

# Impact of Structural Adjustment on Indian Education

G. Balatchandirane

“I say without fear of my figures being challenged successfully, that today India is more illiterate than it was fifty or a hundred years ago, and so is Burma, because the British administrators, when they came to India, instead of taking hold of things as they were, began to root them out. They scratched the soil and began to look at the root, and left the root like that, and the beautiful tree perished. The village schools were not good enough for the British administrator, so he came out with his programme. Every school must have so much paraphernalia, building, and so forth. Well, there were no such schools at all. ...ancient schools have gone by the board, because there was no recognition for these schools, and the schools established after the European pattern were too expensive for the people, and therefore they could not possibly overtake the thing. I defy anybody to fulfil a programme of compulsory primary education of these masses inside of a century. This very poor country of mine is ill able to sustain such an expensive method of education. Our State would revive the old village schoolmaster and dot every village with a school both for boys and girls.”

- Mahatma Gandhi

At Chatham House, London, 20 October, 1931<sup>(1)</sup>

## I Introduction

India had been pursuing economic policies that were inward looking under a centralized planning setup for about four decades till 1991. These policies tended to hold back a lot of potential growth in the economy. A near crisis situation in mid-1991 forced the government to drastically alter the basic economic philosophy it was employing till then. The foreign exchange

reserves position in India had shrunk quite low and was enough to cover just two weeks of imports. Growth was negative and inflation was rising alarmingly. The balance of payments situation was unmanageable and for the first time there was a real danger of India defaulting on its external debt obligations. The proximate cause of this situation was the fiscal profligacy and the mismanagement of the economy in the earlier decade. The crisis of 1991 led to a shift in favor of a pro-growth, market-oriented policy that opened the economy to foreign direct investment and freed the industry from the earlier licensing system. The New Economic Policy, which refers to the set of economic reforms initiated at this time, were reflective of the 'adjustment policies' that are associated with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and which were implemented around this time in well over 100 countries.

These policies, while questioning the dominant role of the State, promote the unbridled role of the market as the arbiter of development. The result is a steep fall in the public subsidies, including those aimed at education. The public posturing of the State is that there is a positive linkage between the process of economic liberalization and primary education. In the present milieu of a neo-liberal economic setup, this linkage implies a reduced role for the State and an increased emphasis on the functioning of the market. This explains the rise of privatization along with a decrease in State expenditure in real terms, in both higher and elementary education.<sup>(2)</sup>

Interesting implications have been arrived at in recent research which has studied both the adjusting and non-adjusting countries to see their impact on educational development. First, while investments in education do not rise when the economy is doing well, they definitely fall when there is a downturn, as during the adjustment periods. Secondly, the trade-off that follows is undesirable. The quality of education gets sacrificed for quantitative expansion, equity considerations are given up for quantitative expansion, investment priorities shift from mass education programs to higher education

Table no. 1  
LITERACY RATES 1991-RURAL AND URBAN, MALE AND FEMALE  
(percentages)

STATE	RURAL			URBAN			TOTAL		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Andhra Pradesh	47	24	36	76	56	66	55	33	44
Arunachal Pradesh	47	25	37	78	62	72	51	30	42
Assam	59	39	49	84	73	79	62	43	53
Bihar	48	18	34	78	56	68	52	23	38
Goa	82	63	72	86	73	80	84	67	76
Gujarat	67	39	53	85	68	77	73	49	61
Haryana	65	33	50	82	64	74	69	40	56
Himachal Pradesh	74	50	62	89	78	84	75	52	64
Jammu & Kashmir	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karnataka	60	35	48	82	66	74	67	44	56
Kerala	93	85	89	96	89	92	94	86	90
Madhya Pradesh	51	20	36	81	59	71	58	29	44
Maharashtra	70	41	56	86	71	79	77	52	65
Manipur	68	43	56	82	59	71	72	48	60
Meghalaya	45	37	41	86	77	82	53	45	49
Mizoram	77	67	72	95	92	93	86	79	82
Nagaland	63	50	57	86	79	83	68	55	62
Orissa	60	31	45	81	61	72	63	35	49
Punjab	61	44	53	77	66	72	66	50	59
Rajasthan	48	12	30	79	50	65	55	20	39
Sikkim	63	44	54	85	75	81	66	47	57
Tamil Nadu	67	42	55	86	70	78	74	51	63
Tripura	67	44	56	89	77	83	71	50	60
Uttar Pradesh	52	19	37	70	50	61	56	25	42
West Bengal	62	38	51	81	68	75	68	47	58
A & N Islands	76	62	70	87	75	82	79	65	73
Chandigarh	66	48	59	84	75	80	82	72	78
D & N Haveli	50	23	37	86	68	78	54	27	41
Daman & Diu	75	47	62	91	72	82	83	59	71
Delhi	78	52	67	82	67	76	82	67	75
Lakshwadeep	89	69	79	91	76	84	90	73	82
Pondicherry	76	54	65	88	72	80	84	66	75
INDIA	58	31	45	81	64	73	64	39	52

Source: Ministry of Human Resource Development 1999: 19

Note: Census was not conducted in 1981 in Assam and in 1991 in Jammu and Kashmir.

favoring the relatively well-off sections of society, and in real terms there is a decline in public investments in education. Thirdly, ways and means of funding education, which would have been frowned upon, if the economy had been in pink health, get sanctified. There is a clear association between intense adjustment policies and a fall in educational development.<sup>(3)</sup>

Table no. 2  
LITERACY RATES 1997-RURAL AND URBAN, MALE AND FEMALE  
(percentages)

STATE	RURAL			URBAN			COMBINED		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Andhra Pradesh	57	35	46	84	69	77	64	43	54
Arunachal Pradesh	67	45	58	86	73	81	69	48	60
Assam	81	63	73	92	85	89	82	66	75
Bihar	59	30	45	84	64	75	62	34	49
Goa	95	75	86	91	82	86	93	79	86
Gujarat	74	47	61	91	74	82	80	57	68
Haryana	71	45	59	88	69	79	76	52	65
Himachal Pradesh	86	69	76	95	85	90	87	70	77
Jammu & Kashmir	65	42	53	93	75	85	71	48	59
Karnataka	60	43	52	83	70	77	66	50	58
Kerala	96	90	93	96	90	93	96	90	93
Madhya Pradesh	64	32	49	87	68	78	70	41	56
Maharashtra	79	54	66	93	79	86	84	63	74
Manipur	82	62	72	95	77	88	86	66	76
Meghalaya	77	72	75	97	89	93	79	74	77
Mizoram	95	91	93	97	98	98	96	95	95
Nagaland	90	72	81	93	87	90	91	77	84
Orissa	60	33	46	87	67	78	64	38	51
Punjab	65	57	61	86	75	81	72	62	67
Rajasthan	69	27	49	90	63	77	73	35	55
Sikkim	84	70	77	92	80	86	86	72	79
Tamil Nadu	73	49	62	91	78	84	80	60	70
Tripura	76	64	70	96	85	91	79	67	73
Uttar Pradesh	66	35	51	80	62	71	69	41	56
West Bengal	78	58	69	90	76	83	81	63	72
A & N Islands	94	74	85	100	95	97	100	94	97
Chandigarh	68	42	59	94	77	86	90	74	83
D & N Haveli	63	25	45	100	85	93	66	30	49
Daman & Diu	93	72	86	99	74	87	95	73	86
Delhi	100	61	83	90	78	85	91	76	85
Lakshwadeep	98	94	96	98	90	94	98	93	96
Pondichery	94	84	89	93	87	90	94	86	90
INDIA	68	43	56	88	72	80	73	50	62

Source: Ministry of Human Resource Development 1999: 20. The original source is the 53<sup>rd</sup> Round of the National Statistical Survey.

In this article we focus on certain critical areas of Indian education and attempt to see what happened to these areas during the period of the structural adjustment policies starting from the early 1990s, using literacy rates as the representative quantitative manifestation of the spread of elementary education. Table no.1 gives the detailed breakup of male and female literacy rates in both rural and urban areas in all the states of India. We can use this as a bench mark and compare it with Table no.2 which gives comparable figures for 1997, the latest year for which data is available. This gives us an idea on the progress of the spread of literacy in all the regions of India in

the structural adjustment period. A cursory glance at the tables will give the impression that India has not done too badly. However, we contend that Indian education has suffered during the structural adjustment period. In what follows, after providing a brief historical sketch of the colonial and the post-independence period, we cover

1. The disparities in the spread of education over regions and social groups
2. The financial aspects of education like the low investments in education, and the subsidies question in higher education
3. The State's indifference to and diminishing role in the field of education as seen in its abdication of its constitutional obligations, the privatization of education and the phenomenon on foreign aid in education

## **II Brief historical overview of the colonial period**

As is well known, the colonial rulers were neither energetic nor enthusiastic when it came to providing education to the Indian population. The literacy rate was 6.3% in 1881, 7.3% in 1911 and 9.3% in 1931. The rulers had created a class of educated Indians to help them administer the country and felt little compulsion to proceed beyond that. Enlightened Indian leaders did fight for mass education. But the Indian elite was vociferous in its demands and ensured that its class interests were taken care of. Thus institutions of higher learning that taught through the medium of English came to be setup, though the crying need of the hour was rapid spread of literacy and basic education in the vernacular.<sup>(4)</sup> Thus when the literacy rate hovered around 6% in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, universities were started. This early development of higher education, in response to the demands of the elite since the late nineteenth century, was to leave its stamp on the growth of education in the post-colonial period.

### III The progress in the half century after independence

Public primary schools have been rapidly set up. Now there are nearly 600,000 of these schools all over the country. There are about 185,000 secondary schools and about 100,000 high schools. There are nearly 7200 colleges for general education while those for professional education number over 2000. Universities, deemed universities and institutions of national importance put together are around 229. As of 1997, over 108 million students were enrolled in grades 1-5. Over 39 million were enrolled in grades 6-8 and about 18 million were enrolled in grades 9-10. As many as 95% of the primary schools are available within a walking distance of 1 kilometer. Adult literacy rates have grown from 18% in 1951 to 62% in 1997, a more than threefold increase. Female literacy has shown a dramatic rise from 9% to 50% in the same period.

On the negative side, there are 35 million children still out of school. 37% of all primary school children drop out before reaching grade 5. The largest illiterate population in the world (424 million or about 30% of the world total), which is more than the population of North America and Japan put together, resides in India. India spends just about 3.5% of its GNP on education. Attendance, completion and quality are major areas of concern. 5% of the primary schools are more than one kilometer away from the students. 84% of the primary schools have no latrines. While 58% of the primary schools have no safe drinking water, 42% of them have no playground. 8% of the schools have no building and 14% are mud or thatched huts.<sup>(5)</sup>

One feature of Indian education, which cries for attention, is the low spread of education. Table no.3 shows the attainments of literacy in the years 1951 to 1991. The latest available figures for literacy in India are found in the 53<sup>rd</sup> round of the National Sample Survey which gives an overall literacy rate of 62% for the population in the '7 years and above' category for the year 1997. Education policy in post-independence India has suffered from

TABLE no. 3  
LITERACY RATES IN INDIA, 1951-1991

YEAR	AGE GROUP	OVERALL	MALE	FEMALE	RURAL	URBAN
1951	5 and above	18.33	27.16	8.86	12.10	34.59
1961	5 and above	28.30	40.39	15.33	22.46	54.43
1971	5 and above	34.45	45.95	21.97	27.89	60.22
1981	7 and above	43.67	56.50	29.85	36.09	67.34
1991	7 and above	52.21	64.13	39.29	44.69	73.09

Source: Tyagi, P.N. 1993: p. 22.

various kinds of inconsistencies and contradictions. These would include 1) confusion of objectives, 2) inconsistencies between stated goals and actual policy, and 3) contradiction between stated goals and resource allocation. As an offshoot of the last point is the widespread acceptance of child labor for boys and girls of poor families, while the privileged classes have ensured and perpetuated their access to heavily subsidized higher education.<sup>(6)</sup>

The push given to higher education by the elite in the colonial period was accentuated after independence. The investment patterns in education were dictated not by economic criteria but by the vested interests of the ruling elite and by misconceptions about the role of education. Higher education grew at 10% per annum in the 1960s while elementary education registered growth rates in the range of 2-3%. The first twenty-five years after independence saw the number of universities in India grow by more than four times and double over the next twenty-five years. The culturally dominant and economically stronger sections of society exploited the resources of the State to consolidate their grip on the expanding status apparatus of new functions and opportunities.<sup>(7)</sup>

#### IV Disparities in education

The disparities seen in Indian education can be classified as those seen among various castes, as those between the urban and rural regions and between the two genders. The phenomenon of disparities can also be seen on the basis of various states, religions, etc. However confining ourselves to the earlier three disparities itself will give us a good idea of the huge differentials in education seen among various social groups and regions. The extreme diversity in the diffusion of educational attainments is endemic and a very tenaciously enduring feature that has to be taken into account before any policy prescription is made.

The literacy rate for India in 1997 was 62%, showing a jump of 10% percentage points over the figures for 1991. However, this hides the fact that the literacy rate for rural women in Dadar Nagar Haveli was just 25% and that for urban male in Andaman and Nicobar Islands was 100%. If a person has all the three disadvantageous attributes of being a woman, living in a rural area and belonging to a backward social caste, the picture can be quite dismal: just 4.4% of the Scheduled Tribe women in the state of Rajasthan were literate in 1991.

##### IV.I Caste disparities

Those belonging to the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe classification have historically featured at the bottom rungs of the caste hierarchy. These were the “untouchables” and had roughly the same status as *eta* or *burakumin* in Japanese society. Put together these two social groups account for close to a fourth of the Indian population. The scheduled castes comprise about 16% of the population and the scheduled tribes about 8%. Even after independence these socially disadvantaged groups have continued to have low access to education. In 1991, as against the national average of 52% literacy rate, that for the scheduled castes was 37% and for the scheduled tribes it



was 30%. The problem with these disadvantaged castes is that while their enrolment rates are low the dropout rates are high. 70% of the scheduled caste students and 80% of the scheduled tribe students drop out between grades 6 and 8.

Explanations for the educational backwardness of these socially disadvantaged groups usually revolve around poverty and the illiterate home environments. It has been found that the learning environment in the formal educational system has also been affecting the children from these castes. Poor infrastructure facilities and an unsympathetic system of pedagogy tend to discourage the schooling of these children. The apathetic treatment by teachers and school administrators contribute in no small measure to the loss of interest in these children. The State, which could have done so much to ameliorate the situation, has been indifferent. Formal education positively affects the awareness, ideological education, political consciousness and the cultural acquisition of education. Notwithstanding various limitations, the acquisition of education by the socially disadvantaged castes has been found to be associated with positive social, political and cultural changes even under a State-sponsored and upper caste dominated system of education. But the going will not be easy what with the higher caste prejudices and an unimaginative system of school textbooks.<sup>(8)</sup> The structural adjustment period has been driven by the market and the specific requirements of these disadvantaged sections of society in terms of socially relevant study material that is sympathetic to their requirements and provision of proper infrastructure for them has not been accorded any priority.

#### **IV.II Rural-urban disparities**

The rural-urban gap in literacy rates is quite striking. In 1997, the urban literacy rate was 80% while that in the rural areas was just 56%. It should be pointed out that the economic returns to investment in education of rural masses are higher than those for the urban worker. Thus public subsidization

of education of the rural workers can be supported on the grounds of economic efficiency. It has been found that rural households tend to invest less in the education of their children either because they fail to recognize the benefits of education or because they cannot afford to invest in education or because of both.<sup>(9)</sup>

While India's literacy rate is much lower compared to that of China, the Indian state of Kerala has a literacy rate which is higher than China's. Further, Kerala's female literacy rate is higher than that of *every individual province* in China. The diverse performances of the Indian states mean that apart from learning from other countries, India has much to learn from *itself*.<sup>(10)</sup> About three-fourths of the out-of-school children are in just six states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. Gender disparity is as much as 42 percentage points for enrolment rates in Bihar and 31 for Uttar Pradesh, but is only 3 percentage points for Kerala. As against Kerala's female literacy rate of 90%, Bihar's figures are only 34%.

Of late, the state of Mizoram has emerged as the one with the highest literacy rate in 1997 at 95%, relegating Kerala, the erstwhile showpiece, to second position with a figure of 93%. The urban literacy rate for Mizoram was 98% and the rural rate was 93%. The worst performing state was Bihar, with an overall literacy rate of 49%. The poorly performing states of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh have lowered the national average as they account for 40% of the total population.

#### IV.III Gender disparities

Literacy rates are much lower for women than for men in most regions. India has one of the highest gender gaps in literacy rates in the world. Only five countries (Bhutan, Syria, Togo, Malawi and Mozambique) have a higher gap than India. Rajasthan, which has the highest gender gap in literacy in the world, has a population that is larger than that of all the five countries

mentioned.<sup>(11)</sup> The states of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh are only marginally better than Rajasthan.

Traditionally, a very low priority has been accorded to women's education in India. By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the female literacy rate was still *below one percent*, with few exceptions, in every province of British India. Compared to this state of affairs, the progress in female literacy in the 20<sup>th</sup> century seems a positive development. But it is abysmal when we compare India's record with other countries. In India, half of all females in the 15-19 age group are illiterate, while in the case of China it is less than 10%. There are over 120 districts in India where rural female literacy is less than 10 percent. The mean years of schooling for females in 1992 were just 1.2 years as against 3.5 years for males.

There are convincing reasons that explain why there has been a low importance given to female education in the society and why this continues to be so. First, existing gender division of labor tends to lower the perceived benefits of female education. In much of rural India, girls are expected to spend their lives in domestic work and child rearing. These being the social expectations of the girl child, it does not seem worthwhile to the parents to invest in female education. The immense benefits that accrue through female education are something that does not enter into their calculations. Secondly, the norms of patrilocal residence and village exogamy which expects a woman to settle in her husband's village after marriage act as a disincentive to parents' investing in their daughter's education. The benefits of investments made in a daughter's education are seen to go to a distant household. Parental self-interest colors the view and a low value is associated with female education. Third, the practice of dowry and the ideology of hypergamous marriage turn girls' education into a liability. An educated girl can only marry a more educated boy, and dowry payments increase with the education of the groom. These being the basic unstated operative rules of the marriage game, an educated girl is more expensive to marry off. On the

other hand, in the case of boys' education, the perception of education ensuring better job prospects acts as an economic incentive; old-age security is a secondary consideration.

In the recent liberalized milieu of the structural adjustment period, general awareness of the masses has increased; this has resulted in the narrowing down of the educational aspirations between various social groups. So one finds that the rural poor is keen to send its children to school as they no more need to be told about the positive impact of education. But even mothers discriminate like fathers when it came to educating their sons and daughters. Greater preference is shown for sending the son to school and the son is expected to spend larger number of years compared to the daughter. In some communities, the norm simply is that girls do not study. Though parental motivation in educating the girl child is low, offering quality education can influence it.

The quality of education and the proper functioning of the school are major factors that affect the parental decision to send the girl child to school. It is now realized that one important reason for the persistence of endemic female illiteracy in India is the poor functioning of the schooling system. When parents find that the school in their village is non-functional or functions only poorly, they usually respond by sending their sons to study in other villages, or to private schools in the village itself where the fees would be higher but where some useful schooling takes place. But the same response is not seen in the case of girls, as parents hesitate to send their daughters to go outside the village, or to pay the fees associated with a private school. Thus the breakdown of a government school affects female children more than male children.<sup>(12)</sup> As the government schools account for an overwhelming majority of the total, the deficiencies in the government schooling system affects the girl child greatly. While it is easy to find fault with the parents' discriminatory attitude towards the education of boys and girls, the failure of the State in providing proper functioning schools and

quality equation is the major reason.

The male literacy rate in 1997 was 73% while that for females was just 50%. The figures for the year 1991 are 64% and 34% respectively. While there is an improvement in absolute terms, the gender gap in literacy has narrowed from 25 percentage points to 23 percentage points. However both in absolute and in relative terms the female literacy rates have been lagging behind and are a cause for great concern. There is enough international evidence to show that the education of women is not only crucial to economic development; it might be more effective than the raising of male literacy rates.<sup>(13)</sup> Table no.4 provides the trends in the disparities in the structural adjustment period. There has been only a marginal lessening of the disparities in the structural adjustment period.

When we arrange the states of India in an ascending order of female literacy rates and see the performance of the social indicators, there is a clear correlation between the two. Namely, the higher the female literacy rate for a state, the higher is the life expectancies (both male and female), and the lower the infant and maternal mortality rates. Similar results are seen when we sort the above mentioned social indicators on the basis of the gender gap in state literacy rates.<sup>(14)</sup> While the policy implications are obvious, what is more important is the fact that the price the society pays for neglecting female education is larger compared to what would have been lost if male

Table no. 4  
Gender gap and rural-urban gaps in literacy in India in the  
Structural Adjustment Period  
(Percentage points)

	Gender gap in literacy in rural India	Gender gap in literacy in urban India	National gender gap in literacy	Urban - rural gap in literacy
1991	27	17	25	28
1997	25	16	23	24

Computed from: Ministry of Human Resource Development 1999.

education had been neglected.

## V Financing Issues

### V.I Low investments

Indian investments in education have shown a tremendous rise in the last half-century. In current prices, educational expenditure has ballooned from about 550 million Rupees in 1955 to about 370 billion Rupees in 1996-7, denoting a jump of over 670 times. But if we consider the 1) Rapid growth of population, 2) Phenomenal increase in the number of students and 3) Rise in prices, then the real increase in expenditure per student turns out to be modest. Table no.5 gives the plan (development) and non-plan (maintenance) expenditures of both the centre and the states on education in the recent past. The 1950s were a period of rapid growth in total expenditure on education. The 1960s too were a favorable period for education. There was a check on the growth of expenditure on education during the 1970s. This gave place to a revival of interest in education in the 1980s as education was considered as an important component of human development. Thus expenditure on education rose during the 1980s. As against this the 1990s can only be described as a 'decade of containment'. Though there seems to have been systematic efforts to raise the allocations, these have been stymied by the policies of stabilization and structural adjustment which dictated that the social sector allocations be reduced. The rate of total growth and that of per capita growth overall has not come near those of the 1950s. Secondly, the rate of growth of education expenditure in the past half a century is only slightly more than the growth in the national economic indicators.<sup>(15)</sup>

Education expenditure of India seen as a percentage of the Gross National Product has risen from about 1% about half a century back to nearly 3.5% now. However, this ratio can be seen to be low when we make an international comparison. The world average for this figure is 4.8%. The

Table no. 5  
Plan and Non-Plan Expenditure on Education in Centre and States  
(Revenue Account)

(Rupees, in 10 millions)

Year	Plan Expenditure			Non-Plan Expenditure			Total(Plan + Non-Plan)		
	Centre	States	Total	Centre	State	Total	Centre	State	Total
1968-69	24 (26)	69 (74)	93 (100)	20 (4)	536 (96)	556 (100)	44 (7)	605 (93)	649 (100)
1971-72	39 (28)	101 (72)	140 (100)	33 (4)	822 (96)	855 (100)	72 (7)	922 (93)	995 (100)
1981-82	86 (25)	262 (75)	348 (100)	155 (5)	3287 (96)	3442 (100)	241 (6)	3549 (94)	3790 (100)
1987-88	772 (51)	750 (49)	1521 (100)	430 (5)	8479 (95)	909 (100)	1202 (12)	228 (88)	10430 (100)
1996-97	3441 (44)	4458 (56)	7899 (100)	1092 (4)	27593 (98)	28685 (100)	4533 (12)	32051 (88)	36584 (100)

Source: Ministry of Human Resources Development 1997: 26

Note: Figures in brackets show percentage share.

industrialized countries spend about 5.1% of their GNP on education while the developing world spent about 3.6% of theirs. Thus India seems to be doing not too badly. But a break up of the figures for the developing world tells the actual story. The figure for Sub-Saharan Africa is 5.4% that for Eastern Europe and the CIS is 4.6%. Latin America and the Caribbean registered 4.6%.<sup>(16)</sup> Thus Indian investments in education is nowhere near what either the developed or developing world is making.<sup>(17)</sup> Table no.6 provides the sector-wise allocations in education by both the centre and states in the past five decades.

Two points need to be highlighted here. First, the developed world is spending immense amounts on education *after* having made substantial investments in this sector in the past. Secondly, the fact that a country is part of the developing world is no excuse why it can not invest properly in education. Japan did invest substantial amounts in education more than a century

Table no. 6  
Percentage Expenditure of Education Departments of Centre and State Governments by Sectors

	Year	EE	SE	AE/Spl Edn	TE	HE	Others	Total
Centre	1951-52	18.7	26.2	4.2	NA	22.3	28.6	100.0
States		48.0	18.7	5.4	NA	10.5	17.5	100.0
Total		46.1	19.1	5.3	NA	11.2	18.2	100.0
Centre	1961-62	4.5	10.2	0.9	NA	44.1	40.3	100.0
States		43.9	22.0	5.4	NA	9.8	18.8	100.0
Total		40.0	20.8	5.0	NA	13.3	21.0	100.0
Centre	1971-72	0.0	0.7	NA	28.8	47.1	23.5	100.0
States		44.7	31.7	2.2	3.6	9.5	8.4	100.0
Total		41.4	29.4	2.0	5.4	12.2	9.5	100.0
Centre	1981-82	4.4	9.8	4.2	24.2	45.6	11.7	100.0
States		46.5	33.9	0.5	2.7	13.2	3.2	100.0
Total		43.8	32.3	0.8	4.1	15.3	3.7	100.0
Centre	1986-87	5.1	20.1	7.0	23.6	39.1	5.1	100.0
States		49.3	31.7	0.7	2.9	12.2	3.3	100.0
Total		45.9	30.8	1.2	4.5	14.2	3.4	100.0
Centre	1987-88	17.8	20.4	4.9	21.9	27.5	7.6	100.0
States		50.3	32.2	0.8	2.9	12.0	1.7	100.0
Total		46.6	30.9	1.3	5.1	13.9	2.4	100.0
Centre	1991-92	16.5	23.8	6.1	18.4	28.9	6.3	100.0
States		49.3	34.0	0.7	2.9	11.4	1.7	100.0
Total		46.3	33.1	1.2	4.3	13.0	2.1	100.0
Centre	1996-97	50.9	15.9	5.0	10.7	15.7	1.7	100.0
States		50.0	32.7	0.5	3.1	10.9	2.9	100.0
Total		50.1	30.6	1.0	4.0	11.5	2.7	100.0

Source: Ministry of Human Resources Development 1997: 27

Note: EE-Elementary Education, TE-Technical Education, SE-Secondary Education, HE-Higher Education, AE-Adult Education

back when she was just beginning to modernize. What made it possible was the State's commitment to the cause. Once the public was convinced of it they also cooperated in no small measure. Unfortunately, it would be difficult to say the same thing in the Indian context.<sup>(18)</sup>

## V.II Subsidies in higher education

Turning to the question of subsidies in higher education, these have come under close scrutiny in the present milieu of structural adjustment. It has



been found that investment in primary education carries higher returns compared to secondary education, which in turn gives larger returns than higher education. There are problems in financing higher education and how the cost can be recovered is a complicated issue. Higher education cannot be priced like any other good or service due to the externalities in education, namely, the benefits which flow to people other than those who pay for it, and because it is not possible to limit education to only those who pay for it.

The University Grants Commission (UGC) appointed a High Powered Committee under the Chairmanship of Justice Dr. K. Punnayya to examine the financial situation in central universities, institutions deemed to be universities and a number of other institutions. Among other things the Committee was to examine "the manner in which plan and non plan grants should be determined, the rationale norms that should be adopted, and look into the pattern and system of expenditure of institutions fully funded by UGC." The Committee, in its Report of 1993 unequivocally reiterated that "... State funding must continue to be an essential and mandatory requirement to support higher education. It was the perception of the Committee that "... the State must continue to accept the major requirements of the universities."<sup>(19)</sup>

The Committee held that there is a mistaken notion that higher education sector is self-sufficient and that it does not require State support. The international evidence did not corroborate this. Table no.7 bears this out. Even in the private universities and institutions in the US, the share of fees was less than 40% and in public institutions it was around 15%. In British universities it was less than 14% and in France it was less than 5% of the total income of the institutions.

The Committee stated it "... viewed the role of higher education:

- 1) as an essential input for meeting the manpower requirement for important and crucial areas of national development and for the integral part of national effort at human resources development ;

Table no. 7  
Sources of Income of Higher Education Institutions (%)

Country/Type of institutions	Year	General Funds	Pubic	Fees	Other Income
France	1975		93.00	2.90	4.20
All Institutions	1984		89.50	4.70	5.80
Germany	1986		68.50	0.00	31.50
All higher education					
Japan	1971		9.00	75.80	15.10
Private 4-yr institutions	1985		15.00	65.80	19.10
Public institutions	1970		83.10	2.00	14.90
All institutions	1987		63.10	8.80	28.00
	1971		53.06	31.69	15.20
	1987		41.99	35.78	22.20
Netherlands	1985		80.00	12.00	8.00
All institutions					
Norway					
Public institutions	1975		95.00	N.A.	5.00
	1987		90.00	N.A.	10.00
Spain					
Universities	mid-1980s		80.00	20.00	N.A.
United Kingdom					
Universities	1970-71		71.20	6.30	22.40
	1986-87		55.00	13.70	31.30
Polytechnics (England only)	1986-87		72.40	16.20	11.40
United States					
Private institutions	1969-70		20.70	38.60	40.60
	1984-85		18.40	38.70	42.90
Public institutions	1969-70		61.10	15.10	23.70
	1984-85		59.30	14.50	26.30
All institutions	1969-70		46.50	20.50	29.90
	1986		44.80	22.40	32.80

Source: Punnyaya, K 1993: 16 Original source: OECD, *Financing Higher Education: Current Patterns*.

Notes:

France	Expenditure of National Ministry of Education
Japan	73 percent of other income is revenue of hospitals attached to universities
Norway	Figures for fees not available but very small
United Kingdom	Almost all the fees of undergraduate students are paid out of public funds. This amounts to about half the fee income of universities and probably a greater proportion of the fee income of polytechnics.
United States	Figures include all government expenditure at all levels. Loans and grants to students amounted to about 80 percent of fees in 1969-70 and 95 percent in 1984-85.

- 2) as a critical input to ensure social justice and equity for providing upward mobility and access to higher levels of economic and social activities for the weaker sections ; and
- 3) as an important input for improving the quality of life by making higher levels of knowledge available to a wider base of population and for preserving our cultural heritage.”

Hence the Committee concluded, “... the role of higher education will continue to be a very important element of national endeavor and will fully justify support and intervention by the State.”<sup>(20)</sup> There is ample research to show that the Committee took the right decision.<sup>(21)</sup>

## **VI State's failure to provide education and its abdication role**

### **VI.I Constitutional Obligations and the State**

Article 45 in Part IV of the Constitution of India states: “*The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education to all the children up to age fourteen*”. A full half-century has passed since the Constitution commenced, but not even two-thirds of the target has been met. The Constituent Assembly in 1948-50 had decided to place education in Part IV of the Constitution that deals with the Directive Principles of State Policy. Clause 37 of Part IV defines the application of the Principles contained in that Part. It holds that “The provision contained in this Part shall not be enforceable by any court, but the principles therein laid down are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country and it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws.” The Directive Principles of State Policy are not justiciable ; that is, the government cannot be taken to court for its failure to abide by the Directive Principles. Part III of the Constitution deals with Fundamental Rights and is justiciable. The Indian State has stone-walled efforts to introduce education in Part III of the Constitution.

Education, particularly elementary education has never occupied a high position in the perception of the Indian State. Political parties too, have consistently attached a low priority to education. The State has fixed various target dates to achieve universal literacy, only to extend them as the target date neared. It has dilly-dallied in its response to the public demand for making education a fundamental right.

However in an historic judgement, the Supreme Court of India held that education was a fundamental right. It held that "Without education, dignity of the individual cannot be assured" and that "The 'right to education' flows directly from right to life". It highlighted the fact that only Article 45 of Section IV of Constitution had a time limit (namely 10 years) and held that "... the right to free education up to the age of 14 years is a fundamental right".<sup>(22)</sup>

The State has always been tardy in providing universal literacy and education to the masses. The failure of the State to accord on education a central role in the development plans is glaring. The various acts of commission and omission of the State and the various political parties, does not go with the rhetoric that constantly emanates from them. The State's abdication of its essential role, despite the exhortation by the Constitution is evident.

A case can be made out to show that in a developing country like India, there is little incentive for political parties to actively promote rapid diffusion of literacy as it goes against their interests, at least in the short term. A large uneducated population becomes amenable to political manipulation and hence the political benefits of a largely illiterate population is more than that of a literate one, from the point of view of the various political parties that are vying to come to power. Once in power, political parties realize that an uneducated population is easily governed than an educated one. The collective conspiracy of various political parties as seen in their apathy to providing education to the masses is thus understandable. There is no shortage of international evidence that points to the useful role education plays in

modernization and the crucial role the State can play.<sup>(23)</sup> Surprisingly, education has never been a political issue in any election, anywhere in India.

Of late, various political parties have been talking of universal elementary education and raising the expenditure on education to at least 6% of GNP. None of them have been consistent in their stand and a number of them, while in power, did not seriously implement policies that would have taken the country anywhere near the above stated two objectives. Raising these twin issues of universal elementary education and increased allocation for education is the politically correct thing to do, and none of the political parties has been found wanting in this regard.<sup>(24)</sup>

Along with the abdication of its essential role, the State has steadily diluted its obligation. The National Policy on Education of 1986, a major policy document, held that the those children who cannot get access to the primary school will get it through the "non-formal stream". This non-formal stream could never be a substitute for the regular formal stream. Different layers of widely varying quality were being officially blessed and sanctified. The resources required for the non-formal streams were much less, but the quality was also abysmal compared to the formal stream.<sup>(25)</sup> The quality of this kind of schooling can be judged from the fact that out of the 700,000 students enrolled in the 35,000 Non-Formal Centres in Madhya Pradesh only 5% of the boys and 3% of the girls managed to pass the grade 5 examination.

Resorting to various red herrings that tended to obfuscate the real issues facilitated the abandonment of the constitutional obligation. In 1997 a committee estimated that the government needed about 1,200 billion Indian Rupees to give formal quality education to the 110 million children who were out of school. Even a scaled-down version of the requirement of 400 billion Rupees<sup>(26)</sup> to meet the target of Universal Elementary Education was made to sound astronomical in public debates. In reality this would have been just an additional 1% of GNP for the next five years. More

importantly, this was a mechanical calculation that did not consider the massive savings that could be made if the communities were involved in the effort of universalizing elementary education. Nor did it consider how other countries that successfully tread this path in the past tackled the huge financial costs involved.<sup>(27)</sup>

There have been attempts to cover up State's failure by raising the bogey of inadequate motivation among poor parents as being an obstacle to rendering primary education universal. The impediments are to be found rather in the direct costs of schooling which was found to be quite high and which tended to dampen the parental enthusiasm for education, and the low quality of schooling facilities which tended to reduce the child's interest in education.<sup>(28)</sup> Only the State can play any meaningful role in lowering the schooling costs and in raising the schooling standards, but it is yet to display any activism in this regard.

## **VI.II Increased withdrawal of the State as seen in Privatization and Foreign Aid in education**

Two important new features of the liberalized 1990s were a) Dependence on the foreign resources for both expansion and improvement of primary education and b) Privatization of higher education. Privatization of education was not a new phenomenon, but the rapid spread of private interests in higher education which the State meekly acquiesced, had few earlier parallels. The Jomtien conference held in 1990 on the theme of 'Education for All' was the turning point from when the developed world turned its attention on the education scene in the developing world in a substantive way. Jomtien came to symbolize a structurally adjusted, emergent political economy of education. The origin of the concept of universal schooling came to be traced in the Jomtien conference rather than the Indian constitution. Though it is still too early to assess the impact of the structural adjustment programmes initiated at the instance of external pressures on India, "... it

appears that the entrenched regional inequality has enabled the more literate and economically better-off states to benefit more than the really needy ones." Equally worrisome is the fact "... that the quality of education is being defined increasingly in terms of technical and managerial efficiency, without any reference to philosophically defensible aims." The tendency of locating quality in an ambience that does not recognize the social or philosophical aims of education is seen, for instance, in the concept of 'minimum levels of learning'. Such tendencies, operative since the structural adjustment policies of the early nineties began, have been depreciative of a holistic perspective in pedagogy.<sup>(29)</sup>

Private interests, in the face of the failure of the State to provide education as enshrined in the Constitution, have exploited the system for their profit motives. The perception of the quality of State-run schools as being low and the slow response of established educational institutions to open new courses in response to market demands unleashed by the liberalization policies, make it easy for private interests to flourish. Further the course of educational development itself is subverted so that the private interests benefit. Private colleges insist on minimal merit conditions for admission; monetary, political or other non-academic considerations determine who gets admitted in some of the most-sought after courses. The steep fees charged by them means that a privileged minority benefits leading to further social inequalities. Private initiatives in education in India can be seen as a response to the interests of various groups-business, caste, class or power politics. Knowledge, a social asset is increasingly sought to be placed in the domain of private property. The wholesale privatization of education has resulted in the lowering of standards, the increasing of various social inequalities and the enhancement of opportunities for the dominant sections of society, thereby perpetuating the elitist social base. The State seems to constantly miss the fact that expenditure on education is not just consumption, but investment in human capital. The role of the welfare State needs to be emphasized, as

there is a danger that the liberalization of the economy and the privatization of education might lead to further deprivations in society.<sup>(30)</sup>

The structural adjustment programme imposed through IMF lending presumes cuts in the spending of social sectors. This led to the World Bank offering the "Social Safety Net" which refers to loans at a slightly lower rate of interest. The opening up of basic education to external aid was thus brought about by liberalization. This has resulted in the District Primary Education Program (DPEP). Though the DPEP funds accounts for just about five percent of total expenditure on elementary education, it has however begun to dominate and has been dictating the agenda for basic education in India. There is a clear overtaking of policy commitments of the Indian State by the Fund/Bank policies.<sup>(31)</sup> Foreign aid in education is at best a mixed blessing.

## VII Concluding remarks

In the structural adjustment period, education, a social sector, seems to have suffered in various ways. As we tried to show, the existing disparities in educational spread have only marginally lessened. There has not been any marked increase in the spending on education, despite grand rhetoric. On the other hand, there is talk of the State spending less on specific sectors like higher education, etc. Subsidies in higher education are sought to be reduced if not completely abolished. What comes out clearly is that the State that has been indifferent to education is turning more and more abdicative towards this sector. Private providers of education are seeking to fill the space vacated by the State, or to create lucrative niches for themselves which may not necessarily be in tune with the national needs in terms of a balanced human resources development which would mesh with the development priorities of the State. Foreign aid in education is also not desirable as it has a disproportionately large say in the policy formulations. There is a real danger that in the new liberalizing setup, where market forces predominate,



specific areas of education which by their very nature are incapable of showing short term returns, but which are crucial for the long term survival of the country, would be affected. If the efforts that are required look huge, they pale into insignificance when we visualize what the country loses by not providing adequate and equitable education to its population.

### References

Acharya, Poromesh, 1994 "Universal Elementary Education: Receding Goal", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXIX, Nos. 1 & 2, 1 January, pp. 27-30.

.....1998 "Bengali *Bhadralok* and Educational Development in Nineteenth Century Bengal", in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998, pp. 25-38.

Banerjee, Sumanta 1998 "Popular Education in Colonial Bengal and Its Legacy: An Examination of a Nineteenth Century Bengali Broadsheet", in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), pp. 39-64.

Balatchandirane, G. 1995a "Role of Education in Japan's Modernization: A Reassessment", *China Report*, New Delhi/Thousand Oaks/London, Vol. 31, no. 2, April-June, pp. 219-33.

.....1995b "Education in Economic Development", *CURES* (Center for Urban and Regional Studies, Faculty of Economics, Kanazawa University), no 36, 31 October, pp. 1-4.

.....1996 "Women's Education and National Development", *The Review of Contemporary News and Views*, New Delhi, Vol. 1, No. 2, October, pp. 9-11.

.....1997a "Lying about education", *The Economic Times*, New Delhi, 26 June.

.....1997b "Education: Economic Benefits and Political Obstacles", *The Review of Contemporary News and Views*, New Delhi, Vol. II, No. 7, July, pp. 14-15.

.....1998 "Gender gap in Literacy and Economic Development: A Preliminary Investigation" *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. XII, No. 3, July, pp. 289-311.

Basu, Kaushik *etal* 2000 "Isolated and Proximate Illiteracy: And Why These Concepts

Matter in Measuring Literacy and Designing Education Programmes”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXV, Nos. 1 & 2, 8 January, pp. 35-39.

Bhatty, Kiran 1998 “Educational Deprivation in India: A Survey of Field Investigations”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 27, 4 July 4, pp. 1731-1740. and Vol. XXXIII, No. 28, 11 July, pp. 1858-69.

Drze, Jean and Sen, Amartya, 1995 *INDIA: Economic Development and Social Opportunity* Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Haq, Mahbub ul & Haq, Khadija 1998 *Human Development in South Asia: The Education Challenge*, Karachi, Oxford University Press.

Kaul, Rekha 1993 *Caste, Class and Education: Politics of the Capitation Fee Phenomenon in Karnataka*, New Delhi, Sage.

.....1998 “Disorders in Education: Private Enterprise and the State”, in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998, pp. 159-174.

Kingdon, Geeta G 1996 “Private Schooling in India: Size, Nature and Equity-Effects”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXI, No. 51, 21 December, pp. 3306-14.

Krishna Kumar, 1995 “Learning and Money: Children as Pawns in Dependency Game”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXX, No. 43, October 28, pp. 2719-2720.

.....1998 “Education and Society in Post-Independence India: Looking Towards the Future”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 23, 6 June, pp. 2719-2720.

.....1999 “Education and New Economic Regime”, Paper presented at the Conference on Economic Development and Quality of Life in South Asia, 27-28 November, Hiroshima, Japan. (mimeo).

Majumdar, Manabi and Vaidyanathan, A. “Access to Education in India: Retrospect and Prospect”, *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, pp. 353-403.

Mathew, E.T 1995 “Educated Unemployment in Kerala: Some Socio-Economic Aspects”,

*Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXX, No. 6, 11 February, pp. 325-335.

Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, 1997 *Spreading the light of Education, Programme for commemoration of 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of India's Independence*, New Delhi.

.....1999 *Selected Educational Statistics 1997-98*, New Delhi.

Nambissan, Geetha B 1996 "Equity in Education?: Schooling of Dalit Children in India" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXI, Nos. 16 & 17, 20 April, pp. 1011-24.

PROBE Team 1999 *Public Report on Basic Education in India*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Punnayya, K 1993 *UGC Funding of Institutions of Higher Education: Report of Justice Dr. K. Punnayya Committee 1992-93*, New Delhi: University Grants Commission.

Radhakrishnan, P and Akila, R, 1993 "India's Educational Efforts: Rhetoric and Reality" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 48, 27 November, pp. 2613-2619.

Raina, Vinod 1999 "Elementary Education and Literacy: Seeking Sense Amidst Populism and Liberalisation", *The Indian Economy 1998-99: An Alternative Survey*, Delhi, Delhi Science Forum, pp. 163-9.

Ramachandran, Vimala 1999 "External Aid in Elementary Education: A Double-Edged Sword", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 50, pp. 3492-3.

Sadgopal, Anil 1997 *Background Material*, Convention on 'Education as a Fundamental Right' in the context of the proposed 83<sup>rd</sup> Amendment to the Constitution of India and its implications for the Ninth Plan, 18 December, Delhi, University of Delhi, Department of Education.

.....1998 "A fraud on our children", *The Hindustan Times* 20 December.

Shatrugna, M 1994 "Financing Higher Education: Justice Punnayya Committee Report", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXIX, No. 32, pp. 2060-2.

Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998 *Education, Development and Underdevelopment*, New Delhi, Sage.

Talib, Mohammad 1998 "Educating the Oppressed: Observations from a School in a working Class Settlement in Delhi", in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998, pp. 199-209.

Tilak, Jandhyala B. G., 1984 "Political Economy of Investment in Education in South Asia", *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 4, No. 2 pp. 155-166.

.....1989 "Center-State Relations in Financing Education in India", *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 33, No. 4 November, pp. 450-480.

.....1992 "Rural-Urban Inequalities in Education: A Study on returns to education, human capital formation and earnings differentiation", *CMDR Monograph Series*, No. 2, Dharwad, Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research.

.....1993 "Financing Higher Education in India", in Suma Chitnis & Philip G Altbach (eds.), *Higher Education Reform in India ; Experience and Perspectives* New Delhi/ Newbury Park/London, Sage. pp. 41-83.

.....1995 *Costs and Financing of Education in India: A Review of Issues, Problems and Prospects*, UNDP Research Project, Thiruvananthapuram, Centre for Development Studies.

.....1996 "How 'Free' is Free Primary Education?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXI, No. 5, 3 February, pp. 275-82 and Vol. XXXI, No. 6, 10 February, pp. 355-66.

.....1997a "Lessons from Cost Recovery in Education", in Christopher Colclough (ed.), *Marketizing Education and Health in Developing Countries*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 63-89.

.....1997b "Five Decades of Underinvestment in Education", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXII, No. 36, 6 September, pp. 2239-41.

.....1998 "Effect of Adjustment on Education: A Review of the Asian Experience" in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998, pp. 99-137.

Tyagi, P. N. 1993 *EDUCATION FOR ALL: A Graphic Presentation*, New Delhi, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.

UNDP 1999 *Human Development Report*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Velaskar, Padma 1998 "Ideology, Education and the Political Struggle for Liberation: Change and Challenge among the Dalits of Maharashtra", in Sureshchandra Shukla and Rekha Kaul (eds.), 1998, pp. 210-240.

World Bank 1997 *Primary Education in India*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers Limited.

- (1) Quoted in Sadgopal 1997: p.1.
- (2) For more on this see Raina, Vinod 1999: 163.
- (3) An extensive treatment of this for the Asian countries can be found in Tilak 1998.
- (4) For the impact that the dominant elite and the influential middle class had on the development of education in 19<sup>th</sup> century and the resultant skewed growth of education, see Acharya, Poromesh 1998 and Banerjee, Samanta 1998.
- (5) Cf. Haq 1998: 4871.
- (6) Cf. Dreze 1995: 119-120.
- (7) See Tilak 1984: 165, Majumdar 1994 and Krishna Kumar 1999: 12.
- (8) On this see Nambissan: 1996, Velaskar: 1998 and Talib: 1998.
- (9) Cf. Tilak, 1992: 28.
- (10) Cf. Dreze 1995: 4.
- (11) Details are available in PROBE Team 1999: 11.
- (12) On this see Dreze 1995: 132-7. For field investigation which confirms this see PROBE Team 1999: 9-35
- (13) More on this is available in Balatchandirane 1996, 1998. Also see the interesting article by Basu *et al*, 2000. where equitable inter household literacy promotion and particularly female literacy promotion is advocated against mere quantitative expansion of literacy in a backward region.
- (14) Cf. Balatchandirane 1998: 303-5.
- (15) Cf. Tilak 1997b: 2239
- (16) For this and more see UNDP 1999.
- (17) It is of course another matter that researchers have shown that to come anywhere near the goal of universal elementary education, a pet theme of the State and the various political parties, it is not 6% of GNP that needs to be spent, but as much as 10%.

- (18) See for instance Balatchandirane 1995a and 1997a
- (19) For a brief but succinct analysis of this Report see Shatrugna 1994.
- (20) Punnayya, K 1993: 1-18
- (21) For this see Tilak 1993, 1995 and 1997a.
- (22) This Supreme Court judgement that declared education as a fundamental right of the citizens of India was delivered in February 1993 by a bench comprising of Justice L. M. Sharma and others in the case of Unnikrishnan and others *versus* State of Andhra Pradesh and others.
- (23) On this see Balatchandirane 1995a, 1995b, 1996 and 1998 where the role that education played in the Japan and other countries along with the utility of comparing the other countries' (especially Japan's) experience with that of the developing world are highlighted.
- (24) For instance in 1996 the various party manifestos state as follows. Bharatiya Janata Party of spending "... at least 6 percent of our GNP". The Indian National Congress (I) recalls its "... firm commitment to spend 6% of the country's GDP on education". The Communist Party of India states "Six percent of the GNP to be allocated for education." The Communist Party of India (Marxist) while talking of the allocation for education holds that it "... must be at least 10 percent of national budget and 30 percent of the state budgets". The Janata Dal says "The level of investment in education will be raised to at least 6 percent of the Gross National Product...". The Samata Party laments the "... the virtual neglect of sufficient investment in education..." and promises "... compulsory and uniform primary education..", as a major plan of its action. The United Front promises that "The right to free and compulsory elementary education shall be made a fundamental right and enforced through suitable statutory measures. Further, "Six percent of nation's GDP will be earmarked for education." Sadgopal 1997: pp.57-66.
- (25) Thus, "While the per child per year cost (at 1990 prices) worked out to more than Rupees 10,000 in Navodaya Vidyalayas and around Rupees 700 in a typical government primary school, the non-formal centre got away by spending the pittance of Rupees.100. Cf. Sadagopal 1998. Also see Acharya 1994.
- (26) This is the figure mentioned in Clause 40 under Financial Implications of the Report of the Committee of Education Ministers, 1997 which was known as the Saikia Committee Report, after the name of its Chairman.
- (27) On this see Balatchandirane 1995a, 1997a
- (28) See PROBE Team 1999: 14, Tilak1996 and Bhattya, Kiran 1998
- (29) For a brief but critical evaluation of the foreign aid in education and the emerging political economy of education which could have potentially negative effects, see

Krishna Kumar, 1995. See also Ramachandran 1999 and Krishna Kumar 1999: 5-10.

(30) For an intensive case study in one state see Kaul, 1993. On the adverse equity effects of the private schools, and official data which underplays the private schools' role and tends to exaggerate that of the government schools, see Kingdon, 1996. Also useful is Kaul, 1998.

(31) See Raina, 1999: 164-5