.9 \% grabbed by male parents and $6.5 \%$ grabbed by female parents. In SSLC, it is 8.8 and $10 \%$ respectively. In Higher Secondary, about $6.9 \%$ of male parents belongs to this category and $10 \%$ of female parents, holding the same. In Graduation, it is 8.5 and 8.1. In Post -Graduation, only $1.2 \%$ of male parents belonging to this and $4.2 \%$ belonging to female parents. Considering a higher degree, only $0.8 \%$ of the male parents are having Doctoral Degree, and none of the female parents hold such degree. In the case of Uneducated category, about $13.5 \%$ of the total male parents belonging to this and $15 \%$ of the female parents belonging to this category.

## Graph 5.6 (a)

Educational attainment of Parents.


## Source Primary data

Table 5.7

Educational Attainment of Siblings versus category

| Educational Qualification | Category | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP | BPL (N=217) | 22 (10.1\%) | 10 (4.6\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 35 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 1 (4.0\%) | 1 (4.0\%) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 0 | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| UP | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 29 (13.4\%) | 26 (12.0\%) | 6 (2.8\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 63 |
|  | APL (N=25) | 2 (8.0\%) | 1 (4.0\%) | 1 (4.0\%) | 0 | 4 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| High School | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 22 (10.1\%) | 9 (4.1\%) | 9 (4.1\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | 41 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 4 (16.0\%) | 2 (8.0\%) | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 2 (11.1\%) | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| SSLC | BPL (N=217) | 46 (21.2\%) | 44 (20.3\%) | 13 (6.0\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 105 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 3 (12.0\%) | 2 (8.0\%) | 2 (8.0\%) | 0 | 7 |
|  | General (N=18) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Higher Secondary | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 33 (15.2\%) | 32 (14.7\%) | 7 (3.2\%) | 6 (2.8\%) | 78 |
|  | APL (N=25) | 1 (4.0\%) | 5 (20.0\%) | 1 (4.0\%) | 0 | 7 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 4 |
| Graduation | BPL (N=217) | 29 (13.4\%) | 13 (6.0\%) | 8 (3.7\%) | 0 | 50 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 12 (48.0\%) | 8 (32.0\%) | 2 (8.0\%) | 0 | 22 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 11 (61.1\%) | 6 (33.3\%) | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| PG | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 3 (1.4\%) | 3 (1.4\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 | 7 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 2 (8.0\%) | 3 (12.0\%) | 2 (8.0\%) | 0 | 7 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 5 (27.8\%) | 2 (11.1\%) | 0 | 8 |
| PhD | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | APL (N=25) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Uneducated | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 1 (0.5\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | APL (N=25) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NA | BPL ( $\mathrm{N}=217$ ) | 32 (14.7\%) | 78 (35.9\%) | 172 (79.3\%) | 204 (94.0\%) | 486 |
|  | APL ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | 0 | 3 (12.0\%) | 17 (68.0\%) | 25 (100\%) | 45 |
|  | General ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) | 1 (5.6\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 15 (83.3\%) | 17 (94.4\%) | 34 |

Source: Primary Data

The table explains the educational attainment of Scheduled caste siblings. And it shows the attainment in specification by a household having on an average four siblings maximum. It also shows the distribution based on BPL, APL and General category. In all such category, BPL family shows a higher value in all ways.

## Graph 5.7 (a)

## Educational attainment of sibling versus category



## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.8
Education qualification of parents versus area

| Educational <br> Qualification | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) |  | Urban (N=36) |  | Total ( $\mathrm{N}=260$ ) |  | P value* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother |
| LP | 39 (17.4\%) | 58 (25.9\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 40 (15.4) | 58 (22.3) | $<0.0001$ | $<0.0001$ |
| UP | 52 (23.2\%) | 55 (24.6\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 3 (8.3\%) | 53 (20.4) | 58 (22.3) |  |  |
| High School | 44 (19.6\%) | 16 (7.1\%) | 0 | 1 (2.8\%) | 44 (16.9) | 17 (6.5) |  |  |
| SSLC | 16 (7.1\%) | 20 (8.9\%) | 7 (19.4\%) | 6 (16.7\%) | 23 (8.8) | 26 (10.0) |  |  |
| Higher Secondary | 11 (4.9\%) | 20 (8.9\%) | 7 (19.4\%) | 6 (16.7\%) | 18 (6.9) | 26 (10.0) |  |  |
| Graduation | 9 (4.0\%) | 8 (3.6\%) | 13 (36.1\%) | 13 (36.1\%) | 22 (8.5) | 21 (8.1) |  |  |
| Post-Graduation | 1 (0.4\%) | 6 (2.7\%) | 2 (5.6\%) | 5 (13.9\%) | 3 (1.2) | 11 (4.2) |  |  |
| Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 | 2 (5.6\%) | 0 | 2 (0.8) | 0 |  |  |
| Uneducated | 34 (15.2\%) | 37 (16.5\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 2 (5.6\%) | 35 (13.5) | 39 (15.0) |  |  |
| NA | 18 (8.0\%) | 4 (1.8\%) | 2 (5.6\%) | 0 | 20 (7.7) | 4 (1.5) |  |  |

Source: Primary data

By considering the educational attainment of scheduled caste parents in rural and urban areas, about 97 peoples in rural area having a qualification of LP, 107 peoples are having UP, 60 having High school education, 36 having SSLC, 31 having Higher Secondary education, 17 having Graduation, 7 having Post Graduation, none of them having Doctoral Degree, and 71 peoples are having no education, that is they are uneducated. About 22 parents are no more. In urban area, about 1 parent having LP education, 4 having UP, 1 having High school education, 13 having SSLC, 13 having Higher Secondary Education, 26 Having Graduation, 7 having Post graduation, 2 of them having Doctoral Degree, and 3 are not educated, i.e. uneducated. And 2 parents are no more in Urban area. * P-values are based on Fisher's exact test. Result: A statistically significant p -value ( $<0.0001$ ) indicates that there is a strong relationship between parental educational qualification and area. People living in rural areas has increasingly better educated as compared to Urban area. Rural women are increasingly better educated than rural men.

## Graph 5.8 (a)

Educational Attainment of Parents' versus area


## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.9
Educational attainment of siblings versus area

| Educational Qualification | Area | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 | Total | P value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 23 (10.3\%) | 11 (4.9\%) | 1 (0.4\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 37 | $<0.0001$ |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| UP | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 31 (13.8\%) | 28 (12.5\%) | 6 (2.7\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 67 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 2 |  |
| High School | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 27 (12.1\%) | 11 (4.9\%) | 9 (4.0\%) | 1 (0.4\%) | 48 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 2 (5.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| SSLC | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 48 (21.4\%) | 46 (20.5\%) | 15 (6.7\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 111 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2 (5.6\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |
| Higher Secondary | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 33 (14.7\%) | 35 (15.6\%) | 8 (3.6\%) | 7 (3.1\%) | 83 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2 (5.6\%) | 3 (8.3\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 6 |  |
| Graduation | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 27 (12.1\%) | 14 (6.3\%) | 8 (3.6\%) | 0 | 49 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 25 (69.4\%) | 13 (36.1\%) | 2 (5.6\%) | 0 | 40 |  |
| PG | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 3 (1.3\%) | 5 (2.2\%) | 4 (1.8\%) | 0 | 12 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 3 (8.3\%) | 6 (16.7\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 10 |  |
| PhD | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Uneducated | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 1 (0.4\%) | 2 (0.9\%) | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| NA | Rural ( $\mathrm{N}=224$ ) | 31 (13.8\%) | 72 (32.1\%) | 173 (77.2\%) | 210 (93.8\%) | 486 |  |
|  | Urban ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2 (5.6\%) | 10 (27.8\%) | 31 (86.1\%) | 36 (100\%) | 79 |  |

## Source: Primary Data

* P-values are based on Fisher's exact test Result: A statistically significant p-value $(<0.0001)$ indicates that there is a strong relationship between siblings' educational qualification and area. People living in rural areas has increasingly better educated as compared to urban area.


## Graph 5.9 (a)

## Educational attainment of sibling versus area



## Source: Primary Data

## Table 5.10

Educational attainment of Parents' versus available nearby educational institutions

| Educational Qualification | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) |  | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) |  | Total ( $\mathrm{N}=260$ ) |  | P value* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother | Father | Mother |
| LP | 28 (18.4\%) | 31 (20.4\%) | 12 (11.1\%) | 27 (25.0\%) | 40 (15.4) | 58 (22.3) | 0.396 | 0.523 |
| UP | 28 (18.4\%) | 34 (22.4\%) | 25 (23.1\%) | 24 (22.2\%) | 53 (20.4) | 58 (22.3) |  |  |
| High School | 30 (19.7\%) | 12 (7.9\%) | 14 (13.0\%) | 5 (4.6\%) | 44 (16.9) | 17 (6.5) |  |  |
| SSLC | 13 (8.6\%) | 17 (11.2\%) | 10 (9.3\%) | 9 (8.3\%) | 23 (8.8) | 26 (10.0) |  |  |
| Higher Secondary | 11 (7.2\%) | 15 (9.9\%) | 7 (6.5\%) | 11 (10.2\%) | 18 (6.9) | 26 (10.0) |  |  |
| Graduation | 13 (8.6\%) | 8 (5.3\%) | 9 (8.3\%) | 13 (12.0\%) | 22 (8.5) | 21 (8.1) |  |  |
| Post-Graduation | 1 (0.7\%) | 6 (3.9\%) | 2 (1.9\%) | 5 (4.6\%) | 3 (1.2) | 11 (4.2) |  |  |
| Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.9\%) | 0 | 2 (0.8) | 0 |  |  |
| Uneducated | 18 (11.8\%) | 26 (17.1\%) | 17 (15.7\%) | 13 (12.0\%) | 35 (13.5) | 39 (15.0) |  |  |
| NA | 10 (6.6\%) | 3 (2.0\%) | 10 (9.3\%) | 1 (0.9\%) | 20 (7.7) | 4 (1.5) |  |  |

Source: Primary Data

This table explains that, out of these 260 households, about 152 households are having the availability of nearby educational institution and about 108 are not having such facility. But the educational attainment of the scheduled caste parents and the availability of educational institutions have no relevance and relation. The attainments are somewhat lower in these areas. * P-values are based on Fisher's exact test Result: A statistically insignificant p -values indicates that there is no relationship between parental educational qualification and availability of nearby educational institutions.

Graph 5.10 (a)
Educational attainment of parents versus available nearby educational institution.


Source: Primary Data

Table 5.11
Educational attainment of siblings versus available nearby educational institutions

| Educational Qualification | Nearby Education | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 | Total | P value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 16 (14.8\%) | 5 (4.6\%) | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0.0110 |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 7 (4.6\%) | 7 (4.6\%) | 1 (0.7\%) | 2 (1.3\%) | 17 |  |
| UP | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 15 (13.9\%) | 20 (18.5\%) | 2 (1.9\%) | 0 | 37 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 17 (11.2\%) | 8 (5.3\%) | 5 (3.3\%) | 2 (1.3\%) | 32 |  |
| High School | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 19 (17.6\%) | 7 (6.5\%) | 4 (3.7\%) | 0 | 30 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 8 (5.3\%) | 6 (3.9\%) | 5 (3.3\%) | 1 (0.7\%) | 20 |  |
| SSLC | No (N=108) | 13 (12.0\%) | 18 (16.7\%) | 7 (6.5\%) | 2 (1.9\%) | 40 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 37 (24.3\%) | 29 (19.1\%) | 8 (5.3\%) | 0 | 74 |  |
| Higher Secondary | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 10 (9.3\%) | 8 (7.4\%) | 3 (2.8\%) | 1 (0.9\%) | 22 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 25 (16.4\%) | 30 (19.7\%) | 6 (3.9\%) | 6 (3.9\%) | 67 |  |
| Graduation | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 20 (18.5\%) | 12 (11.1\%) | 4 (3.7\%) | 0 | 36 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 32 (21.1\%) | 15 (9.9\%) | 6 (3.9\%) | 0 | 53 |  |
| PG | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 1 (0.9\%) | 6 (5.6\%) | 2 (1.9\%) | 0 | 9 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 5 (3.3\%) | 5 (3.3\%) | 3 (2.0\%) | 0 | 13 |  |
| PhD | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 1 (0.9\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Uneducated | No ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 1 (0.7\%) | 2 (1.3\%) | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |
| NA | No (N=108) | 13 (12.0\%) | 32 (29.6\%) | 86 (79.6\%) | 105 (97.2\%) | 236 |  |
|  | Yes ( $\mathrm{N}=152$ ) | 20 (13.2\%) | 50 (32.9\%) | 118 (77.6\%) | 141 (92.8\%) | 329 |  |

## Source: Primary Data

This table reveals the relationship between the availability of nearby educational institution and sibling's educational attainment. As we are moving towards higher education, the family having such nearby educational institution enhanced the educational attainment of them. The pupils having such facility perform bitterly in educational attainment than the family which do not have such educational institution nearby. * P-values are based on Chi-square test of independence. Result: A statistically significant p-value indicates that there is a relationship between Siblings educational qualification and nearby educational institutions. The following chart will clear the same in a better way.

Graph 5.11 (a)
Educational attainment of siblings versus available nearby educational institutions.


Source: Primary Data.

Table 5.12

Education level versus Expenditure

| Source of <br> Expenditure | Education <br> Level | N | Mean | Median | Standard <br> Deviation | Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uniform | School | 63 | 584.1 | 500 | 744.7 | $0 ; 3000$ |
|  | College | 40 | 405 | 0 | 853.03 | $0 ; 3000$ |
| Books | School | 63 | 385.7 | 0 | 506.05 | $0 ; 2000$ |
|  | College | 40 | 1345 | 1000 | 1048.55 | $0 ; 5000$ |
| Private Tuition | School | 63 | 125.4 | 0 | 319.76 | $0 ; 1500$ |
|  | College | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 ; 0$ |
| Fee | School | 63 | 69.2 | 0 | 180.85 | $0 ; 600$ |
|  | College | 40 | 925 | 0 | 2123.31 | $0 ; 10000$ |
| Transportation | School | 63 | 361.9 | 0 | 528.67 | $0 ; 3000$ |
|  | College | 40 | 813 | 1000 | 461.31 | $0 ; 2500$ |
| Other | School | 63 | 271.4 | 99 | 312.37 | $0 ; 1000$ |
|  | College | 40 | 1065 | 500 | 1928.14 | $0 ; 10000$ |

## Source: Primary Data

The educational expenditure in schools and colleges for the Scheduled caste households is affordable. This means that the expenditure burden is somewhat lesser for the households as the expenditure burden has already been incurred by the government. In uniform expenditure, both school and college showing the same range. The lowest value is 0 and the highest is 3000 . In book expenditure, the range is $0-2000$ in schools and $0-5000$ in colleges. For private tuition the range is $0-1500$ is the range for schools, and $0-0$ is the range for college. It means that no such families sending their siblings to have a private tuition as in schools. Regarding the fee at the educational institution, the range is $0-600$ for the schools and $0-10000$ for the colleges, in transportation expenditure, the value $0-3000$ represents the range of schools and 0-2500 for the colleges. And by considering the other expenditures, the schools are having a range of $0-1000$ and colleges are having $0-10000$. So, from this we can says that the financial burden for the educational attainments is lower for the families. The following graphs will explain in detail the same.

Graph 5.12 (a)

## Mean Plot of Expenditure



## Source: Primary Data

## Graph 5.12 (b)

Median Plot of Expenditure


Source: Primary Data

Table 5.13
Educational qualification (Highest) versus Family Income

| Educational <br> Qualification | $<10000$ <br> $(\mathrm{~N}=129)$ | $10000-$ <br> 25000 <br> $(\mathrm{~N}=75)$ | $25000-$ <br> 50000 <br> $(\mathrm{~N}=15)$ | $>50000$ <br> $(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ | P value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP | $18(14.0 \%)$ | $1(1.3 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| UP | $15(11.6 \%)$ | $4(5.3 \%)$ | $1(6.7 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| High School | $18(14.0 \%)$ | $3(4.0 \%)$ | 0 | $1(12.5 \%)$ |  |
| SSLC | $31(24.0 \%)$ | $17(22.7 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| Higher <br> Secondary | $25(19.4 \%)$ | $15(20.0 \%)$ | $1(6.7 \%)$ | $1(12.5 \%)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Graduation | $20(15.5 \%)$ | $28(37.3 \%)$ | $6(40.0 \%)$ | $3(37.5 \%)$ |  |
| Post-Graduation | $1(0.8 \%)$ | $7(9.3 \%)$ | $7(46.7 \%)$ | $2(25.0 \%)$ |  |
| Doctor of <br> Philosophy | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(12.5 \%)$ |  |
| Uneducated | $1(0.8 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

## Source: Primary data

The table explains the relationship between the education qualifications that is highest with the family income. And it clearly shows that only the households having higher income has the highest level of education qualifications. When income increases, the proportion of uneducated families getting vanished. This can be proved by a statistical test which is the following. The value of such test is $<0.0001$. * P-values are based on Chi-square test of independence. Result: A statistically significant p-value indicates that there is a strong relationship between highest educational qualification and family income. Higher the family income better the educational qualification.

Graph 5.13 (a)

## Education qualification (Highest) versus Family Income



## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.14
Stream from which the qualification obtained by the parents

| Educational <br> Qualification | Father |  |  | Mother |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=116)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=87)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=1)$ | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=185)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=29)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ |
| LP | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(33.6 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 57 <br> $(30.8 \%)$ | $1(3.4 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| UP | 25 <br> $(21.6 \%)$ | 28 <br> $(32.2 \%)$ | 0 | 45 <br> $(24.3 \%)$ | 12 <br> $(41.4 \%)$ | 0 |
| High School | $10(8.6 \%)$ | 34 <br> $(39.1 \%)$ | 0 | $15(8.1 \%)$ | $2(6.9 \%)$ | 0 |
| SSLC | 12 <br> $(10.3 \%)$ | 11 <br> $(12.6 \%)$ | 0 | 21 <br> $(11.4 \%)$ | $5(17.2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Higher <br> Secondary | 13 <br> $(11.2 \%)$ | $5(5.7 \%)$ | 0 | 20 <br> $(10.8 \%)$ | $5(17.2 \%)$ | $1(50.0 \%)$ |
| Graduation | 13 <br> $(11.2 \%)$ | $8(9.2 \%)$ | $1(100 \%)$ | $17(9.2 \%)$ | $3(10.3 \%)$ | $1(50.0 \%)$ |
| Post- <br> Graduation | $3(2.6 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | $10(5.4 \%)$ | $1(3.4 \%)$ | 0 |
| Doctor of <br> Philosophy | $1(0.9 \%)$ | $1(1.1 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uneducated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Source: Primary Data

The figures mentioned in this table represents the stream from which the parents obtained their education qualifications. The variables under considerations are Government stream, Private stream and Aided stream. From the table it is clear that majority of the male parents got their education from governmental educational institutions (about 116 male parents). In the case of aided stream, it is 87 and finally in private only a single parent took their graduation from there. In female parent cases too, the trend is existing. But in comparison with male parents, the female parent's participation in government stream is greater (about 185). In aided stream, the number of female parents is 29 which is lesser in comparison with male parents in aided stream. In private, about 2 female parents obtained their education, especially in higher secondary and one in graduation. In short, the governmental educational institution is considered as a catalyst in the case of parent's educational attainment. This can be explained by the following diagram.

## Graph 5.14 (a)

## Stream from which the qualification has obtained



## Source: Primary Data

The following table explains educational attainment from various streams by the sibling were represented in above table. On an average, the family has four children. And their educational attainments say that, as in parents' cases, the siblings too were
took their education qualifications from governmental institutions. This doesn't mean that, they completely depend on the governmental institutions, the role of aided educational institutions too plays a vital role for their educational attainment. This is clearly represented in the following figure.

Table 5.15
Stream from which the qualification has obtained by the siblings

| Educational <br> Qualification | Sib 1 |  |  | Sib 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=156)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=61)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=9)$ | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=121)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=51)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=4)$ |
| LP | 21 <br> $(13.5 \%)$ | 0 | $2(22.2 \%)$ | $9(7.4 \%)$ | $1(2.0 \%)$ | $2(50.0 \%)$ |
| UP | 21 <br> $(13.5 \%)$ | 11 <br> $(18.0 \%)$ | 0 | $11(9.1 \%)$ | 17 <br> $(33.3 \%)$ | 0 |
| High School | $10(6.4 \%)$ | 17 <br> $(27.9 \%)$ | 0 | $7(5.8 \%)$ | $6(11.8 \%)$ | 0 |
| SSLC | 38 <br> $(24.4 \%)$ | 12 <br> $(19.7 \%)$ | 0 | 34 <br> $(28.1 \%)$ | 13 <br> $(25.5 \%)$ | 0 |
| Higher | 30 <br> $(19.2 \%)$ | $2(3.3 \%)$ | $3(33.3 \%)$ | 30 <br> $(24.8 \%)$ | $7(13.7 \%)$ | $1(25.0 \%)$ |
| Secondary | 31 <br> $(19.9 \%)$ | 17 <br> $(27.9 \%)$ | $4(44.4 \%)$ | 19 <br> $(15.7 \%)$ | $7(13.7 \%)$ | $1(25.0 \%)$ |
| Praduation | $4(2.6 \%)$ | $2(3.3 \%)$ | 0 | $11(9.1 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
| PhD | $1(0.6 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The following table is a continuation of the previous table

| Educational <br> Qualification | Sib 3 |  |  | Sib 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=35)$ | Govt <br> $(\mathrm{N}=9)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=5)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=0)$ | Aided <br> $(\mathrm{N}=19)$ | Private <br> $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ |
| LP | 0 | $2(22.2 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(50.0 \%)$ |
| UP | $3(8.6 \%)$ | $1(11.1 \%)$ | $1(20.0 \%)$ | 0 | $4(21.1 \%)$ | 0 |
| High School | 5 <br> $(14.3 \%)$ | $1(11.1 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | $4(21.1 \%)$ | 0 |
| SSLC | 10 <br> $(28.6 \%)$ | 0 | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 0 | $5(26.3 \%)$ | 0 |
| Higher Secondary | 8 <br> $(22.9 \%)$ | $5(55.6 \%)$ | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 0 | $1(5.3 \%)$ | 0 |
| Graduation | 5 <br> $(14.3 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $4(21.1 \%)$ | $1(50.0 \%)$ |
| PG | 4 <br> $(11.4 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(5.3 \%)$ | 0 |
| PhD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Primary Data

## Graph 5.15 (a)

## Stream from which the qualification obtained by the siblings



## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.16
Educational attainment versus sub caste (Parents)

| Educational Qualification | Caste | Father | Mother |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chakkiliyan (N=15) | 0 | $4(26.7 \%)$ |
|  | Cheruman (N=36) | $6(16.7 \%)$ | $6(16.7 \%)$ |
|  | Kanakkan $(\mathrm{N}=40)$ | $14(35.0 \%)$ | $10(25.0 \%)$ |
|  | Kavara $(\mathrm{N}=14)$ | $3(21.4 \%)$ | $3(21.4 \%)$ |
|  | Mannan $(\mathrm{N}=26)$ | $3(11.5 \%)$ | $11(42.3 \%)$ |
|  | Nayadi $(\mathrm{N}=31)$ | $8(25.8 \%)$ | $9(29.0 \%)$ |
|  | Panan $(\mathrm{N}=56)$ | $5(8.9 \%)$ | $13(23.2 \%)$ |
|  | Paravan $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ | $1(50.0 \%)$ | 0 |
|  | Pulayan $(\mathrm{N}=23)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 0 | $2(13.3 \%)$ |
|  | Velan $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | $12(80.0 \%)$ | $10(66.7 \%)$ |
|  | Cheruman $(\mathrm{N}=36)$ | $1(2.8 \%)$ | $4(11.1 \%)$ |
|  | Kanakkan $(\mathrm{N}=40)$ | $8(20.0 \%)$ | $10(25.0 \%)$ |
|  | Kavara $(\mathrm{N}=14)$ | $3(21.4 \%)$ | $5(35.7 \%)$ |
|  | Mannan $(\mathrm{N}=26)$ | $4(15.4 \%)$ | $7(26.9 \%)$ |


| Educational Qualification | Caste | Father | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 6 (19.4\%) | 8 (25.8\%) |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 15 (26.8\%) | 7 (12.5\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 1 (4.3\%) | 3 (13.0\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 3 (20.0\%) | 4 (26.7\%) |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 3 (20.0\%) | 1 (6.7\%) |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 5 (13.9\%) | 1 (2.8\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 4 (10.0\%) | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 2 (14.3\%) | 1 (7.1\%) |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 6 (23.1\%) | 3 (11.5\%) |
| High School | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 4 (12.9\%) | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 11 (19.6\%) | 4 (7.1\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 0 | 1 (4.3\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 9 (60.0\%) | 6 (40.0\%) |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2 (5.6\%) | 5 (13.9\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 4 (10.0\%) | 2 (5.0\%) |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 1 (7.1\%) | 1 (7.1\%) |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| SSLC | Nayadi (N=31) | 0 | 3 (9.7\%) |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 8 (14.3\%) | 8 (14.3\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 1 (50.0\%) | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 4 (17.4\%) | 4 (17.4\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 2 (13.3\%) | 1 (6.7\%) |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 1 (50.0\%) | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2 (5.6\%) | 4 (11.1\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 5 (12.5\%) |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 1 (7.1\%) | 3 (21.4\%) |
|  | Mannan (N=26) | 0 | 1 (3.8\%) |
| Higher Secondary | Nayadi (N=31) | 6 (19.4\%) | 5 (16.1\%) |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 2 (3.6\%) | 4 (7.1\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 7 (30.4\%) | 4 (17.4\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| Graduation | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 8 (22.2\%) | 5 (13.9\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 1 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 1 (7.1\%) | 0 |
|  | Mannan (N=26) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nayadi (N=31) | 3 (9.7\%) | 2 (6.5\%) |


| Educational Qualification | Caste | Father | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 2 (3.6\%) | 4 (7.1\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 7 (30.4\%) | 10 (43.5\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan (N=2) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 4 (11.1\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 2 (5.0\%) |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| Post-Graduation | Nayadi (N=31) | 1 (3.2\%) | 1 (3.2\%) |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 0 | 3 (5.4\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 2 (8.7\%) | 1 (4.3\%) |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kavara (N=14) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor of Philosophy | Nayadi (N=31) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 1 (1.8\%) | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| Uneducated | Chakkiliyan ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 3 (8.3\%) | 7 (19.4\%) |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 9 (22.5\%) | 11 (27.5\%) |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 3 (21.4\%) | 1 (7.1\%) |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 11 (42.3\%) | 3 (11.5\%) |
|  | Nayadi (N=31) | 3 (9.7\%) | 3 (9.7\%) |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 4 (7.1\%) | 10 (17.9\%) |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 1 (6.7\%) | 2 (13.3\%) |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 1 (50.0\%) | 1 (50.0\%) |

## Source: Primary Data

The table provides an insight related to the subcaste wise educational attainment of scheduled caste parents. It says, by considering Lower Primary as the first component in educational attainment, the Chakkiliyan family's parents' both male and female parents', having such qualification. Whose number is $0 \& 4$, In Cheruman, it is 6\&6. In Kanakkan, it is $14 \& 10$. In Kavara, it is $3 \& 3$. In Mannan, it is $3 \& 11$. It is $3 \& 11$ in Nayadi. In Panan, it is $5 \& 13$. In Paravan, it is $1 \& 0$, In Thotti, it is $0 \& 2$. And in Pulayan and Velan caste, no such parents having Lower Primary education as highest qualification.

In Upper Primary Education, the distribution of Parents in different subcaste are the following; In Chakkiliyan caste, the male parents are about 12 are qualified at UP and in female parents, it is 10 . In Cheruman, it is $1 \& 4$, in Kanakkan, it is $8 \& 10$, in Kavara, it is $3 \& 5$, in Mannan, it is $4 \& 7$, in Nayadi, it is $6 \& 8$, in Panan, it is $15 \& 7$, in Paravan, it is $0 \& 0$, in Pulayan, it is $1 \& 3$, in Thotti, it is $3 \& 4$ and in Velan Family, it is $0 \& 0$. In High School Education, The Chakkiliyan having a number of 3\&1, Cheruman having 5\&1, Kanakkan family having 4\&0, Kavara by 2\&1, Mannan by 6\&3, Nayadi by $4 \& 0$, Panan by $11 \& 4$, Paravan by $0 \& 0$, Pulayan, it is $0 \& 1$, Thotti by $9 \& 6$ and in Velan, it is $0 \& 0$.

In SSLC, the distributions are; $0 \& 0$ for Chakkiliyan family, $2 \& 5$ for Cheruman, $4 \& 2$ for Kanakkan, $1 \& 1$ for Kavara, $0 \& 0$ for Mannan, $6 \& 3$ for Nayadi, $8 \& 8$ for Panan, $1 \& 1$ for Paravan, $4 \& 4$ for Pulayan,2\&1 for Thotti and $1 \& 1$ for Velan Family. In Higher Secondary, it is $0 \& 0$ for Chakkiliyan caste, $2 \& 4$ for Cheruman, $0 \& 5$ for Kanakkan, $1 \& 3$ for Kavara, $0 \& 1$ for Mannan, $6 \& 5$ for Nayadi, $2 \& 4$ for Panan, Pulayan by $7 \& 4$, and Paravan, Thotti \& Velan having $0 \& 0$.

In Graduation, it is $0 \& 0$ for Chakkiliyan family. $8 \& 5$ for Cheruman, $1 \& 0$ for Kanakkan, $1 \& 0$ for Kavara, $0 \& 0$ for Mannan, $3 \& 2$ for Nayadi, $2 \& 4$ for Panan, $0 \& 0$ for Paravan, $7 \& 10$ for Pulayan and $0 \& 0$ for both Thotti and Velan family. In PostGraduation, the caste like Chakkiliyan, Cheruman, Kanakkan, Kavara, Mannan, Panan, Paravan, Thotti and Velan have 0 value. Only on Pulayan and Nayadi having a non-zero numbers like 2\&1. In Female parents, it is 0 for Chakkiliyan, Kavara, Mannan, Paravan, Thotti, and Velan. In Cheruman, it is 4, in Kanakkan, it is 2, in Nayadi, it is 1 , Panan by 3 and in Pulayan, it is 1 . In PhD, only 1 from Panan and 1 from Pulayan can be seen on male parents' case. No such women parents' have PhD.

In the uneducated parents' the castes like Chakkiliyan and Pulayan shows 0 , which means that no such uneducated persons can be seen in their family. In other caste, Cheruman by 3 male parents, Kanakkan by 9, Kavara by 3, Mannan by 11, Nayadi by 3, Panan by 4, Thotti by 1 and in Velan, it is 1 . In Female parents' it is 7 for Cheruman, 11 for Kanakkan, 1 for Kavara, 3 for Mannan, 3 for Nayadi, 10 for Panan, 1 for Paravan, 2 for Thotti and 1 in Velan Cast.

Table 5.17

Educational attainment versus subcaste (Siblings')

| Educational Qualification | Caste | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 4 (11.1\%) | 3 (8.3\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan (N=40) | 4 (10.0\%) | 2 (5.0\%) | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (7.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 8 (30.8\%) | 1 (3.8\%) | 0 | , |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 1 (3.2\%) | 1 (3.2\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 6 (10.7\%) | 3 (5.4\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 0 | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 1 (6.7\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UP | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 6 (40.0\%) | 9 (60.0\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 6 (16.7\%) | 3 (8.3\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 5 (12.5\%) | 4 (10.0\%) | 1 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 1 (7.1\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 5 (19.2\%) | 4 (15.4\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 3 (9.7\%) | 3 (9.7\%) | 3 (9.7\%) | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 4 (7.1\%) | 3 (5.4\%) | 1 (1.8\%) | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 2 (13.3\%) | 1 (6.7\%) | 1 (6.7\%) | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (6.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Velan (N=2) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| High School | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 9 (60.0\%) | 3 (20.0\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 1 (2.8\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 5 (12.5\%) | 0 | 1 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Kavara (N=14) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |


| Educational <br> Qualification | Caste | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $(14.3 \%)$ |  |
|  | Mannan (N=26) | $4(15.4 \%)$ | $3(11.5 \%)$ | 4 | $(15.4 \%)$ | 00


| Educational Qualification | Caste | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nayadi (N=31) | 8 (25.8\%) | 5 (16.1\%) | 1 (3.2\%) | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 5 (8.9\%) | 4 (7.1\%) | 5 (8.9\%) | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 1 (50.0\%) | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (50.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (73.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9 (39.1\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 1 (6.7\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 1 (50.0\%) | 1 (50.0\%) | 0 | 0 |
| Post-Graduation | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 1 (2.8\%) | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 0 | 1 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0 | 1 (3.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 1 (3.2\%) | 1 (3.2\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 3 (5.4\%) | 4 (7.1\%) | 4 (7.1\%) | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan (N=23) | 1 (4.3\%) | 4 (17.4\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor of Philosophy | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 1 (1.8\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uneducated | Chakkiliyan $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Cheruman ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0 | 1 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kanakkan ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Kavara ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mannan (N=26) | 1 (3.8\%) | 1 (3.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nayadi ( $\mathrm{N}=31$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Panan ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Paravan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pulayan ( $\mathrm{N}=23$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Thotti ( $\mathrm{N}=15$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Velan ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Source: Primary data

The educational attainment of children represents a vibrant part in any society, because they are going to be the policy makers or catalyst for the future development of the society. Here also considers a lot of variables starting from Lower Primary to Doctoral Degree. And here the caste wise count can also be available. For explaining the same, an assumption needs to be considered, that is as far as the family's strength in children's case is concerned, it is assumed that the maximum number of children are four. Among these, an overall count is taken into account in every subcaste. By considering LP as an education qualification, about 8 persons from Cheruman family having the same. It is 7 in Kanakkan community, it is 1 in Kavara, 9 in Mannan, 2 in Nayadi, 9 in Panan and Pulayan \& Thotti having 1. In UP education, about 15 persons from Chakkiliyan family belonging to this category. In Cheruman, it is 9. In Kanakkan, it is 10, Kavara by 1, Mannan by 9, Nayadi by 10, Panan by 8, Pulayan by 2, Thotti by 5 and Velan \& Paravan having None.

In high school education holding population, the proportion of Chakkiliyan by 12, Cheruman by 2, Kanakkan by 6 , Kavara by 2, Mannan by 11, Nayadi by 4, Panan by 10, Pulayan by 2 and Thotti by 1. In SSLC it is 3 in Chakkiliyan, 8 in Cheruman, 24 in Kanakkan, 12 in Kavara, 8 in Mannan, 17 in Nayadi,25 in Panan, 1 in Paravan, 14 in Thotti and Velan by 1 represents the same. In Higher Secondary 15 from Cheruman community, 5 from Kanakkan community, 13 from Kavara community, 6 from Mannan community, 17 from Nayadi, 22 from Panan, 1 from Paravan, 5 from Pulayan and 5 from Thotti had such qualifications.

In Graduation, 16 from Cheruman are graduates, 7 from Kanakkan are graduates, 4 from Kavara, 3 from Mannan, 14 from Nayadi, 14 from Panan, 2 from Paravan, 26 from Pulayan, 1 from Thotti, and 2 from Velan community are graduates. In Postgraduation, 2 from Cheruman, 1 from Kanakkan, 1 from Mannan, 2 from Nayadi, 11 from Panan, 5 from Pulayan are post-Graduates, the rest of the community's representation are poor. In Doctoral Degree, only a single one from the children community are qualified. In Uneducated stream, 1 from Cheruman, 2 from Mannan are uneducated. From this we can say that, as we are moving towards the higher education, the participation from the part of Scheduled Caste community is falling down.

Table 5.18

## First Degree holder of the family

| First degree holder | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Father | $25(9.6 \%)$ |
| Mother | $11(4.2 \%)$ |
| Father and Mother | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Sibling 1 Female | $21(8.1 \%)$ |
| Sibling 1 Male | $12(4.6 \%)$ |
| Sibling 2 Female | $6(2.3 \%)$ |
| Sibling 2 Male | $3(1.2 \%)$ |
| Sibling 3 Female | $9(3.5 \%)$ |
| None | $172(66.2 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Educational status of parents and grandparents plays a vital role the educational attainment of their children. Thereby this section deals with the finding out process of first-Degree holder of the family. Here both paternal and Maternal sides were considered. And it says that No such family's grand-parents got completed their education to get a Degree. And this table says that, the male parent was the first to hold such Degree by a percentage of 9.6. In Female Parent, it is $4.2 \%$, Both the parents represent $0.4 \%$, First female child is constituted by $8.1 \%$, first Male child by 4.6, Second female child by a percentage of 2.3 , second male by $1.2 \%$, Third female child by $3.5 \%$, and about 66.2 percentage family having no such first-degree holder. It shows that, the higher education attainment is pathetic in Scheduled caste community.

Table 5.19
Highest Degree Holder of the family

| Highest degree holder | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Father | $6(2.3 \%)$ |
| Mother | $14(5.3 \%)$ |
| Father and Mother | $8(3.0 \%)$ |
| Sibling 1 Female | $19(7.3 \%)$ |
| Sibling 1 Male | $9(3.5 \%)$ |
| Sibling 2 Female | $11(4.2 \%)$ |
| Sibling 2 Male | $3(1.2 \%)$ |
| Sibling 3 Female | $9(3.5 \%)$ |
| Sibling 1 \& 2 | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Sibling 2 Male \& Sibling 3 Female | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Father \& Sibling 1 Female | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Father, Sibling 1 Female \& Sibling 2 Female | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| All Members | $4(1.5 \%)$ |
| All Siblings | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| None | $172(66.2 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary Data

By considering the highest Degree holder of the family, the table shows that, father is the highest degree holder ( $2.3 \%$ ), Mother by $5.3 \%$, both by $3 \%$, first female child by 7.3, first male child by $3.5 \%$, second female child by $4.2 \%$, second male by $1.2 \%$, third female by $3.5 \%$, second child male and third child female by $0.4 \%$, father and first female child by $0.4 \%$, father, first female and second female child by $0.4 \%$, all members by $1.5 \%$, all children by $0.4 \%$, and $66.2 \%$ represents no such higher degree holder.

Table 5.20
Overall Education of the Population

| Educational Qualification | Count (Percentage) |
| :--- | :---: |
| LP | $136(14.0 \%)$ |
| UP | $180(18.5 \%)$ |
| High School | $111(11.4 \%)$ |
| SSLC | $163(16.8 \%)$ |
| Higher Secondary | $133(13.7 \%)$ |
| Graduation | $132(13.6 \%)$ |
| Post-Graduation | $36(3.7 \%)$ |
| Doctor of Philosophy | $3(0.3 \%)$ |
| Uneducated | $77(7.9 \%)$ |

Source: Primary data
Percentages are obtained by dividing the values with 971.
The educational attainment of the population considered as an indicator of that society's improvement. Here a briefing of the educational attainment of the sampling is represented in the above table. It shows that, out of 971 people in that locality, about 136 (14\%) having an education qualification of Lower Primary. About 180 (18.5) having Upper Primary education, 111 (11.4\%) having High School education, 163 (16.8\%) having SSLC, 133 (13.7) having Higher secondary education, 132 ( $13.6 \%$ ) having graduation, $36(3.7 \%$ ) having Post-graduation, and 3 ( $0.3 \%$ ) having Doctor of Philosophy. Along with that, about $7.9 \%$ of the scheduled caste population are uneducated. And here a notifying feature is that, as the education move upward, the count of population on that educational attainment are falling down. From this it is clear that the lion share was grabbed by Upper-Primary, then SSLC, third position by Lower Primary. From this it is clear that, the scheduled caste is educationally backward.

Graph 5.20 (a)
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Source: Primary Data
Table 5.21

## Computer Knowledge

| Computer Familiarity | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| No | $128(49.2 \%)$ |
| Yes | $132(50.8 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Other details influencing the productivity of Scheduled caste includes computer familiarity, extent of professional and technical education. Considering the same specifically computer familiarity, about 128 out of 260 houses having certain knowledge regarding the computer. But about 132 are still behind the category of non-familiar by the computer. This can be realized from the following figure clearly.

## Graph 5.21 (a)
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## Source: Primary data

Table 5.22

## Technical and Professional Education Details

| Professional and technical education | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| B Tech | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| B.Ed. | $8(3.1 \%)$ |
| B. Pharm | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| M Pharm | $3(1.2 \%)$ |
| Nursing | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Others | $3(1.2 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Regarding the professional and technical education, we cay says that only few of the family sent their children to attains the same. About 1 family's child went to grab BTech course. About 8 having B.Ed. Degree, 1 having B. Pharm, 3 having M. Pharm, 1 having Nursing and about 3 family falls into the category of others. Graphical representation is the following

Graph 5.22 (a)
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## Source: Primary data.

Table 5.23

## Knowledge regarding Constitutional Provisions

| Knowledge regarding constitutional provisions | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| No | $197(75.8 \%)$ |
| Yes | $63(24.2 \%)$ |

Source: Primary Data
Generally, the Scheduled caste are falling into the marginalized section of the society, to a large extent their knowledge regarding the constitutional provisions to avoid untouchability and various sections protecting the rights of scheduled caste are less. So here only about 63 families said that they were familiar with the provisions in our constitutions, and about 197 were still falling into the opposite side. This is mainly because of their lower educational attainment. The following represents the graphical explanations.

## Graph 5.23 (a)
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## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.24
Free Computer availed from the Government

| Free computer | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| No | $236(90.8 \%)$ |
| Yes | $7(2.7 \%)$ |
| NA | $17(6.5 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary Data

Since they were backward in every respect, the government is trying to improve their educational status by providing a lot of services, it includes free computer and study room grants, considering the same only countable families got such services. In the case of free computer, only 7 households availed the same, 197 households have said that, they didn't receive the computer from the government, and about 17 households said that such provision is not applicable to them. Graphical representation is the following.

Graph 5.24 (a)

## Computer availed from the Government



## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.25
Study Room Grant

| Study room grant from govt | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| No | $241(92.7 \%)$ |
| Yes | $6(2.3 \%)$ |
| NA | $13(5.0 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Study room grant were availed only 6 respondents, 241 households said that, they didn't receive this too and for 13 households, it is not applicable. This can be explained by the following graphs too.

## Graph 5.25 (a)
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Source: Primary Data
Table 5.26

Services available from the educational institutions by the students

| Services |  | Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No |  |  | Yes |
|  |  | $6(2.3 \%)$ | $62(23.8 \%)$ | $192(73.8 \%)$ |
|  | Mid-day meal | $19(7.3 \%)$ | $49(18.8 \%)$ | $192(73.8 \%)$ |
|  | Scholarship | $8(3.1 \%)$ | $60(23.1 \%)$ | $192(73.8 \%)$ |
|  | Remedial coaching | $27(10.4 \%)$ | $39(15.0 \%)$ | $194(74.6 \%)$ |
|  | Computer coaching | $25(9.6 \%)$ | $42(16.2 \%)$ | $193(74.2 \%)$ |
|  | Lumpsum grant | $1(0.4 \%)$ | $44(16.9 \%)$ | $215(82.7 \%)$ |
|  | Scholarship | $2(0.8 \%)$ | $43(16.5 \%)$ | $215(82.7 \%)$ |
|  | Remedial coaching | $34(13.1 \%)$ | $11(4.2 \%)$ | $215(82.7 \%)$ |
|  | PSC coaching | $45(17.3 \%)$ | 0 | $215(82.7 \%)$ |
|  | Civil service coaching | $45(17.3 \%)$ | $1(0.4 \%)$ | $214(82.3 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Other efforts which are considered to be more important to support the scheduled caste are includes lump-sum grant, mid-day meal, scholarship, remedial coaching and computer coaching at the school level, and at college, it includes lumpsum grant, scholarship, remedial coaching, psc coaching, civil service coaching...etc. Regarding lump-sum grant, this is available both at schools and colleges, major shares of the studying groups were able to receive the lump-sum grants, in the case of scholarship, about $23.1 \%$ at the school level receiving the same, and it is $16.5 \%$ at the college. About 39 households' children were received the remedial coaching at the school level and it is $4.2 \%$ at the college level. Regarding computer coaching, 0 nly $16.2 \%$ of the studying category received such services. At the college level other two services are also available in the form of PSC coaching and Civil Service coaching. Because their participation and successfulness in the same fields are lesser, thereby the government promote the implementation of the same in every area, but the pathetic thing is that, no such family's child got such coaching and in the case of Civil Service coaching, only a single household availed the same. The graphical representation regarding the services available from the educational institutions are the following.
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## Source: Primary Data

Table. 5.27
Risk factor identification of Education Attainment

| Factors | Category | Uneduca ted | Educated | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { value } \end{gathered}$ | OR (95\% <br> CI) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family status | BPL | $\begin{gathered} 460 \\ (47.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 335 \\ (34.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.634 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.74(0.27, \\ 2.04) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | APL | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (3.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \\ (7.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.61(0.21, \\ 1.76) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | General (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (6.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Family income | $<10000$ | $\begin{gathered} 372 \\ (38.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 183 \\ (18.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ 8^{*} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.75(0.22 \\ 2.58) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 10000- \\ & 25000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110 \\ (11.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 205 \\ (21.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.48(0.43, \\ 5.07) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 25000- \\ 50000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (5.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.39(0.39 \\ 4.98) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} >50000 \\ (\text { ref }) \end{gathered}$ | 7 (0.7\%) | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (3.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Nearby educational institution | No | $\begin{gathered} 225 \\ (23.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 176 \\ (18.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.346 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.86(0.63, \\ 1.17) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Yes (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 279 \\ (28.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 291 \\ (30.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Area | Rural | $\begin{gathered} 490 \\ (50.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 346 \\ (35.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ 5 * \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32(0.16, \\ 0.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Urban <br> (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (1.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ (12.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Job motivation | No | $\begin{gathered} 82 \\ (8.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (24.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.072 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.45(0.97 \\ 2.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Yes (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 422 \\ (43.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 232 \\ (23.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Education loan | No | $\begin{gathered} 504 \\ (51.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 463 \\ (47.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.984 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | NE |
|  | Yes (ref) | 0 | 4 (0.4\%) |  |  |
| Privatization affects the education attainment | No | $\begin{gathered} 363 \\ (37.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 412 \\ (42.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.006 \\ 7 * \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.69(1.16 \\ 2.47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Yes (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 141 \\ (14.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (5.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Family backward or forward educationally | Backward | $\begin{gathered} 419 \\ (43.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 184 \\ (18.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} <.000 \\ 1^{*} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32(0.21, \\ 0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Forward (ref) | $\begin{gathered} 85 \\ (8.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 283 \\ (29.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |

## Source: Primary Data

Footnote: * indicates statistically significant result. NE $=$ Non-estimable, ref $=$ Reference category, $\mathrm{OR}=$ Odds ratio.
$P$ value and Odds ratios are obtained from Logistic regression.
This table explains the risk factor identification of scheduled castes educational attainment. A lot of variables influence the educational attainment. It includes, family status, family income, Education loan, Job motivation, area, privatization of education and available nearby educational institutions. Any P value which is less
than 0.05 is considered as statistically significant. In this analysis, the p - value indicates that whether any factor is statistically significant to predict the educational attainment. For example, Family income the p-value is 0.0018 , which is less than 0.05 . And it means that the family income is a significant factor for predicting the educational attainment.

An Odds Ratio (OR) is a measure of association between a certain property A and a second property B in a population. Specifically, it tells how the presence or absence of an event influence the presence or absence of another event. In this analysis, the odds of being educated versus uneducated in each factor levels. For example, for the factor Area, we have got an odds ratio of 0.32 in rural with respect to urban area. Which means that the odds of being educated in rural area is lower as compared to urban.

Table 5.28

## Relationship between Family Income and Educational Attainment

| Family Income | Education Attainment |  | Chi-Square | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Uneducated | Educated |  |  |
| $<10000$ | $372(67.0 \%)$ | $183(33.0 \%)$ |  |  |
| $10000-25000$ | $110(34.9 \%)$ | $205(65.1 \%)$ | 124.07 | $<0.0001$ |
| $25000-50000$ | $15(23.1 \%)$ | $50(76.9 \%)$ |  |  |
| $>50000$ | $7(19.4 \%)$ | $29(80.6 \%)$ |  |  |

## Source: Primary Data

This table explains the relationship between the family income and educational attainment of the Scheduled Caste people. A higher P value indicates there is a strong correlation between family income and educational attainment.

Table 5.29
Relationship between Area and Educational attainment

| Family Area | Education Attainment |  | Chi-Square | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Uneducated | Educated |  |  |
| Rural | $490(58.6 \%)$ | $346(41.4 \%)$ | 108.35 | $<0.0001$ |
| Urban | $14(10.4 \%)$ | $121(89.6 \%)$ |  |  |

Source: Primary Data

Here the relationship between the area in which the people lives and the educational attainment can be realized. Here the value is significant, implies a greater degree of relationship.

Table.5.30

## Employment details

| Job Sector | Female (N=469) | Male (N=514) | Total (N=983) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child (<3 years old) | $12(2.6 \%)$ | $5(1.0 \%)$ | $17(1.7 \%)$ |
| Student Population | $73(15.6 \%)$ | $80(15.6 \%)$ | $153(15.6 \%)$ |
| Primary Sector | $123(26.2 \%)$ | $314(61.1 \%)$ | $437(44.5 \%)$ |
| Secondary Sector | $33(7.0 \%)$ | $69(13.4 \%)$ | $102(10.4 \%)$ |
| Service Sector | $28(6.0 \%)$ | $21(4.1 \%)$ | $49(5.0 \%)$ |
| Retired | $1(0.2 \%)$ | $6(1.2 \%)$ | $7(0.7 \%)$ |
| Unemployed | $199(42.4 \%)$ | $19(3.7 \%)$ | $218(22.2 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

The employment status of a particular society represents the extent to which human capital has been formed. The total population consisted with 983 people, out of which 469 are female and 514 are male. About 17 belongs to the child below 3 years, 153 belongs to the student category. The total population engaged in primary sector are 437 , out of which $61.1 \%$ (314) are male and $26.2 \%$ (123) are female. The lion share was comprised with this primary sector. In the case of secondary sector, about 102 were engaged, out of which $13.4 \%$ (69) are male and $7.0 \%$ (33) are female. In service sector, the shares are $5 \%$ (49), out of which 28 (6.0\%) are female and 4.1\% (21) are male. The overall participation of male is greater in primary and secondary sector, but, in service sector, female participation is greater. This table also represents the unemployment status too. About $22.2 \%$ are unemployed, it comes about 218 in numbers. Out of which 199 ( $42.4 \%$ ) are female and 19 (3.7\%) are male. The unemployment rate is greater for the scheduled caste women. In that total population, about 7 are retired from various jobs, 1 female and 6 males. It can be represented by the following graph.
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## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.31

## Unemployment Details

| Category | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Unemployed Male | $19(3.7 \%)$ |
| Unemployed Female | $199(42.4 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

Percentages are calculated separately for male and females, for males, the total male population is 514 , and for female, it is 469 . And from the table it is clear that the unemployed scheduled caste is greater in female gender. About 199 females are considered to be unemployed and about 19 males are unemployed.

Table 5.32

## Educated Unemployment

| Educated Unemployment | Count and Percentage |
| :---: | :---: |
| Male | $4(0.8 \%)$ |
| Female | $95(20.3 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

This table reveals the unemployment status of the scheduled caste population in the sample area. Here about 4 males approximately $0.8 \%$ are considered to be educationally unemployed, and in female category it is 95 , that is about $20.3 \%$ are educationally unemployed. This also shows the educated unemployment in female category is greater than Male.

Table 5.33
Number of Languages Known to the family

| Number of languages known | Count (Percentage) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $113(43.5 \%)$ |
| 2 | $141(54.2 \%)$ |
| 3 | $6(2.3 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary Data

Regarding the number of knowledges to the family members are taken into account in this table, and it says that about 113 households out of 260 are familiar only by a single language, about 141 by 2 languages and about 6 households are familiar by 3 languages. Number of knowledges known by the family doesn't mean that, all the members have the knowledge about that languages. At least one member who knows more than one language taken into the category of 2 and 3 . Number of knowledges known to the family do not have any relationship with the educational attainment too, some families do and others don't have. Graphical representation of the same is following.
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## Source: Primary Data

Table 5.34

## Employment Details Parents

| Job Sector | Father | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Population | 0 | $2(0.8 \%)$ |
| Primary Sector | $169(65.0 \%)$ | $103(39.6 \%)$ |
| Secondary Sector | $37(14.2 \%)$ | $14(5.4 \%)$ |
| Service Sector | $15(5.8 \%)$ | $12(4.6 \%)$ |
| Retired | $6(2.3 \%)$ | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Unemployed | $13(5.0 \%)$ | $124(47.7 \%)$ |
| NA | $20(7.7 \%)$ | $4(1.5 \%)$ |

Source: Primary Data

This table represents the employment status of Scheduled caste parents in the study area. The job status of a person depends on the education qualification. Generally, a highly educated person may like to work in the Tertiary or sector service sector, then only their preference biased to industrial sector followed by primary sector. But in some circumstances, they may be forced to work in opposite direction, and some may be ended up in unemployed status too. This table represents the extension by which
the human capital formation is taking place in different sector. From this, it is clear that the participation in different sectors is in opposite of their preference; about $65 \%$ of the male parents were finding their livelihood by ended up by engaged in primary sector, this one is completely on agriculture and allied activities. In female parents, it is $39.6 \%$. In secondary or industrial sector, the percentage of male parents engaged in the same are $14.2 \%$ and it is $5.4 \%$ in female parents. When we consider the service sector, it is $5.8 \%$ by the male parent and it is $4.6 \%$ by the female parents. Other details in some way have an influence on the job status and the improvement in the society are the unemployed persons percentage. It is $5 \%$ in Male parent and $47.7 \%$ in female parent. In some family, it is not applicable in the sense that, the family does not have such male and female parent head. It is, $7.7 \%$ in male parent and it is $1.5 \%$ in female head. Along with that a portion is goes to the student population, it is $0.8 \%$ in female parent and it is $0 \%$ in male parents.
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## Source: Primary data

Table 5.35

## Employment Details of Siblings

| Job Sector | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child (<3 years old) | $13(5.0 \%)$ | $4(1.5 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
| Student Population | $68(26.2 \%)$ | $60(23.1 \%)$ | $18(6.9 \%)$ | $6(2.3 \%)$ |
| Primary Sector | $87(33.5 \%)$ | $57(21.9 \%)$ | $18(6.9 \%)$ | $3(1.2 \%)$ |
| Secondary Sector | $24(9.2 \%)$ | $21(8.1 \%)$ | $5(1.9 \%)$ | $1(0.4 \%)$ |
| Service Sector | $14(5.4 \%)$ | $7(2.7 \%)$ | $1(0.4 \%)$ | 0 |
| Unemployed | $33(12.7 \%)$ | $33(12.7 \%)$ | $13(5.0 \%)$ | $3(1.2 \%)$ |
| NA | $21(8.1 \%)$ | $78(30.0 \%)$ | $205(78.8 \%)$ | $247(95.0 \%)$ |

## Source: Primary data

This table represents the employment status of the children of the families. The total number of children fall into the category of primary sector are 165, in secondary sector it is 51 . In service sector it is 22 . Total unemployed persons in this category are 82. And it is not applicable to some families, which means such family does not have a child.

## Graph 5.35 (a)

## Employment Details of Siblings



## Source: Primary data

Table 5.36

Education versus employment (Parents)

| Job Sector | Educational qualification | Father | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Population | Post-Graduation | 0 | 2 (100.0\%) |
| Primary Sector | LP | 34 (20.1\%) | 39 (37.9\%) |
|  | UP | 46 (27.2\%) | 28 (27.2\%) |
|  | High School | 34 (20.1\%) | 5 (4.9\%) |
|  | SSLC | 15 (8.9\%) | 8 (7.8\%) |
|  | Higher Secondary | 4 (2.4\%) | 5 (4.9\%) |
|  | Graduation | 6 (3.6\%) | 0 |
|  | Post-Graduation | 0 | 1 (1.0\%) |
|  | Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 30 (17.8\%) | 17 (16.5\%) |
| Secondary Sector | LP | 1 (2.7\%) | 0 |
|  | UP | 2 (5.4\%) | 0 |
|  | High School | 9 (24.3\%) | 0 |
|  | SSLC | 4 (10.8\%) | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  | Higher Secondary | 11 (29.7\%) | 4 (28.6\%) |
|  | Graduation | 9 (24.3\%) | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  | Post-Graduation | 1 (2.7\%) | 0 |
|  | Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 0 | 0 |
| Service Sector | LP | 2 (13.3\%) | 0 |
|  | UP | 0 | 1 (8.3\%) |
|  | High School | 1 (6.7\%) | 0 |
|  | SSLC | 1 (6.7\%) | 2 (16.7\%) |
|  | Higher Secondary | 2 (13.3\%) | 1 (8.3\%) |
|  | Graduation | 6 (40.0\%) | 8 (66.7\%) |
|  | Post-Graduation | 2 (13.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Doctor of Philosophy | 1 (6.7\%) | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 0 | 0 |


| Job Sector | Educational qualification | Father | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retired | LP | 0 | 0 |
|  | UP | 0 | 0 |
|  | High School | 0 | 0 |
|  | SSLC | 3 (50.0\%) | 0 |
|  | Higher Secondary | 1 (16.7\%) | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  | Graduation | 1 (16.7\%) | 0 |
|  | Post-Graduation | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctor of Philosophy | 1 (16.7\%) | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 0 | 0 |
| Unemployed | LP | 3 (23.1\%) | 19 (15.3\%) |
|  | UP | 5 (38.5\%) | 29 (23.4\%) |
|  | High School | 0 | 12 (9.7\%) |
|  | SSLC | 0 | 11 (8.9\%) |
|  | Higher Secondary | 0 | 15 (12.1\%) |
|  | Graduation | 0 | 8 (6.5\%) |
|  | Post-Graduation | 0 | 8 (6.5\%) |
|  | Doctor of Philosophy | 0 | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 5 (38.5\%) | 22 (17.7\%) |

## Source: Primary data

Education is considered as an indicator or pre-requisite to have a better employment status. Her the table shows the education qualifications of parents and their employment in different sectors shown simultaneously. In parent population, about 2 female parents belonging to the category of student population. The primary sector shows the agriculture and allied activities. In Primary sector, about 20.1\% of the male parents having an education of LP, it is $37.9 \%$ in the case of female parents. By considering UP as an education qualification, about $27.2 \%$ of the male parents and $27.2 \%$ of the female parents belonging to this category. High school qualified parents belonging to this sector are $20.1 \%$ for male and $4.9 \%$ for female. In SSLC holding population belongs to this sector are, $8.9 \%$ for male and $7.8 \%$ for female. Higher secondary qualified persons belonging to this category are $2.4 \%$ for male and $4.9 \%$ for female. Considering graduates working in this sector are only 6 male parents. In
post-graduates, only 1 female parent working in primary sector. Regarding uneducated population, about 30 males and 17 females working in this sector.

In Secondary Sector, the sector otherwise known as industrial or manufacturing sector, the qualification wise participation is the following. Only 1 male parent having LP working in this sector, 2 male parents having UP also working in this sector, 9 male parents having High school education belonging to this sector. The female parents having these qualifications working in this sector is Zero. By considering SSLC as a qualification, about 4 male parents and 5 female parents working in this sector. By Higher Secondary as a qualification, about 11 male parents and 4 female parents working in this sector. About 9 male graduates and 5 female graduates are working in this sector. In the case post graduates, only 1 female parent is working here and no such PhD and Uneducated persons are working in this sector.

In Service sector, about 2 male parents having LP working in this sector. 1 female with UP also working in this sector. 1 male parent having High School education, 1 male parent having SSLC and 2 female parents having SSLC also working here. In Higher Secondary qualified persons, 2 male and 1 female parent are working in this sector. About 6 males graduated and 8 female graduates are also working in this sector. And 1 male post graduate and I male PhD holder also working in this sector.

In retired hand section, 3 male retired persons from various services are holding a qualification of SSLC. 1 male and 1 female retired hand's having a qualification of Higher Secondary Education. 1 retired male person having graduation and 1 male PhD holder also a retired personality.

In unemployed category, 3 male parents are LP educated, 5 male parents are UP educated and 5 uneducated male parents are unemployed. In female parents, 19 having LP, 29 having UP, 12 having High School, 11 having SSLC, 15 having Higher Secondary, 8 having graduation, 8 having post-graduation and 22 uneducated are also belonging to the unemployed category. And from this, it is clear that the female unemployed persons are greater than male unemployed.

Graph 5.36 (a)
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Source: Primary data
Table 5.37

## Education versus Employment (Siblings)

| Job Sector | Educational qualification | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child ( $<3$ years old) | LP | 1 (7.7\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | NA | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (92.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (100.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Student Population | LP | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (14.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9 (15.0\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 2 (33.3\%) |
|  | UP | 9 (13.2\%) | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (16.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 5 (27.8\%) | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  | High School | 4 (5.9\%) | 4 (6.7\%) | 3 (16.7\%) | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  | SSLC | 4 (5.9\%) | 7 (11.7\%) | 3 (16.7\%) | 0 |
|  | Higher Secondary | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (14.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (18.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 (16.7\%) | 2 (33.3\%) |
|  | Graduation | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (42.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (25.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 (16.7\%) | 0 |
|  | PG | 2 (2.9\%) | 4 (6.7\%) | 0 | 0 |
| Primary Sector | LP | 7 (8.0\%) | 2 (3.5\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | UP | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (20.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (17.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 |
|  | High School | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (21.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 8 (14.0\%) | 6 (33.3\%) | 0 |
|  | SSLC | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (37.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (36.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 8 (44.4\%) | 2 (66.7\%) |


| Job Sector | Educational qualification | Sib 1 | Sib 2 | Sib 3 | Sib 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Higher Secondary | 8 (9.2\%) | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (22.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 (11.1\%) | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  | Graduation | 1 (1.1\%) | 1 (1.8\%) | 1 (5.6\%) | 0 |
|  | Uneducated | 1 (1.1\%) | 2 (3.5\%) | 0 | 0 |
| Secondary Sector | High School | 0 | 1 (4.8\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | SSLC | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (41.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 7 (33.3\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Higher Secondary | 7 (29.2\%) | 7 (33.3\%) | 3 (60.0\%) | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Graduation | 6 (25.0\%) | 5 (23.8\%) | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 |
|  | PG | 1 (4.2\%) | 1 (4.8\%) | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 |
| Service Sector | Higher Secondary | 4 (28.6\%) | 1 (14.3\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Graduation | 8 (57.1\%) | 3 (42.9\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | PG | 1 (7.1\%) | 3 (42.9\%) | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (100.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
|  | PhD | 1 (7.1\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unemployed | LP | 5 (15.2\%) | 1 (3.0\%) | 0 | 0 |
|  | UP | 5 (15.2\%) | 8 (24.2\%) | 1 (7.7\%) | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  | High School | 4 (12.1\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SSLC | 3 (9.1\%) | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (36.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 4 (30.8\%) | 0 |
|  | Higher Secondary | 6 (18.2\%) | 6 (18.2\%) | 1 (7.7\%) | 2 (66.7\%) |
|  | Graduation | 8 (24.2\%) | 3 (9.1\%) | 5 (38.5\%) | 0 |
|  | PG | 2 (6.1\%) | 3 (9.1\%) | 2 (15.4\%) | 0 |

## Source: Primary Data

The table shows the total children or the sibling population's education qualification along with their employment status in various sectors, namely primary, secondary and tertiary sector. By considering the total population having Lower Primary education engaged in Primary sector is 9 . Total UP holding child population belonging to this sector is 29, about 33 having High School education, about 64 having SSLC, 24 having Higher Secondary, 3 having graduates and 3 uneducated persons too engaged in Primary sector jobs.

Regarding Secondar sector, the distribution is the following. 1 person having high school education, 17 having SSLC, 18 having Higher Secondary, 12 graduates and 3 post-graduates also working in this sector.

In Service Sector, about 5 persons having higher secondary education, 11 graduates, 5 post-graduates and 1 PhD holder are working in this sector. And considering the
unemployed population in this sibling's group, 6 LP holders, 15 UP holders, 4 high school educated persons, 19 SSLC holders, 15 Higher secondary holders, 16 graduates and 7 post graduates are also unemployed. From this analysis it is clear that, as we are moving from primary to secondary and from secondary to tertiary, the education level is increasing, but the educated persons count is falling throughout.
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## Source: Primary data

## Findings from this Chapter:

> The district Palakkad endowed by an SC population of 403833. Out of which, 206382 are females and 197451 are males. Thereby the sex ratio is 1045 females for 1000 males.
$>$ Total number of Blocks under consideration are 13 in numbers; Alathur, Attappady, Chittur, Kollemkode, Kuzhalmannam, Malampuzha, Mannarkkad, Nemmara, Ottappalam, Palakkad, Pattambi, Srikrishnapuram and Thrithala.
$>$ Considering the Socio-economic status of the Scheduled Caste in Palakkad, they are not that much better in every respect, especially in the case of shelter. That is majority of the households are built by using bricks and those houses were constructed under various schemes like EMS and IAY from government.
> About 20 households are still thatched in nature out of 260 households. And about 2 households are still lacking toilet facility.
$>$ Regarding agricultural farm, only 6 households are having agricultural fields, and 2 families are having cattle rearing and poultry farming.
$>$ In the study area, about 217 houses are still in the BPL category and only $25 \& 18$ are in APL and General category. Which means only the general category belonging households are having a government employee.
> Regarding Rural Urban classification, about 224 houses are in Rural area and only 36 houses are in Urban area.
> Major, SC subcaste under consideration are Chakkiliyan, Cheruman, Kanakkan, Kavara, Mannan, Nayadi, Panan, Pulayan, Thotti and Velan. And Panan Community followed by Kanakkan and Cheruman are greater in numbers and the least are Velan community.
$>$ Majority of the houses are first generation in their educational attainment. That is about 186 households. And about 21 houses are not still having the achievement as first generation. That is, they are uneducated.
$>$ By considering the parental education, that is male parent as well as female parent in BPL, APL, and General category, majority of the male parents' education attainment is UP in BPL category, in the case of female parents, it is LP. Along with that the uneducated parents too are nearby the count of majority.
$>$ In APL family, graduation count is greater for the male parents.
$>$ In General category also graduates are greater, but it is applicable to both male and female parents.
> In overall count, both LP and UP have the same rate and percentage.
$>$ In children's educational attainment, the count from BPL houses is greater than APL and General category. And the concentration is greater in SSLC, this also is from BPL family. When we move upward to higher education, the count is falling continuously.
> Uneducated child is also greater in BPL family and which is zero in APL as well as General category.
> In parental education with area in which they reside, the parents in rural area has increasingly better educated than Urban area and rural women are increasingly better than rural men.
$>$ By considering the child education with respect to area, rural people are better educated compared to urban area.
> Parental education is not related to the available nearby educational institutions.
$>$ In the case of child population, there is a greater degree of relationship with available nearby educational institutions.
> The educational expenditure of the scheduled caste family is lesser both at the school and college level. The maximum values range between 0-3000 at school level, and $0-10000$ at college level. But it doesn't mean that expenditure on education is lesser, but it was financed by the government. So, we can say that education is a public good.
$>$ There is a strong relationship between the highest educational attainment and family income.
> Majority of the parents, obtained their educational attainment from governmental institution compared to Private and Aided. In the case of child populations too the education is attained from governmental institutions.
> The educational attainment of parents, in various sub caste shows that, most of the male parents in Kanakkan family holding LP. In female parents, it is Chakkiliyan and Kanakkan family.
> In High School education, Mannan male parent and Thotti female parent are greater.
$>$ In SSLC, Panan male parents and Panan female parents are greater.
> In Higher Secondary, Nayadi community's male parents are greater. In female parents, both Nayadi and Kanakkan family shows such improvement.
$>$ In graduation Cheruman male parents and Pulayan female parents are greater.
> In Post-graduation, the subcaste like Nayadi and Pulayan community having male parents' participation can be seen. In female parents, Cheruman community represents a greater share.
$>$ At PhD level, only 1 Panan and Pulayan parents' participation can be seen.
> In uneducated category, Mannan male parents and Kanakkan female parents share is greater.
> In Child population LP holding people are greater in Panan and Mannan community.
> UP holding populations are greater in Chakkiliyan community.
$>$ High School education is greater in Chakkiliyan families.
$>$ In SSLC Panan community's share is greater.
$>$ At Higher Secondary too, Panan community shows a better achievement.
$>$ At graduation level, Pulayan community had a greater share.
$>$ At Post-graduation level, Panan community's share is greater.
$>$ Regarding PhD , only 1 from Panan community can be seen.
> Uneducated siblings are existing in Mannan community.
$>$ Overall educational attainment is greater in Panan community.
$>$ Regarding first Degree holder of the family, no such families have an answer like grandparents. Majority family's first-Degree holder is father itself. And about 172 houses have not any such Degree holder.
> In case of Highest Degree holder, mother's count is greater. And about 172 houses have not such highest Degree holder.
$>$ Total educational attainment is greater at Upper Primary level followed by SSLC \& LP.
$>$ Regarding Computer literacy, about 128 households are illiterate.
$>$ Regarding Professional and Technical qualifications, B.Ed. proportion is greater.
> About 197 families are not even knows about constitutional provisions reserved for themselves.
$>$ The number of families got free computer from government is only 7 .
$>$ Study room grant by 6 households.
$>$ The services availed by the scheduled caste students from school are; Lumpsum grant, Mid-day meal, Scholarship, Remedial coaching and Computer coaching.
> At college level, it is Lumpsum grant, Scholarship, Remedial coaching, PSC coaching and Civil Service coaching.
$>$ Regarding the employment details, Primary sector contributed by $44.5 \%$ followed by Secondary $10.4 \%$ and Service Sector by $5 \%$.
$>$ Total count of unemployed persons is $218(22.2 \%)$.
$>$ Regarding educated unemployment, female count is greater than male count. That is about 95 by females and 4 by males.
> Number of languages known to the households are 3 in maximum, but majority households knows only 1 language.
> Regarding parental employment in different sectors, Primary sector stood by first by a count of 272 , Secondary by 51 and Service Sector by 27. This can be seen in child populations also.
> Total Unemployed are 137.
$>$ Regarding education and employment, the service sectors employees are highly educated. But in Primary and Secondary sector, even uneducated persons participations too can see. Even educated persons also were engaged in Primary sector. In the child populations category also follows this trend.
$>$ Educated unemployed persons count is also greater in the sample population.
So, from the analysis, we can derive the conclusion that, the Scheduled castes are basically poor and backward in every respect' especially in education and employment. Because only a countable number of persons were able to have a higher income earning job. And these higher income earning jobs are held by highly qualified personalities. But some persons having a better education may participate in low paid job also. And in general, all the low paid scheduled caste persons are less qualified.

