

Civil strife and Education of Children

A Study of Districts Affected by Left wing Extremism

SUNITA CHUGH*

Abstract

Activities of left wing extremists called naxalites are adversely affecting the functioning of school system in several parts of the country. The problem is found to be particularly severe in a few states like Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa and West Bengal. In all, about 83 districts were identified as affected by civil strife with 35 of these as severely affected. These districts are predominantly inhabited by population of different tribal groups and are mostly covered with forest that provides natural protection to armed groups. The security forces have occupied several schools either partially or fully driving out teachers and students disturbing the function of schooling system in these areas. The ever presence of large contingent security personnel and ever present threat of violence breaking any point of time has put off children particularly girl child from schools. These conditions pose several immediate challenges in achieving universalisation of elementary education. The present paper makes an attempt to review the current status of elementary education using a couple of indicators on participation of children and infrastructure facilities available in schools drawing from DISE data and attempts to identify areas of concern that need immediate policy attention. An attempt has been made to juxtapose the districts affected by civil strife as identified by Government with those that are not affected by civil strife within each state.

* Professor, NCSL, NUEPA, New Delhi - 110016

Background

The conflict, both external and internal, would adversely impact the well being of people in general and the children in particular. The impact of conflict is found to fall more acutely on vulnerable groups like women, poor, children, etc. While the impact of external aggression on people in general and children in particular is widely recognised and documented but the impact of internal conflict on well being of children is only beginning to be recognised now. According to a DFID (Department for International Development) commissioned report (Smith and Vaux, 2003), 82 per cent of the reported 113 million children out-of-school were from crisis and post-crisis countries. Rose and Greeley (2006) add to this the estimated figures that as many as a third to one-half of all out-of-school children live in 'fragile' states, and observe reaching these groups which are excluded from education is very difficult. Global Monitoring Report on Education for All (EFA), 2011 mentions that the armed conflicts are diverting funds from the social sector including education into military spending. The expenditure on defence and armaments is much higher than on education which destroys the opportunities for millions of children. Nevertheless whenever conflicts are documented education seldom gets figured, its only life and property that is counted and there is no mention of the hidden costs and lasting legacies that these violent

civil strife's have. Human Rights Watch in its report on 'Sabatoged Schooling' has highlighted as to how the schooling is being disrupted by the ongoing conflict between naxalite insurgents and police in the eastern states of Bihar and Jharkhand. The report also mentions that children live in fearful condition when they come to school. Even children cannot play freely during the recess time. Now the question comes how it will be possible for the school to function smoothly and peacefully when the schools are bombed and parents fear to send their children to school. It is quite sure that at any moment of time Child's right to free and compulsory education is violated and also the other child right too. NCPCR (National Commission for Protection of Child's Rights) in its report on Protection of Children's Rights in Areas of Civil Unrest acknowledges the extremely difficult circumstances in which children in areas of civil unrest live and the gross violation of their rights including education. The internal conflict may likely to be limited to small pockets often located in remote parts or to demographically a small proportion of population who may often tend to be most undeveloped communities. As such these areas and/or population groups are in need of special measures for development and well being. The internal conflict may confound the problems of these groups further.

The activities of left wing extremists called naxalites are

concentrated largely in districts located in central India on the borders of several states that include Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, West Bengal, Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, and Maharashtra. These districts are predominantly inhabited by population of different tribal groups and are mostly covered with forest that provides natural protection to armed groups. In all about 83 districts were identified as affected by civil strife with 35 of these as severely affected (List of districts is given in Annexure-I).

In the recent past it was widely reported by media, civil rights groups, etc that in several parts of the country affected by activities of left wing extremists the security forces have occupied several schools either partially or fully driving out teachers and students disturbing the function of schooling system in these area. It was also reported that naxalites are blasting off schools on the pretext that they are being used as shelter by security forces. The residential schools in tribal areas are sometimes used as shelter and recruitment ground by left wing extremists. This lead to complete disruption in the functioning of schooling system and many a times schools are closed down for months together. The presence of large contingent security personnel and ever present threat of violence breaking any point of time has put off children particularly girl child from schools. Teachers are unwilling to be posted and work in areas affected

by naxalites. They are more likely to be absent. Further teachers seldom get a safe place to stay or bring their family to the village where they are working. In fact the Supreme Court hearing a PIL has directed the state governments to vacate schools immediately and observed under no condition security forces can occupy schools. The frequent exchange of fire and demolition of schools has adversely impacted the infrastructural facilities in schools. Further violent conditions in these districts have become stumbling block in improving the infrastructure destroyed by naxalites or deteriorated over time. The poverty, limited opportunities for employment, and more importantly violent conditions and consequent migration in these districts have also adversely affected the nutritional status of children endangering the growth of children. These conditions pose several immediate challenges in implementation of RTE 2009.

Key Educational Issues in the Naxal Affected Areas

- The naxal affected areas are mostly the tribal areas and therefore there is double disadvantage. The geographical inaccessibility of the naxal prone areas makes it extremely difficult for teachers to reach such areas and community support is also lacking in running schools. There is no community ownership of schools as the communities themselves are displaced.

- There is no convergence amongst different policies so as to have focused efforts.
- Schools are occupied by security personals and in that case the naxalites are more likely to damage schools.
- There is no forward linkage for secondary schools which also demotivate the children for taking up education.
- Irregular attendance of students and increasing dropouts due to the violent atmosphere is another major problem.
- There is lack of human resource since regular teachers are not willing to move to such regions due to fear of security personals and naxals as well. High teacher absenteeism is another major issue.
- Due to displacement and migration to another area/state, language and medium of instruction becomes a major issue for the children.

In such a situation the challenge is how to ensure all children enroll and attend schools regularly. How to ensure the provision of schooling and infrastructure facilities in schools are in sync with the norms of RTE 2009. What strategies can revive the functioning of schooling system? Can involvement of community, local political leaders including front organisations is possible and ensure revival of the functioning of schooling system? Do the facilities in schools vary across different districts

especially those located in civil strife area? These are some questions that arise in the context of participation of children in school in areas affected by conflict. The present paper reviews the current status of elementary education using a couple of indicators on participation of children and infrastructure facilities available in schools drawing from District Information System for Education (DISE) data and attempts to identify areas of concern that need immediate policy attention. An attempt has been made to juxtapose the districts affected by civil strife as identified by Government with those that not affected by civil strife within each state. The paper also presents the challenges in reviving the schooling system. These include upgrading the infrastructure on par with RTE, identifying and enrolling all children, ensuring regular attendance of teachers and students, ensuring regular functioning of schools with community monitoring, prevention of dropping out, etc.

Literacy

Literacy rates reveal efforts made for educational development cumulated over a period of time. Districts and states vary widely in terms of literacy rates. In Chhattisgarh, though variation within districts affected and not affected by extremism is high but majority of districts not affected by extremism have high literacy levels. For example, 8 districts (Raigarh, Korba, Janjgir-Champa, Kabeerdhan,

Durg, Raipur, Mahasamund, and Dhamtari) except for Bijapur out of 9 districts that are not affected by extremism have literacy rates above 60 per cent compared to 7 districts (Koriya, Surguja, Jashpur, Rajnandgaon, Bilaspur, and Uttar Bastar Kanker) out of 10 affected by extremism. Remaining 3 districts (Bastar, Narayanpur, and Dakshin Bastar Dantewada) have literacy rates well below 60 per cent. Similarly, in Andhra Pradesh, 15 districts (Adilabad, Nizamabad, Karimnagar, Medak, Mahbubnagar, Nalgonda, Warangal, Khammam, Srikakulam, Vishakhapatnam, Guntur, Prakasam, Kurnool, Anantpur, Vizianagaram) out of 16 affected by extremism have literacy rates between 60-70 per cent and only 1 district (East Godavari) has literacy rate in the range of 70-80 compared. In comparison to this out of 7 district not affected by extremism, 2 districts (Sri Potti Sriramulu Nellore, Y.S.R. Kadapa) have literacy rate in the range of 60-70 percent and 5 districts (Rangareddy, West Godavari, Krishna, Hyderabad and Chittoor) are having literacy rate in the range of 70- 80 per cent. In Bihar, the patterns seem to be somewhat different. In Bihar, 6 (Munger, Patna, Bhojpur, Kaimur, Rohtas, Aurangabad) out of 14 districts affected by extremism have literacy levels between 70-80 compared to just 2 (Siwan and Buxar) districts out of 22 not affected by extremism. Another 5 districts (Nalanda, Gaya, Nawada, Jamui and Jehanabad) that are affected

by extremism have literacy levels between 60-70 per cent compared to 11 districts (Muzaffarpur, Gopalganj, Saran, Vaishali, Samastipur, Begusarai, Khagaria, Bhagalpur, Banka, Sheikhpura and Arwal) that are not affected by extremism. A large chunk of districts i.e, 9 districts (Shohar, Supaul, Araria, Kishanganj, Purnia, Katihar, Madhpura, Saharsa, Darbhanga) out of 22 that are not affected by extremism have literacy levels between 50-60 per cent compared to 3 (Paschim Champaran, Purba Champaran and Sitamarhi) out of 14 districts that are affected by extremism. In Jharkhand also 5 districts (Bokaro, Purbi Singhbhum, Hazaribagh, Ramgarh, Ranchi) out of 15 affected by extremism have literacy rates between 70-80 per cent compared to just 1 district (Dhanbad) out of 7 not affected by extremism. Another 9 districts (Garhwa, Chatra, Kodarma, Giridih, Lohardaga, Palamu, Latehar, Gumla, Saraikela-Kharsawan) affected by extremism have literacy rates between 60-70 per cent compared to 3 districts (Deoghar, Dumka, Jamtara) that are not affected by extremism. Only one district (Paschimi Singhbhum) out of 15 affected by extremism has literacy levels below 60 per cent compared to 3 (Godda, Sahibganj, Pakur) out of 8 not affected by extremism. In Orissa however, a large majority of districts not affected by extremism have higher literacy rates; for example only 6 districts (Sambalpur, Sundargarh, Jajpur, Dhenkanal, Nayagarh,

Ganjam) out of 13 affected by extremism have literacy rates above 70 per cent compared to 13 (Bargarh, Jharsuguda, Debagarh, Baleshwar, Bhadrak, Kendrapara, Jagatsinghpur, Cuttack, Anugul, Khordha, Puri) out of 15 not affected by extremism. While 5 districts (Gajapati, Rayagada, Nabarangapur, Koraput, Malkangiri) affected by extremism have literacy rates less than 60 per cent compared to one district (Nuapada) not affected by extremism.

The above discussion points out though variation in literacy rates within districts affected by and not by affected by extremism is high but these two groups of district do differ at least moderately. However, the patterns change by state. In Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh and Orissa districts affected by extremism have lower rates of literacy whereas, in Bihar and Jharkhand they are on par or moderately higher literacy rates than districts not affected by extremism.¹

I. Participation of Children in Education

The Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) and Net Enrolment Ratio (NER) reveal the progress made in bringing of elementary education and RTE. The variation between districts in terms of GER and NER appears to be moderate within states. However, districts not affected by extremism appear to be moderately ahead of districts affected by extremism (Table 1, Annexure II).

In Chhattisgarh a few districts appears to be off the mark in terms of participation in education with districts not affected by extremism appears to have moderately higher participation rates than districts affected by extremism. For example in 3 districts (Kanker, Bastar, Dantewada) out of 8 affected by extremism have NER lower than 60 per cent at the upper primary level. All districts not affected by extremism have NER higher than 60 per cent. However, it may be noted that participation at the upper primary stage is quite low across districts as except for Janjgir-champa, no other district has NER higher than 70 per cent barring single exception. At the primary level NER is 100 or nearly 100 in all districts barring 2 (Kanker and Dantewada) and 3 districts (Raigarh, Durg and Dhamtari) affected and not affected by extremism respectively.

The data on GER and NER in Andhra Pradesh is somewhat unconvincing. Ten districts both affected and not affected report GER less than 100 per cent even at the primary stage. At the upper primary stage all districts barring one report GER less than 100 per cent. The NER reported at the upper primary stage hovering around 50 in several districts. Even some of the known educationally advanced districts have much lower GER and NER.

In Bihar GER at the primary level is well over above 100 per cent in respect to both districts affected and

¹ Detailed Tables are available with author at Sunitachugh11@gmail.com

not affected by extremism barring Patna and Jehanabad. NER at the primary stage is exactly 100 per cent in all districts barring a lone exception! At the upper primary stage however, the level of both GER and NER are much lower across districts. However, variation between districts affected and not affected by extremism appears to be very marginal. For example 8 out of 14 districts affected by extremism and 11 out of 21 districts not affected by extremism have GER lower than 60 per cent at the upper primary level. Only 6 extremist affected districts and 10 districts not affected by extremism have GER above 60 per cent at the upper primary stage. The numbers once again confirm that Bihar in general is underdeveloped including in education sector.

In Jharkhand, GER at the primary stage varies quite widely with many districts reporting over 100 per cent and two districts reporting even less than 90 per cent. However, NER is reported to be 100 across districts with few exceptions. No discernible differences can be found between districts affected and not affected by extremism. The participation rates at the upper primary stage were generally low across in majority of districts. Even GER is found to be as low as 45 per cent in Dumka or barely about 42 per cent in Pachim Singhbhum in 2010-11. Similarly, NER at the upper primary stage is reported to be less than 60 per cent in 3 out of 6 districts not affected by extremism and 4 out

of 10 districts affected by extremism. The data once again points out the educational backwardness of Jharkhand encompassing the whole state. It appears that in Bihar as well as Jharkhand, the overall backwardness of states and extremism are confounded masking distinct impact of extremism on schooling.

In Orissa, also GER at the primary stage is well over 100 per cent across all districts affected and not affected by extremism with few exceptions. NER at the primary stage is also 100 or nearly 100 per cent in 9 districts out of total 13 districts and in remaining four districts it is in the range of 80-90 per cent. However, no discernible differences are observed between districts affected and not affected by extremism. However, the participation rates at the upper primary stage continue to be low across all districts though districts not affected by extremism do have somewhat higher participation rates. For example, NER at the upper primary stage is less than 50 per cent in 10 out of 13 districts affected by extremism compared to 6 out of 17 not affected by extremism. In 11 out of 17 districts not affected by extremism NER at the upper primary stage is more than 50 per cent compared to just 3 districts out of 13 affected by extremism.

From the above discussion it is clear that the participation rates at the primary stage is approaching near universalisation with notable options but at the upper primary

stage it is still a long way to go across all districts. Districts affected by extremist activities appear to be moderately lagging behind districts not affected by extremism in a few states. Further, it appears that extreme backwardness and the impact of extremism confounds making it difficult to identify distinct impact of extremism.

II. Promotion, Dropout and Transition

It is not adequate that all children are enrolled in schools and GER and NER is very high. It is feared that many children dropout in progression from one grade to next grade and also in transition from primary to the upper primary stage. An analysis of progression of children from one grade to next and transition to next stage of education provides insights into the functioning of schooling and implementation of RTE 2009. Whether the districts affected by extremism display higher levels of dropout rates than the districts not affected by extremism is moot question. This section analyses promotion, dropout and transition rates drawing data from DISE.²

From Table 2 (Annexure II) it appears that the annual average dropout rate as calculated by DISE is high in a large number of districts particularly in Bihar, Jharkhand

and also in Chhattisgarh and Orissa. Dropout rate is more than 5 per cent in over 80 districts in these states. In more than 20 districts it is over 10 per cent. In Chhattisgarh and Orissa dropout rate is distinctly high in districts affected by extremism. Similarly in Andhra Pradesh also districts affected by extremism have higher dropout rates than districts not affected by extremism. In Bihar and Jharkhand, all districts whether affected by extremism, dropout rate is very high-in most cases upwards 5 per cent over 20 per cent. One can find similar trends in promotion rates-obverse of dropout rate across districts. Districts not affected by extremism having higher promotion rates than districts affected by extremism in many states.

Similarly, transition rates are uniformly low across districts both affected and not affected by extremism in Bihar, Jharkhand and Orissa. Transition rates are as low as or even lower than 70-80 per cent in several districts. In Chhattisgarh, transition rates are generally high compared to Bihar, Jharkhand and Orissa. Not significant difference is found between the districts affected by extremism with districts not affected by extremism in Chhattisgarh and Orissa. The transition rate in Chhattisgarh and Orissa is over 90 per cent with few

² DISE publications calculate annual dropout rates by grade adjusting for repetition and averages over all grades. Promotion rate is obverse of dropout rate adjusted for repetition. Transition rate to the upper primary education is calculated between grade 5 (terminal grade of primary level) and grade 6 (entry grade of the upper primary stage).

exceptions in mostly districts affected by extremism. In Andhra Pradesh, a few districts affected by extremism display lower transition rates in comparison to the other districts not affected by extremism. In all districts barring lone exception not affected by extremism, transition rate is over 90 per cent in Andhra Pradesh.

From the above discussion it is clear that the districts affected by extremism have higher dropout rates and lower promotion and transition rates. In underdeveloped states like Bihar and Jharkhand, all districts have higher dropout rates and lower promotion and transition rates.

III. Infrastructure Facilities in the Schools

Infrastructure facilities play pivotal role in facilitating teaching learning process. RTE 2009 prescribed a few norms on minimum facilities that should be available in schools. This section examines the availability of a few basic facilities like girl's toilet and drinking water facility arbitrarily chosen as proxy to facilities in schools.

Availability of Girls' Toilet

Districts vary quite widely on the availability of girls' toilet though no discernible differences could be found between districts affected by extremism and not affected. Overall girls' toilet is available in less than 50 per cent of schools nearly in half of districts. The upper primary

schools with primary section appear to be somewhat better placed as in more than 70 districts girls' toilet is available in more than 50 per cent schools.³

In Chhattisgarh, the proportion of schools with girls' toilet is less than 50 per cent in all districts barring one in case of primary schools. Availability of girl's toilet in the upper primary schools is no different barring a few exceptions. In Bihar, the proportion of schools with girls' toilet in districts affected by extremism is much less than the districts not affected by extremism. In several districts affected by extremism girls' toilet is available only in miniscule number of schools. In Jharkhand, proportion of schools with girls toilet varies by margin across districts with no noticeable differences between those affected and not affected by extremism. In Orissa also districts vary widely by the proportion of schools with girls' toilet but with districts affected by extremism at a distinct disadvantage. In Andhra Pradesh, girls' toilet is available in more than 50 per cent in all extremist affected districts except one. Ironically districts known as advanced and not affected by extremism one can find fewer than 50 per cent schools with girls' toilet. However both extremist affected and not affected appear to be equally deficit in the availability of girls' toilet.

The foregoing description makes it clear that in a large number of districts

³ Detailed tables are available with author

girls' toilet is available only in 50 per cent of schools. From the discussion it also emerges that districts affected by extremism are at best on par with or even worse than the districts not affected by extremism with respect to availability of girls toilet.

Availability of Drinking Water

Drinking water facility is another indicator usually examined to assess the condition of schools. It appears more than 70-80 of schools have the drinking water facility across all districts. The upper primary schools appear to be better placed with nearly 100 per cent schools having drinking water facility in large majority of districts. The districts affected by extremism and not affected by extremism appear to be not differing in the availability of drinking water facility across all states.

Epilogue

From the foregoing discussion it can be surmised that districts affected by extremism are at best on par (or as low as) or lower than districts not affected by extremism on a host of variable relating to universal elementary education and right to education. By no means, this means causation. The discussion also hints that in underdeveloped states, backwardness and extremism appears confounding making it difficult to identify distinct patterns between districts affected by extremism and not affected by extremism. The discussion also points the strengths and weaknesses

using district aggregate level data in identifying the impact of extremism on education. Perhaps district level aggregate data at best can indicate differences between districts affected and not affected by extremism. Under conditions of extreme backwardness, district aggregates may not reveal anything however, as mentioned earlier that the education of children gets adversely affected in these conflict prone areas therefore the innovative strategies have been adopted by the state and civil society organisation to tackle this situation.

State Initiatives to Improve Participation of Children in Conflict Areas

In this conflict prone situation the State has taken into cognizance that education must be kept high up among the top priorities of the country as it has the greatest potential for building peace and prosperity in the long term. The SSA Framework for Implementation has been aligned to the mandate of the Right to Education Act. Under SSA, "equity" means that the programme will focus on addressing issues of excluded children of various categories such as SCs/STs/urban deprived/ minorities etc. A new category of children living in areas affected by civil strife has now been added. Such children, particularly those living in areas affected by left wing extremism, are marginalised from educational processes because of the conditions prevailing in such

areas. SSA recognises the situation of these children as an alarming problem. The programme treats areas affected by civil strife as Special Focus Districts for the purpose of appraising the Annual Work Plan and Budget of States and suggests some measures to try and insulate children and their education from the impact of situations prevailing in such areas. These measures include — banning the use of school and other educational facilities for housing police/paramilitary/military personnel; making schools safe zones by providing adequate security and emotional support to children; in the absence of security, making alternative arrangements for all affected children to enable them to continue their education without a break – for example by provision of residential schools or transportation to safer schools and also organising special negotiations with leaders in these areas to ensure that schools are allowed to function uninterrupted. Some of the states affected by civil strife have taken few steps to mitigate the effects of conflict on the education of children as discussed below:

Few Innovative Strategies

- (a) Chhattisgarh has opened residential schools on a large scale. The experiment of residential schools in left wing extremism affected districts in Chhattisgarh has been quite successful. It has demonstrated that a school constructed with pre-fabricated bamboo construction material is likely to continue being used as a school because it is unsuitable for occupation by security forces. The speed of construction is another advantage of using such pre-fabricated material.
- (b) Balbandhu program' has been initiated in 10 districts of civil unrest of Assam, Bihar, and Chhattisgarh in Phase I and in areas of civil unrest of States of Jharkhand, Jammu and Kashmir and Odisha in Phase II. The focus of the programme is to mobilise the community on child rights, and give it confidence to access institutions for children such as primary health care centres, anganwadi centers, schools, Ashramshalas, hostels, Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya's (KGBVs) and all other entitlements and to interact with the government at the block and district level to bring to the fore the gaps in access to public institutions.
- (c) Bamboo mission schools have been established in the Bastar region. The Naxalites (Maoists) destroyed several buildings. But these (bamboo) buildings ensure that the children continue going to schools.
- (d) Initiatives such as 'Sports for Development' and psycho-social support like arts-based therapy have been promoted by UNICEF in partnership with government and civil society groups to schoolchildren in districts

affected by civil strife to help them overcome trauma, dislocation and stress.

Way Forward

How can we instill confidence in children and their parents that sending children to school is not only safer but a potential antipode to violence? For this to happen, schools should be freed from interference both from security forces and also extremist activities. Further awareness programmes may have to be initiated among the people about positive benefits of education and schooling. Perhaps initiation of a school reconstruction programme

to uplift the infrastructure facilities could revive the functioning of schooling in these districts. Number of Residential Institutions should be increased in the district. As a short term measure for disruption of schools, temporary schools may be established with makeshift infrastructure by pooling together teachers and students of nearby schools with appropriate facilities for accommodation if necessary. Involvement of community, parents and leaders of various political parties and civil rights activists is crucial in confidence building measures and revival of schooling system in the conflict prone area.

Annexure – I

Districts Identified as Affected by Civil Strife

<i>State</i>	<i>Districts in State</i>	<i>Districts Affected</i>	<i>Districts Affected</i>
Andhra Pradesh	23	16	Warangal, Karimnagar, Adilabad, Khammam, Medak, Nalgonda, Mahbubnagar, Guntur, Prakasam, Anantapur, Kurnool, Vizianagaram, East Godavari, Srikakulam, Nizamabad, Vishakhapatnam
Bihar	38	15	Aurangabad, Gaya, Jehanabad, Rohtas, Nalanda, Patna, Bhojpur, Kaimur, East Champaran, West Champaran, Sitamarhi, Arwal, Munger, Nawada, Jamui
Jharkhand	24	18	Hazaribagh, Lohardaga, Palamu, Chatra, Garhwa, Ranchi, Gumla, Simdega, Latehar, Giridih, Koderma, Bokaro, Dhanbad, East Singhbhum, West Singhbhum, Saraikela Kharsawan, Khunti, Ramgarh
Madhya Pradesh	50	1	Balaghat
Chhattisgarh	18	9	Bastar, Bijapur, Dantewada, Kanker, Rajnandgaon, Sarguja, Jashpur, Koriya, Narayanpur

Maharashtra	35	3	Gadchiroli, Chandrapur, Gondia
Orissa	30	15	Malkangiri, Ganjam, Koraput, Gajapati, Rayagads, Nabarangpur, Mayubhanj, Sundargarh, Sambalpur, Keonjhar, Jajpur, Deogarh, Kandhamal, Dhenkanal, Nayagarh
Uttar Pradesh	72	3	Sonbhadra, Mirzapur, Chandauli
West Bengal	19	3	Bankura, West Midnapore, Purulia
Total		83	

Annexure – II

Table 1

GER and NER in Districts affected by Civil Strife

	GER				NER			
	Primary		upper primary		Primary		upper primary	
	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10
CHHATTISGARH								
<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>								
Koriya	115.8	118.1	92.3	88.4	100.0	100	67	62.7
Surguja	143.5	142.9	94.7	86.3	100	100	72.4	64.9
Jashpur	112.4	115.3	90.7	85.6	100	100	65.3	61.1
Rajnandgaon	120	122	104.7	96.5	100	100	73.8	69
Bilaspur	157.9	154.4	105.0	100.1	100.0	100	71.0	67.6
Kanker	116.5	115.4	91.9	79.3	94.7	94.2	59.4	50.9
Bastar	129.4	119.1	73.2	65.6	100.0	97	47.7	36.4
Dantewada	109.2	101.9	43.2	40.9	93.7	85.7	28.4	26.3
<i>Districts not affected by naxalites</i>								
Raigarh	101.9	101.5	86.7	82.8	89.6	88.8	64.3	60
Korba	117.5	120.1	91.5	85.8	100.0	100	74.1	66.6

Janjgir - Champa	126.5	126.7	103.1	97.2	100	100	80.8	74.4
Kawardha	175	167.9	107.0	96.2	100	100	70.9	61.6
Durg	103.1	106.5	94.9	91.3	86.8	87.4	66.3	61.2
Raipur	134.8	131.2	108	96.5	100	100	74.1	66.8
Mahasamund	119.7	121.8	102.2	95.6	100	100	70.2	65.7
Dhamtari	110.1	112.3	104.0	100	88.5	92.5	70.0	65.5
Bilaspur	157.9	154.4	105.0	100.1	100.0	100	71.0	67.6
ANDHRA PRADESH								
<i>Naxalite Affected districts</i>								
Adilabad	129.3	125.9	89.3	87.6	100.0	92.1	68.9	61.9
Nizamabad	110.7	109.3	90.3	89.9	90.5	86.6	68.4	72.2
Karimnagar	97.0	97.3	96.2	92.2	79.5	80.2	73.0	70.9
Medak	120.6	114.3	89.6	87	95.3	90	69.4	66.1
Mahbubnagar	122.9	119.8	80.3	79.2	95.9	94.1	61.2	60.2
Nalgonda	105.9	101.7	87.1	82.5	87.5	83.7	69.2	65.2
Warangal	110.9	106.2	95.3	89	89.5	85.5	78.3	70.6
Khammam	104.5	100.3	87.8	80.8	85.7	80.8	65.7	61
Srikakulam	98.9	97.1	78.1	74	79.7	78.3	56.2	53.9
Vizianagaram	99.6	98.7	75.1	71.8	79.9	79.1	53.3	52.3
Visakhapatnam	104.5	99.5	78.2	72.2	85.2	81.2	57.6	53.8
East Godavari	94.4	81.9	76.5	70.7	78.0	67.5	56.0	52.4
Guntur	89.1	70.4	69.6	57.3	72.9	57.4	51.0	41.5
Prakasam	111.4	95.6	74.2	63.7	89.8	76.7	53.1	46.5
Kurnool	120.5	116.6	84.1	81.6	96.0	94.9	60.3	59.7
Anantapur	99.0	94.8	78.2	74.5	78.1	73.8	53.7	53.8
<i>Districts not affected by naxalites</i>								
Hyderabad	119.2	110.7	93.9	90.3	89.2	82.4	68.4	65
Rangareddy	166.5	162	128.5	124.9	100.0	100	97.4	96.2
West Godavari	90.5	80.7	76.0	68.4	75.0	67	56.1	51.2
Krishna	86.3	79.6	71.1	66.9	71.3	65.8	52.3	50.2
Nellore	96.0	89.8	71.4	68.1	79.0	74.1	51.4	49.8
Chittoor	93.0	90	81.9	78	74.0	72.3	55.7	53.8

BIHAR								
<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>								
Pashchim Champanan	138.0	133.7	41.3	39.5	100.0	100	34.2	33
Purba Champanan	152.4	146	56.3	45.9	100.0	100	48.7	41.7
Sitamarhi	144.6	135	51.7	44.2	100.0	100	45.6	41
Munger	136.5	119.1	62.9	57.3	100.0	100	59.5	54.6
Nalanda	115.6	118.3	58.8	55.6	100.0	100	51.8	52.6
Patna	93.9	84.4	42.1	37.4	87.4	80.4	37.7	34.7
Bhojpur	161.7	152.4	72.1	66.9	100.0	100	62.5	63.8
Kaimur (Bhabua)	146.7	138.7	84.6	82.6	100.0	100	79.5	78.2
Rohtas	124.0	119.6	67.5	65.2	100.0	100	64.6	62.5
Aurangabad	151.5	144.3	71.0	65.8	100.0	100	62.1	60.7
Gaya	140.9	125.7	61.7	56.3	100.0	100	59.3	52.8
Nawada	144.7	137.4	59.4	57.6	100.0	100	51.5	53.2
Jamui	158.1	145	55.3	50	100.0	100	52.3	46.3
Jehanabad	91.5	131	40.4	60.4	80.6	100	34.5	54.6
<i>Districts not affected by naxalites</i>								
Sheohar	149.8	142.8	53.2	46.3	100.0	100	46.2	40.3
Supaul	169.3	148.8	62.6	67.1	100.0	100	54.2	52.9
Araria	163.1	146.5	47.0	34.7	100.0	100	39.9	34.7
Kishanganj	172.1	159.7	56.8	52.6	100.0	100	43.5	45.7
Purnia	159.9	140.9	46.4	44.2	100.0	100	42.9	40.6
Katihar	198.7	157.6	58.4	44	100.0	100	41.8	44
Madhepura	175.0	175	61.7	49.9	100.0	100	54.6	43.9
Saharsa	175.0	172.9	52.5	44.6	100.0	100	44.0	40.1
Darbhanga	138.4	131.6	55.0	50.4	100.0	100	50.4	47.7
Muzaffarpur	123.2	141	55.3	52.9	100.0	100	46.8	47.5
Gopalganj	146.3	141.3	63.5	58.9	100.0	100	50.9	48.1
Siwan	133.7	131.1	65.5	58.9	100.0	100	56.7	55.6
Saran	136.7	121.4	63.7	54	100.0	100	56.9	49.7
Vaishali	137.5	132.2	74.0	64.3	100.0	100	69.9	61.2

Samastipur	150.1	142.9	58.0	54.4	100.0	100	48.2	50.6
Begusarai	156.1	145.7	78.3	68.7	100.0	100	73.6	66.6
Khagaria	144.6	149.4	76.3	56	100.0	100	60.9	43
Bhagalpur	133.4	128.4	55.0	51.1	100.0	100	50.3	42.6
Banka	139.2	134	60.7	44.9	100.0	100	54.3	41.3
Sheikhpura	140.1		55.0		100.0		48.8	
Buxar	150.8	125.9	75.7	56.9	100.0	100	68.9	52.3
Arwal	N.A	129.5	N.A	54.2	N.A	100	N.A	46.2
JHARKHAND								
<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>								
Garhwa	175.0	175	110.3	93.2	100.0	100	94.3	75.8
Chatra	175.0	175	103.2	106.8	100.0	100	86.9	93.3
Kodarma	175.0	169.8	106.9	84.2	100.0	100	84.4	66.6
Giridih	175.0	175	74.0	63.7	100.0	100	58.8	50.8
Bokaro	112.5	106.7	81.0	73.3	100.0	100	69.1	59
Lohardaga	175.0	175	113.5	95.7	100.0	100	85.0	78
Purbi Singhbhum	106.0	94.4	73.1	66.3	97.1	86.4	63.8	55.9
Palamu	151.7	149.9	78.4	66.1	100.0	100	64.5	54.8
Latehar	N.A		N.A	NA	N.A		N.A	
Hazaribagh	87.3	91.2	53.4	50.1	78.1	81.4	48.7	42.7
Ramgarh	N.A	n.a	N.A	n.a	N.A	n.a	N.A	n.a
Ranchi	120.5	113.9	79.5	69.7	100.0	97.1	66.8	56.6
Gumla	110.7		55.4		85.4		42.6	
Pashchimi Singhbhum	90.1	88.6	43.0	41.9	75.9	81.9	38.2	34.5
Saraikela- Kharsawan	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
<i>Districts not affected by naxalites</i>								
Deoghar	168.1	164.5	88.1	77.7	100.0	100	67.4	65.5
Godda	170.2	166.4	75.5	68.5	100.0	100	64.7	61.4
Sahibganj	175.0	173	77.6	58.1	100.0	100	62.2	43
Pakur	168.3	163.6	67.4	59.8	100.0	100	55.4	54.2
Dhanbad	110.1	84.6	70.9	51.8	99.5	75	59.4	44.6

Dumka	99.7	97.5	45.6	39.8	85.4	81.9	33.6	31.4
Jamtara	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
ORISSA								
<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>								
Sambalpur	101.1	99.6	88.4	69.5	80.2	78.3	65.7	51
Sundargarh	106.5	104.6	75.2	67.2	85.1	82	54.2	47.6
Mayurbhanj	137.8	132.6	64.7	64.7	100.0	100	45.9	45.9
Jajapur	124.0	95.9	100.0	61.9	99.1	77.4	71.7	61.9
Dhenkanal	109.4	105.2	94.1	68.7	87.7	85.5	65.1	43.6
Nayagarh	111.1	111.1	73.2	73.2	88.7	88.7	47.4	47.4
Ganjam	125.8	125.3	95.0	73.7	100.0	100	66.8	49.8
Gajapati	155.9	158.3	75.6	67.5	100.0	100	52.8	48.2
Kandhamal	175.0	169.8	99.3	77.9	100.0	100	71.7	55.9
Rayagada	150.4	142.8	65.4	55.5	100.0	100	46.6	38.7
Nabarangapur	166.5	152.5	76.9	63.1	100.0	100	57.4	46
Koraput	155.8	145	61.5	54	100.0	100	42.8	36.8
Malkangiri	175.0	173.5	67.0	56.4	100.0	100	40.0	41.9
<i>Districts not affected by naxalites</i>								
Bargarh	94.4	89.2	93.0	72.3	75.4	69.9	66.5	50.4
Jharsuguda	103.8	95.9	103.0	83.9	84.8	77.4	77.5	61.9
Deogarh	134.1	131.8	110.4	82.2	100.0	100	78.4	60.2
Balasore	130.0	126	100.9	74.3	100.0	100	72.8	50.1
Bhadrak	134.4	132.4	107.4	78.8	100.0	100	73.7	46.8
Kendrapara	112.6	109	98.9	73.1	92.5	88.2	70.4	73.2
Jagatsinghapur	102.6	91	90.3	63.5	85.9	74.6	67.3	41.4
Cuttack	88.1	81.5	75.3	56.1	72.0	66.8	52.5	36.6
Anugul	115.7	110.4	100.4	77.4	90.8	88.1	71.8	52.6
Khordha	110.3	89.4	91.3	62.3	90.6	75.1	64.9	43.6
Puri	104.3	102.8	91.6	70.1	80.9	84.5	61.7	45.7
Baudh	137.8	142	121.2	87	100.0	100	85.4	59.7
Sonepur	109.6	108	101.0	79.4	87.5	87.7	69.0	50.2
Bolangir	136.0	133.1	101.2	78.8	100.0	100	72.6	55.8
Nuapada	165.8	166.2	104.5	81.6	100.0	100	78.7	62.9
Kalahandi	149.7	143	92.9	69.6	100.0	100	69.4	51.7

Table 2
Transition Rate, Drop-Out Rate and Promotion Rate

States	Districts	Transition Rate	Drop-out Rate	Promotion Rate
		P+UP	primary	primary
Andhra Pradesh	<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>			
	Adilabad	90.9	6.6	93.3
	Anantapur	96.2	4.8	95.
	East Godavari	94.8	4.1	95.6
	Guntur	95.4	5.6	94.1
	Karimnagar	94.4	4.8	94.8
	Khammam	95.9	5.5	93.8
	Kurnool	88.2	4.3	95.4
	Mahbubnagar	95.1	9.7	89.0
	Medak	95.1	6.9	91.0
	Nalgonda	94.7	8.1	90.8
	Nizamabad	93.4	5.4	94.3
	Prakasam	86.8	7.5	92.1
	Srikakulam	93.0	5.8	93.6
	Visakhapatnam	89.9	8.1	91.7
	Vizianagaram	89.7	8.0	91.3
	Warangal	93.9	8.3	91.0
	<i>Districts not affected by Naxalites</i>			
	Hyderabad	93.5	3.6	95.4
	Rangareddi	98.4	9.5	89.7
West Godavari	91.9	4.2	95.8	
Krishna	90.4	5.7	94.2	
Sri Potti Sriramulu Nellore	91.0	5.0	94.5	
Y.S.R. Kadapa	N.A	N.A	N.A	
Chittoor	96.2	2.4	97.5	
<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>				
Bihar	Aurangabad	82.9	1.6	85.6
	Bhojpur	63.8	18.3	76.5

Gaya	77.7	4.1	89.1
Jamui	82.3	7.3	86.4
Jehanabad	78.3	6.3	81.4
Kaimur	81.6	0.3	96.4
Munger	74.6	3.7	90.8
Nalanda	92.8	N.A	N.A
Nawada	74.5	9.1	90.3
East Champaran	78.5	4.2	92.9
Patna	80.5	0.2	93.3
West Champaran	60.3	10.6	79.3
Sitamarshi	75.4	4.3	86.4
Rohtas	82.6	7.5	90.2
<i>Districts not affected by Naxalites</i>			
Sheohar	72.6	6.7	82.2
Supaul	78.4	7.2	91.4
Araria	62.9	7.6	79.3
Kishanganj	74.6	3.3	84.5
Purnia	55.7	8.5	83.5
Katihar	79.3	7.7	91.0
Madhepura	72.2	7.3	82.8
Saharsa	69.8	7.1	84.7
Darbhanga	64.2	14.7	77.9
Muzaffarpur	82.8	2.9	94.7
Gopalganj	70.6	18.5	77.7
Siwan	81.3	8.3	82.6
Saran	81.2	5.1	85.8
Vaishali	85.5	0.5	92.3
Samastipur	81.7	9.4	84.1
Begusarai	89.4	7.1	87.8
Khagaria	90.8	N.A	N.A
Bhagalpur	68.2	4.2	83.5
Banka	75.4	N.A	N.A
Sheikhpura	84.4	3.3	88.8
Buxar	87.1	N.A	N.A
Arwal	83.2	N.A	N.A

<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>					
	Baster	96.7	9.4	89.5	
	Dantewada	82.5	22.3	73.7	
	Kanker	99.6	3.7	96.1	
	Rajnandgaon	97.6	2.3	97.1	
	Bilaspur	94.9	5.2	93.9	
	Jashpur	96.7	5.3	94.3	
	Koriya	99.9	4.4	95.6	
	Surguja	91.8	9.0	90.8	
	<i>Districts not affected by Naxalites</i>				
	Bijapur	N.A	N.A	N.A	
	Dhantari	97.4	2.7	95.7	
	Durg	N.A	1.2	98.7	
	Janjgir – Champa	95.2	3.1	95.9	
	Kabeerdham	N.A	N.A	N.A	
	Korba	97.3	1.5	98.2	
	Mahasamund	97.7	4.0	95.9	
	Raipur	96.3	4.4	95.2	
	Raigarh	N.A	3.5	95.7	
	<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>				
	Jharkhand	Bokaro	93.7	5.3	90.7
Chatra		66.8	9.0	83.5	
Garhwa		77.8	10.8	82.6	
Giridih		68.6	18.8	75.8	
Hazaribag		80.6	12.6	81.5	
Koderma		80.0	8.8	85.2	
Latehar		72.3	13.6	82.5	
Lohardaga		75.2	13.7	81.4	
Palamu		73.2	9.5	79.8	
East Singhbhum		86.9	9.6	87.2	
West Singhbhum		72.9	9.8	82.7	
Ramgarh		70.7	16.9	78.8	
Saraikela Kharsawan		77.7	12.1	82.6	

	Khunti	79.7	15.4	81.7
	Ramgarh	N.A	N.A	N.A
	Ranchi	72.5	18.8	78.4
	Simdagi	78.9	17.1	71.1
	Gumla	74.6	16.5	74.5
	<i>Districts not affected by Naxalites</i>			
	Deoghar	74.1	11.9	82.7
	Dhanbad	83.9	10.9	84.4
	Dumka	71.9	13.9	82.0
	Godda	69.7	8.7	87.4
	Jamtara	79.3	15.2	81.7
	Sahibganj	75.1	11.2	86.1
	Pakaur	70.3	10.2	80.2
	<i>Naxalite affected districts</i>			
Orissa	Rayagada	70.5	7.9	89.2
	Deogarh	91.7	6.4	89.0
	Gajapati	76.7	7.7	91.3
	Malkangiri	52.4	12.2	87.8
	Sambalpur	87.4	7.0	89.6
	Ganjam	87.5	4.3	94.3
	Koraput	52.3	13.3	78.6
	Nabarangpur	74.2	8.3	88.1
	Mayurbhanj	85.8	9.0	85.9
	Sundargarh	95.7	N.A	N.A
	Keonjhar	81.2	11.7	85.6
	Jajpur	N.A	N.A	N.A
	Kandhamal	81.3	8.3	87.0
	Dhenkanal	91.4	7.2	92.5
	Nayagarh	91.6	6.0	92.9
	<i>Districts not affected by Naxalites</i>			
	Angul	87.8	5.5	91.3
	Bolangir			
	Balsore	91.4	4.2	92.6
	Bargarh	99.2	N.A	N.A

Boudh	87.0	6.5	87.7
Bhadrak	88.3	6.7	92.1
Cuttack	98.1	N.A	N.A
Deogarh	91.7	6.4	89.0
Jagatsinghpur	89.5	8.9	89.6
Jharsuguda	91.0	4.6	94.0
Kalahandi	86.2	5.1	94.0
Kendrapara	89.9	6.2	92.9
Khordha	93.7	N.A	N.A
Nuapada	87.4	4.7	91.8
Puri	93.4	5.5	92.6
Sonepur	95.9	2.5	96.2

REFERENCES

- ALAN SMITH AND TONY VAUX. 2003. *Education, Conflict and International Development*. DFID Report
- BHARGAVA PRADEEP AND SHILP SHIKSHA SINGH. 2011. Conflict and crises situation: Case of Salawa Jedium in Chhatisgarh of the project NEC-FRE/STL00/01/10-11. G.B. Pant, Social Science Institute, Jhansi Allahabad
- BIRD, L. 2007. Children in Crisis: Education Rights for Children in Conflict Affected and Fragile. States. Background paper prepared for the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2008. Education for All by 2015: Will We Make It?* UNESCO
- District Report Cards for various years*. National University of Educational planning and Administration NUEPA
- Education for All Global Monitoring Report. 2011. *The Hidden Crisis: Armed conflict and education*. UNESCO
- HUMAN RIGHT WATCH. 2009. *Sabotaged Schooling: Naxalite attacks and police occupation of schools in India's Bihar and Jharkhand states*
- MEHTA RAHAL. 2011. Children's education in conflict areas in Jharkhand for NEG for New Delhi of the project NEC-FRE/STL00/01/10-11
- NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR PROTECTION OF CHILD RIGHT. 2012. *Education an emergency relief*. Bal Bandha Scheme for protection of Child Right in Areas of Civil Rights
- PLANNING COMMISSION. 2008. *Development Challenges in extremist affected Areas*: Report of an expert group to Planning Commission. Government of India. New Delhi
- ROSE, P. AND GREELEY M. 2006. *Education in Fragile States: Capturing Lessons and Identifying Good Practice*. Prepared for the DAC Fragile States Group Service Delivery Workstream Sub-Team for Education Services
- YOUNG INDIA. 2010. *Orissa Plight of Children in post communal violence situation in Kandhamal District of Orissa*