

Original Article

Factors Influencing the Household Choice in the Selection of School for Educating Their Wards in India: Evidence from National Sample Survey

¹Somnath Choudhury

¹Department of Economics, Berhampore College, Murshidabad, West Bengal.

Received Date: 19 September 2023

Revised Date: 25 September 2023

Accepted Date: 27 September 2023

Published Date: 29 September 2023

Abstract: *The present study has attempted to explore the pattern of enrolment witnessed by the country during the last decade. Further, the study also has examined whether the enrolment of children at public and/or private schools is influenced by the socio-economic characteristics of the households. The standard binary logit model has been used to identify the most relevant factors influencing households in selecting schools. The study found a transference in the enrolment of children from government schools to non-government schools. It might be the fact that teaching-learning methods along with the medium of language motivated the households to send their child to private schools. Under this circumstance, the statistical association reveals that the gender of the child, household size, ethnicity, education of the household and the ratio of educational expenditure to total household expenditure are found to be good predictors in the selection of school.*

Keywords: Education, Gender, Household, Public School, Private School.

I. INTRODUCTION

The last decade of the twentieth century witnessed a rapid expansion of access to education throughout the country of India (Ramcharan, 2003), and it is believed that this century has got the fruits of such expansion of education. In today's world, education and the acquisition of skills and knowledge have become significant determinants of the nation's productivity (Tilak, 2005; Yaacob et al., 2014). At the same time, education is expected to meet the families' demands by increasing the individual's productivity. Thus, increasing education has many dimensions; it helps families break the barrier of poverty and unemployment, simultaneously accelerating the health and nutrition status of families. Correspondingly, education has a key role in reducing various inequalities and deprivation in society. In India, the reflection of expanding education has been seen in the literacy rate of women vis-à-vis the enrolment in girls' schooling. Both of these have been increasing at a significant rate during the last three decades. The policymakers have believed that expanding girls' education is the most effective investment in the country.

Moreover, the magnitude of such expansion has a great impact on the well-being of the nation by reducing fertility (Dreze and Murthi, 1999), infant mortality, and maternal mortality, as well as it has been increasing the supply of efficient labour (Ozturk, 2008; Chandra A, 2011). On the contrary, the household's income has been increasing with the participation of women in the labour market (Pieters, 2011; Mukherjee, 2015). Under this circumstance, women's education has a significant role in increasing families' income; it is believed that this has a significant impact on the expansion of child education in society.

However, the twenty-first century has also witnessed the rapid privatisation of the education system in India (Chaturvedi, 2014). Indeed, it is assumed that public schools have failed to deliver quality education with respect to time (Rana et al., 2005), and private schools have become the prominent choice of many urban, suburban, and rural people of the nation (Langouët & Léger, 2000; Nishimura and Yamano, 2013). This has many reasons; for instance, Indian society can be classified according to different cultures, religions, ethnicities, and languages. Thus, because of the presence of such social disparity in the economy, the country witnessed different variations in the enrolment of students in different schools (Ball et al., 1996; Borooah and Iyer, 2005; Denessen et al., 2005; Huisman et al., 2010). Contrariwise, the presence of inequality in income distribution is also responsible for the stimulation of such variation in enrolment. Hence, the choice of schools has increased the gap between privileged and unprivileged sections of the country (Ambler, 1994). Households of higher income will prefer to be admitted to such schools where all the modern facilities are available; in this regard, private schools are ahead of public schools (Goyette, 2008; Tooley et al., 2007).



In contrast to private schools, public schools still have been using traditional methods of teaching (Kingdon, 1996), and they have to depend a lot on the policies and allotments of the government to install budgetary resources. The investors are well informed of the facts; they have been investing their money in building the school, advertising the school's facilities, and providing quality education through their brilliant academic staff (Muralidharan and Sundararaman, 2015). Correspondingly, it cannot be denied the role of government policies in the enhancement of private schools. The policymakers have been too concerned about reducing dropouts in schools rather than providing quality education in public schools. For this, a large number of households, mostly in urban and suburban areas, have been bypassing the public school and have preferred to send their child to the private school. However, there is no doubt that such a choice of schools ultimately increases the welfare of the students (Gallego et al., 2008). Thus, if all the schools have been conveying qualitative education to the learners, this will benefit the students (Hastings et al., 2005). In this circumstance, various factors are expected to determine the households' choice in the selection of schools. For instance, the choice of school has been significantly linked with the provision of a good school (Gorard, et al., 2002). The competitiveness among the students is also responsible for selecting private schools (Bosetti, 2004).

In most cases, the households have assumed to prefer neighbourhood schools for the education of their child; simultaneously, it is also seen that a large number of school buses are running on the highways. Thus, it has been a long debate about the factors that influenced the choice of households in selecting schools. Most researchers have identified the school's performance as the crucial determinant in the selection of the school. In addition, education is seen as a consumption good, and people would like to maximise the utility subject to budgetary resources (Bosetti, 2004). Thus, there may be various quantitative and qualitative factors that influence the households in the selection of schools, although it cannot be avoided the importance of socio-economic characteristics of the households in the selection of schools. Under this circumstance, the present study set the following objectives,

1. To understand the pattern of enrolment of students studied in the different schools.
2. To ascertain the factors that are influencing the household in the selection of private schools.

II. METHODOLOGY AND DATA DESCRIPTION

The present study has used the 71st and 75th NSSO unit-level data on the education of school-going children between the ages of 5-18. The study has two parts; in the first part, some aggregative analyses are made using cross-tab methods. The enrolment rate according to the socio-economic characteristics and the proportion of the students studied in public schools are considered for the analysis.

In the second part, the factors influencing households' choice in school selection are considered in the study. However, the households have two choices: whether they can send their child to public or private school; hence, the study has considered the binary logistic regression model to investigate the association of the explanatory variables to the binary factor of the households' choice in the selection of school. The logistic regression model can be estimated as,

$$y_i = \gamma + \delta \ln \left(\frac{EE_i}{CE_i} \right) + \beta \ln n_i + \sigma C_i + \varphi I_i + \alpha l_i + \epsilon \quad \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

where, $y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the HH sends their child to public school} \\ 0 & \text{for others} \end{cases}$

The n_i is the size of the household, $\left(\frac{EE_i}{CE_i} \right)$ is the ratio of education expenditure to consumption expenditure, C_i is the characteristics of the household like religion, caste and I_i is the individual characteristics like sex, age, and l_i is the living of origin of the household. The above equation can be extended as,

$$\ln \left(\frac{\hat{y}_i}{1-\hat{y}_i} \right) = \vartheta = \gamma + \delta \ln \left(\frac{EE_i}{CE_i} \right) + \beta \ln n_i + \sigma C_i + \varphi I_i + \alpha l_i \quad \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

However, $\hat{y}_i$ is the predicted probability of occurring the event $y = 1$ and $\ln \left(\frac{\hat{y}_i}{1-\hat{y}_i} \right)$ is the log odd ratio or logit. However, the log odd ratio can be interpreted as,

$$\text{or, } \hat{y}_i = \frac{e^\vartheta}{1+e^\vartheta} = \frac{e^{\gamma + \delta \ln \left(\frac{EE_i}{CE_i} \right) + \beta \ln n_i + \sigma C_i + \varphi I_i + \alpha l_i}}{1 + e^{\gamma + \delta \ln \left(\frac{EE_i}{CE_i} \right) + \beta \ln n_i + \sigma C_i + \varphi I_i + \alpha l_i}} \quad \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

The maximum likelihood estimation method was used to determine the coefficients of the explanatory variables from logistic transformation.

A) Description of the Variables Used

In the selection of school during the pre-adulthood periods of the children, the household is assumed to be the only source at which the household member collectively decides the school where they would likely send their wards for education. However, in India, there are two types of schools: government schools and non-government / private schools. All the schools followed the rules and regulations of the government of India in conveying education to the learners, but the private schools have some liberty to implement some rules in favour of boosting the school's financial condition. In this circumstance, the regulating authority of the school has made decisions about the fee structure, process of admission, examination schedule, syllabus of the courses, and the appointment of faculties. The regulations of the government schools have been based on different welfare policies, while the non-government. The school prefers to admit the students of the cream layer of society. The various researchers have elaborately discussed that non-government /private schools are much ahead of public schools in delivering qualitative education. For this, some households would decide to take admission for their wards in non-government schools. Thus, despite the competitiveness of the education system, it has great significance to identify the factors that determine the choice of the school. The following variables have been used in the analysis,

B) Variables used in the Logistic Regression Analysis

Abbreviations	Variables
ln_(HS)	Natural logarithm of the number of Household size
ln_(Edu. Exp./ACE)	Natural logarithm of the ratio of education expenditure to annual consumption expenditure
AYRSEDU	Average years of education of the household
Sector of origin = SE	$D_1 = SE = 1$ if the students belong to the urban area and 0 for others; the reference category has been selected as others.
Minority communities = MC	$D_2 = MC = 1$ if the students belong to the minority community, and 0 for others; the reference category has been selected as others community
Vulnerable category = VC	$D_3 = VC = 1$ if the students belong to the vulnerable category of SC/ST and 0 for others; the reference category has been selected as the others category.
Gender = SX	$D_4 = SX = 1$ if the student is male, and 0 for female. The reference category has been selected as others.
NCHH	No. of child between the ages of 0-18 of the household
Age = AG	Age of the child
Economic class = EC	$D_5 = EC = 1$, if the students belong to non-poor, 0 for poor, the reference category has been selected as the poor category

The present study has used the dependent variables y , where $y = 1$ if the household sends their wards to a private school and $y = 0$ if the household sends their wards to a public school. Correspondingly, the dummy variables $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_5$ along with some continuous variables are used in the study. Thus, the equation (3) can be extended as,

$$y_i = \gamma + \delta \ln_{-}\left(\frac{\text{Edu.Exp}}{\text{ACE}}\right) + \mu \ln_{-}HS + \sum_{i=1}^5 \sigma_i D_i + \alpha AYRSEDU + \tau NACHH + \theta AG + \epsilon \quad \dots\dots\dots(4)$$

The Pearson chi-square test is estimated to determine whether the model is fit for the above explanatory variables.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A) The Pattern of Enrolment in School Education at the Ages Of 5-18

It is a sterling fact that student enrolment between the ages of 5-18 has increased from 87.06 per cent to 88.29 per cent from 2014-15 to 2017-18, while female enrolment increased from 86.15 per cent to 87.25 per cent during the same time. In addition, with the passage of time, the enrolment of the poorest students has increased in a greater proportion while different results emerged among the richest students of the country. Appendix Table 1 illustrates the enrolment of the students according to their socio-economic characteristics. In the twenty-first century, the country witnessed a change in the enrolment of children from public schools to non-government /private schools. There may be various reasons for such transference, but the fact is that some households have preferred to send their wards to private schools.

In contrast, quite different results have emerged in recent days despite the appearance of such huge preferences for private schools. It is observed that the percentage of students studying in government schools has increased from 55.76 per cent (71st NSSO unit-level data) to 58.86 per cent (75th NSSO unit-level data) between the ages of 5-18, which reflects the changing preference of households in the selection of schools. Correspondingly, it is expected that a greater proportion of students from the upper strata has preferred to enrol on private school, while the households of lower strata preferred the government school for education. Indeed, the situation has changed with the enhancement of structural transformation; as a

result, the probability of poor students studying in the government school has decreased to some extent (from 79.49 per cent to 78.56 per cent source NSSO unit-level data of 71st and 75th rounds) while opposite situation emerged for the household of upper strata in the country (appendix Table 1).

Thus, as such a large number of students are studied in both government /public schools and private schools in the country, it has great significance in predicting the factors that influenced the choice of households in the selection of schools.

B) The Choice of Selection of School of the Household

Table 1 illustrates the result of binary logistic regression analysis for determining the factors in the choice of the school of the household. The study found that most of the explanatory variables are statistically significant except for the minority community and the number of children between the ages of 0-18 in the household, which are non-significant. In India, it is expected that the education scenario will change broadly after the implementation of new education policies in 2020. The policymakers have recommended implementing a universal education system for all students, which indirectly implies that the current education system possesses some degree of inequality in gathering knowledge. Under this circumstance, a certain number of households have sent their ward to private schools based on the fact that the child would receive modern education by using scientific methods. These households mostly belong to the rich and middle class of society. The fundamental thinking of these households is that the child can compete in every sphere of their life in the world. The higher unemployment rate along with poverty of the country might be the main reasons behind such thinking of the households. Contrariwise, it is the fact that these households have different socio-economic characteristics in the economy; henceforth, it has great significance to predict which factors mostly influence the households in the selection of schools.

Table 1: Binary logistic regression: Dependant variable: whether households send their child to a Private School

Explanatory variables	Coef.	Std. Error	Odds ratio
Sector of origin (reference category rural)	0.518	0.015141***	1.679
Ln_(Household size)	-0.130	0.02554***	0.878
Minority community (reference category others)	0.012	0.014983	1.012
Vulnerability category (reference category others)	-0.604	0.014595***	0.547
Ln_(proportion of education expenditure to total annual expenditure)	0.035	0.004665***	1.036
Economic class (reference category non-poor)	0.807	0.015583***	2.241
Sex of the child (reference category female)	0.188	0.013294***	1.207
No. of children at the age of 0-18 in the Household	-0.004	0.006959	0.996
Age of the child	-0.072	0.002039***	0.930
Avg. years of schooling of the HH	0.208	0.002823***	1.232
_cons	-0.967	0.045688***	0.380

Number of observations = 116485

Number of covariate patterns = 116378

LR $\chi^2(10) = 21811.42$, Prob > $\chi^2 = 0.0000$

Log-likelihood = -67998.859, Pseudo $R^2 = 0.1382$

Pearson $\chi^2(116367) = 116667.54$ (Goodness of fit), Prob > $\chi^2 = 0.2664$

*** indicates 1 percent level of significance

Source: Author's own calculation from NSSO 75th round unit level data

The result presented in Table 1 indicates that the probability of sending a child to a private school increased significantly by 1.679 times if the household belongs to the urban area compared to the country's rural area. In India, it is expected that most people in the urban area are employed in either the secondary or tertiary sector for livelihood; henceforth, they are expected to be well aware of the association between education and employment. Under this circumstance, they might prefer to educate their child up to the level where they can at least afford the quality of living in future and henceforth send their child to private school. In this dimension, the rural household lagged with the urban household.

Another attempt is made to find out how household size affects the choice of selection of schools for the household. The study found that the probability of sending a child to a private school declined significantly by 0.878 times if the household size was large and vice-versa. The plausible reason is that people's perception of their families has changed a lot; mostly, they prefer small families for the perfect nourishment of their wards. Hence, if the family size is large, people would try to bear minimum expenditure in education and send their children to public school.

To understand how the choice of selection of a school is affected by the religion and social category of the household, the study found that the propensity of selection of private school decreased significantly by 0.547 times if the household

belonged to vulnerable categories of SCs/STs communities as compared to the reference category of non-vulnerable groups. It may be the fact that poverty, unemployment and landlessness among the vulnerable categories of SCs and STs deterred them from enrolling their wards in private schools. As a result, they have preferred to send their wards to public schools. On the other hand, religion is also an important factor in the selection of school, and the study found that the association between minority communities and the propensity to select a private school is positive but insignificant, implying that no significant difference existed among the minority and non-minority communities in the choice of selection of school. Economic class is another significant factor that determines the preference for schools of the households. The result presented in Table 1 suggests that the propensity of sending a child to private school increased significantly by 2.241 times if the household belonged to the upper strata of society. Hence, most of the households of the upper strata would favour sending their child to private school. In this circumstance, the teaching-learning methods along with the medium of language might stimulate them to send their child to private school.

The study also attempted to show how the choice of selection of school is affected by the gender of the child. The result exhibited that the probability of selecting private schools increased significantly by 1.207 times if the child is male compared to the reference category of female. This mainly happened due to persisting gender discrimination in society. Still, many households in the country have preferred male children by expecting they would provide financial support in their old age and add to the family's wealth. Consequently, they preferred to provide quality education to them and, if required, send them to private schools. To understand how the number of children in the household between the ages of 0-18 affects the decision of households to send their wards to private school, the study found the association between the number of children in households between the ages of 0-18 and the propensity to the selection of a private school is negative but insignificant suggesting that the number of children in the household does not impact on the decision of the household whether send their wards in the public or private school.

An attempt is made to assess how the education of the household impacted the choice of selection of a school for their wards, and the study found that the probability of sending a child to private school increased by 1.232 times if the household contained decent education, indicating that most educated households have preferred to send their wards to the private school. It might be a fact that the perception of educated households has changed a lot; they prefer to send their wards to the top schools. In this context, private schools may have a higher preference than public schools. Correspondingly, it is believed that the medium of the classes of private schools, along with academic excellence and opportunities, might force the household to send their child to a private school. Another attempt has been made to investigate the impact of the age of children on the selection of school; interestingly, the study found that the probability of sending the child to a private school decreased by 0.93 times with the increase in the child's age. Under this circumstance, the expenditure on education is getting more significant while continuing their education in private schools. It is a fact that many households prefer to send their wards to a private school at an early age of their child, but in later times, when the cost of education gets higher, they are compelled to shift their child to public school.

Educational expenditure has played a significant role in the household when they send their wards to private schools for school education. The study found that the propensity of sending a child to a private school increased by 1.232 times with the increase of the proportion of educational expenditure in the household's total expenditure. Hence, a certain percentage of households have preferred to send their child to a private school despite increasing educational expenditure in total household expenditure. It may be the fact that the households of the richer section have preferred to send their child to the top school, where the budgetary resources do not bother them in achieving their expectation. On the contrary, the effectiveness of providing quality education to their child is almost unimportant to them.

IV. CONCLUSION

The present study illustrates that student enrolment between the ages of 5-18 has increased quite dramatically during the last decade. Conversely, the country also witnessed an alteration in the enrolment of children from public school to private school. It is believed that in the last two decades, government policies have been responsible for such alteration. However, the pattern of enrolment has changed quite a lot. Once upon a time, the households of upper strata preferred to send their child to the private school, but nowadays, a certain proportion of households of lower strata also prefer to send their child to the private school. Under this circumstance, the econometric analysis illustrates that the living origin, age, gender, average education of the household, the proportion of educational expenditure to total consumption expenditure, ethnic groups and household size are significantly associated with the household decision of selecting a school. The probability of sending a child to a private school has increased significantly if the household belongs to an urban area.

Similarly, a male child has a higher propensity to attend private school than a female child. Contrariwise, the households of the upper expenditure class are found to have a higher preference to send their child to private school. The propensity of sending a child to a private school has significantly enhanced if the household has a decent education. Thus,

various factors motivate households to enrol their child in private schools, and it is believed that the preference for enrolment in private schools has been increasing day by day. Henceforth, special attention is required for the survival of the public school. In this context, the government should implement some policies in favour of public schools that would encourage households of all economic classes to enrol their child in public schools.

V. REFERENCES

- [1] Ambler J. S “Who Benefits from Educational Choice? Some Evidence from Europe,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 13(3), 454-476 (1994).
- [2] Ball S. J, Bowe. R, and Gewirtz. S “School choice, Social Class and Distinction: The Realization of Social Advantage in Education,” *Journal of Education Policy*, 11(1), 89-112 (1996).
- [3] Borooah V. K., and Iyer. S “Vidya, Veda, and Varna: The Influence of Religion and Caste on Education in Rural India,” *The Journal of Development Studies*, 41(8), 1369-1404 (2005).
- [4] Bosetti. L., “Determinants of School Choice: Understanding how Parents Choose Elementary Schools in Alberta,” *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 387-405 (2004).
- [5] Chandra. A “Nexus between Government Expenditure on Education and Economic Growth: Empirical Evidences from India,” *Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education*, 3(6), 73-85 (2011).
- [6] Chaturvedi. M, Determinants of School Choice: Evidence from India, *Available at SSRN 2883736* (2014).
- [7] Denessen. E, Driessena. G, and Slegers. P “Segregation by Choice? A Study of Group-Specific Reasons for School Choice,” *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 347-368 (2005).
- [8] Drèze. J, and Murthi. M “Fertility, Education and Development: Further Evidence from India,” *LSE STICERD Research Paper No. DEDPS20* (2000).
- [9] Gallego F. A, Hernando. A. E, Flabbi. L, and Tartari. M “On the determinants and implications of school choice: Semi-structural simulations for Chile [with comments]. *Economía*, 9(1), 197-244 (2008).
- [10] Gorard. S, Taylor. C, and Fitz. J “Does School Choice Lead to Spirals of Decline?” *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(3), 367-384 (2002).
- [11] Goyette K. A. “Race, Social Background, and School Choice Options,” *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(1), 114-129 (2008).
- [12] Hastings. J. S, Kane T. J, and Staiger D. O “Parental preferences and school competition: Evidence from a public school choice program (2005).
- [13] Huisman A. H. M, Rani. U, and Smits J. P. J. M “School Characteristics, Socio-economic Status and Culture as Determinants of Primary School Enrolment in India,” (2010).
- [14] Kingdon. G, “The Quality and Efficiency of Private and Public Education: A Case Study of Urban India, “*Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 58(1), 57-82 (1996).
- [15] Langouet. G, and Léger. A “Public and Private Schooling in France: An Investigation into Family Choice,” *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(1), 41-49 (2000).
- [16] Sinha Mukherjee. S “More Educated and More Equal? A comparative Analysis of Female Education and Employment in Japan, China and India,” *Gender and Education*, 27(7), 846-870 (2015).
- [17] Muralidharan. K., and Sundararaman. V, “The Aggregate Effect of School Choice: Evidence from a Two-stage Experiment in India, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(3), 1011-1066 (2015).
- [18] National Sample Survey Organization, *Social Consumption: Education, 2014-15* (71st round), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi, (2014-15).
- [19] National Sample Survey Organization, *Household Social Consumption on Education in India, 2017-18* (75th round), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi, (2017-18).
- [20] Nishimura. M, and Yamano. T, “Emerging Private Education in Africa: Determinants of School Choice in Rural Kenya,” *World Development*, 43, 266-275 (2013).
- [21] Ozturk. I “The Role of Education in Economic Development: A Theoretical Perspective,” *Available at SSRN 1137541*, (2008).
- [22] Pieters. J, “Education and Household Inequality Change: A Decomposition Analysis for India,” *Journal of Development Studies*, 47(12), 1909-1924. (2011).
- [23] Ramachandran. V, “Gender Equality in Education (India), Progress in the last decade,” Background Paper for the EFA Monitoring Report, 2003-2004 (2003).
- [24] Rana. K., Santra. S, Mukherjee. A, Banerjee. T, and Kundu. M, “Public-Private Interface in Primary Education: A Case Study in West Bengal,” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1550-1555 (2005).
- [25] Tilak. J. B “Post-elementary education, poverty and development in India,” *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(4), 435-445 (2007).
- [26] Tooley. J and Dixon. P “Private Schooling for Low-income Families: A Census and Comparative Survey in East Delhi, India,” *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(2), 205-219 (2007).
- [27] Yaacob N. A., Osman M. M, and Bachok. S “Factors Influencing Parents’ Decision in Choosing Private Schools,” *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 153, 242-253 (2014).

Appendix Table 1:

		Enrolment of the students between the ages of 5-18						Percentage of students studied in public institutions at the age of 5-18					
		71 st Round (2014-15)			75 th Round (2017-18)			71 st Round (2014-15)			75 th Round (2017-18)		
		Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Region	Northern region	90.03	91.08	90.53	91.19	93.17	92.01	66.12	37.34	52.31	66.64	34.68	53.22
	Western region	80.99	86.49	83.12	82.02	88.27	84.40	59.69	27.94	46.88	64.31	30.21	50.71
	Eastern region	84.67	88.63	85.95	85.89	90.62	87.22	88.06	62.29	79.43	89.95	60.81	81.46
	North-eastern region	91.56	94.24	92.56	89.11	93.79	90.60	71.38	48.31	62.55	75.86	45.55	65.92
	Southern region	91.47	94.49	92.94	92.67	95.50	93.90	59.80	31.43	45.79	59.55	32.98	47.81
	Total	85.24	89.80	87.06	86.51	91.38	88.29	68.41	37.70	55.76	71.52	38.05	58.86
Sex	Male	86.49	89.90	87.84	87.73	91.52	89.12	66.09	35.51	53.68	69.67	36.60	57.21
	Female	83.76	89.68	86.15	84.99	91.20	87.25	71.25	40.23	58.23	73.90	39.90	60.97
	Transgender	0.00	0.00	0.00	83.33	100.00	88.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	66.67	87.50
	Total	85.24	89.80	87.06	86.51	91.38	88.29	68.41	37.70	55.76	71.52	38.05	58.86
Religion	Hindu	85.96	91.73	88.19	87.23	93.18	89.35	68.43	36.90	55.78	71.50	36.75	58.64
	Muslim	78.37	80.62	79.43	80.21	83.60	81.74	73.07	43.79	59.10	75.27	43.28	60.49
	Others	90.08	94.45	91.76	89.35	94.26	90.88	61.97	32.62	50.31	67.75	37.98	58.17
	Total	85.24	89.80	87.06	86.51	91.38	88.29	68.41	37.70	55.76	71.52	38.06	58.86
Social groups	Schedule tribe	83.67	90.86	85.31	84.10	91.99	85.78	79.27	49.34	71.99	82.52	50.99	75.34
	Schedule caste	83.45	86.07	84.32	84.82	88.35	85.84	76.48	54.19	68.86	76.59	51.63	69.13
	Other backward caste	85.05	88.25	86.38	86.87	90.17	88.12	63.32	35.09	51.34	67.06	37.04	55.43
	Others	88.35	93.01	90.70	89.83	93.93	91.85	62.24	31.71	46.42	65.23	30.63	47.75
	Total	85.24	89.80	87.06	86.51	91.38	88.29	68.41	37.70	55.76	71.52	38.05	58.86
Economic class	Poorest	81.06	78.57	80.54	83.94	87.36	84.52	83.15	64.85	79.49	82.52	59.56	78.56
	Poorer	84.49	85.13	84.68	85.82	86.19	85.90	74.52	53.80	68.25	77.13	52.98	72.04
	Middle	85.90	88.39	86.86	87.23	89.03	87.79	67.59	42.39	57.80	69.70	47.10	62.61
	Richer	87.61	91.34	89.41	88.50	91.65	89.91	57.21	34.74	46.11	61.89	38.62	51.27
	Richest	91.91	95.70	94.35	90.30	94.77	93.41	42.68	22.37	29.41	50.47	25.06	32.55
	Total	85.24	89.80	87.06	86.51	91.38	88.29	68.41	37.70	55.76	71.52	38.05	58.86

Source: author's own calculation from NSSO 71st and 75th round unit level data