ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at http://www.journalijdr.com

IJDR

International Journal of Development Research
Vol. 07, Issue, 07, pp.13727-13731, July, 2017

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

PARENTS' SATISFACTION REGARDING SCHOOLING NEAR A THERMAL POWER PROJECT – A CASE STUDY OF KALISINDH THERMAL POWER PROJECT

[1,*]Ms. Reeta Karra, [2]Dr. Mishra, P. N. and [3]Dr. Pooja Jain

[1]Assistant Engineer, Service Building, H-II, Second Floor, Kalisindh Thermal Power Project, Near village Undal, Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Utpadan Nigam Limited, Jhalawar - 326023 (Raj.) India
[2]Director, Institute of Management Studies, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidhyalay, Takshshila Campus, Khandwa Road, Indore – 452017 (M.P.) India
[3]Asst. Professor, International Institute of Professional Studies, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidhyalay, Takshshila Campus, Khandwa Road, Indore – 452017 (M.P.) India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 05th April, 2017
Received in revised form
24th May, 2017
Accepted 06th June, 2017
Published online 22nd July, 2017

Key Words:

ANOVA,
Convenience Sampling,
School Education,
Social Life.

Corresponding author:

ABSTRACT

A thermal power plant named as Kalisindh Thermal Power Project (KaTPP) is constructed in State Rajasthan. For construction of this power project land of nearby villages viz Devri, Motipura, Nimoda, Singhania and Undal was acquired. Availability of School Education for children in these villages is to be analyzed to know satisfaction level of parents living in villages with available facilities. A survey has been carried out on people living in these villages through a structured questionnaire to collect information. Convenience sampling is used for collection of data. Frequency, percentage, simple arithmetic mean and ANOVA are the statistical tools used for the analysis. With the help of this study it has been concluded that few parents are not satisfied with available education facilities in villages as they expect better education facilities for their children.

Citation: Ms. Reeta Karra, Dr. Mishra, P. N. and Dr. Pooja Jain. 2017. "Parents' satisfaction regarding schooling near a thermal power project – a case study of kalisindh thermal power project", *International Journal of Development Research*, 7, (07), 13727-13731.

INTRODUCTION

Education plays a very important role in our life. Education also helps to build confidence in someone and leading an independent life. Without education life is like an animal. It influences our social life in so many ways. Education is necessary to achieve success in life. School education is basic education for children. It gives knowledge and develops better understanding towards life. School education is prime and essential part of our life. These days for better education people rush towards private schools, hence education level in Government schools decreases. Sometimes private schools are expensive and located at far from villages. Everyone can not afford such expensive education for their children.

Muralidharan and Kremer (2006) found in their national survey of 20 states, 51% of all private rural primary schools were unrecognized. This accords with evidence from individual states in other studies. Kalisindh thermal power plant is constructed in state Rajasthan. It is located near village Undal approximately 15 km far from District Jhalawar. Construction of Kalisindh Thermal Power Plant was started in Oct 2009. For constructing this thermal power plant, land was acquired in the year 2008. During land acquisition, land of five villages i.e. Devri, Motipura, Nimoda, Singhania and Undal was also acquired, for which compensation was paid to villagers. A research on the socio-economic impact of Kalisindh thermal power project has been carrying out.

As a part of this research Assets owned by villagers of these five villages has been analysed. This paper presents the findings.

Literature Review

Good deal of literature is available related to this work. A few are presents below:-

Alan Peshkin (1978, 1982) showed how vital a school is to the survival of rural communities. He noted that schools serve as symbols of community autonomy, community vitality, community integration, personal control, personal and community tradition, and personal and community identity Bashir (1994, 1997), Govinda and Varghese (1993), and Kingdon (1994, 1996b) opined that due to the lack of achievement data linked to school and teacher characteristics, studies of the relative effectiveness of public and private schools in India have had to rely on achievement tests carried out by the researchers themselves, typically in small samples of schools.

Kingdon (1998) and Kingdon and Unni (2001) found that the education-wage relationship is convex in India, i.e. returns to secondary and higher education are significantly greater than to primary and middle levels of education. PROBE Team, (1999), reported that in rural Himachal Pradesh, for instance, there is a good deal of purchasing power but the government schools function well, so that there are few private schools. In central Bihar, by contrast, poverty is endemic, yet private schools can be found in many villages due to the dysfunctional state of government schools. Pradhan and Subramaniam (2000), found that private schooling is utilized even among the poor in India. Findings from the MIMAP survey show that, of all enrolled children aged 5-10 years old living below the poverty line, 14.8% attended private schools (8% in rural and 36% in urban India). The corresponding figures for ages 11-14 (junior school age) and 15-17 (secondary school age) were 13.8% and 7.0% respectively.

Kingdon et. al. (2004) noted that while attendance rates themselves are not a guarantee of grade completion or of achieving minimum levels of learning, these are nevertheless highly encouraging trends. Hanushek (2005), summarised that a large body of evidence suggests that workers' productivity and earnings depend not only on years of education acquired but also on what is learnt at school. Kremer et. al (2005), surveyed and found that absence of teacher in rural India in 2003 made three unannounced visits to each one of 3700 schools in 20 major states of India. They found that, on average, 25 percent of teachers in government primary schools were absent from school on a given day. Secondly, and more disturbingly, even among teachers who were present, only about half were found engaged in teaching.

Hanushek and Zhang (2006) confirmed significant economic returns to literacy for 13 countries on which literacy data were available. This evidence underlines the importance of ensuring that what schools do leads to learning achievement. Muralidharan and Kremer (2006) presented an OLS regression of the presence of a private school (in a village) on village level predictors. Controlling for village population, village per capita income, pupil-teacher ratio in public schools in the village, and state fixed effects, they found that private schools are significantly more likely to exist in villages with high mean level of teacher absence in the public schools. National data on learning achievement levels in ASER2005 (Pratham, 2006) found that private school students of grades 2 to 5 were 37.4% more likely than government school students to be able to read a text of grade 2 standard. They were also 50% more likely to be able to solve a 23 division problem (3 digits divided by 1 digit). Kingdon (2007), examined in his paper schooling access in terms of enrolment and school attendance rates, and schooling quality in terms of literacy rates, learning achievement levels, school resources, and teacher inputs. She also investigated the role of private schooling in India, examined the extent of growth of private schooling, surveyed evidence on the relative effectiveness and unit costs of private and public schools and discussed some major public education initiatives.

Objective

This study has a single objective of analysis of availability of school education in villages near to KaTPP.

Rationale

Kalisindh Thermal Power Project is constructed near village Undal, Rajasthan. Few more villages are also situated in neighbouring area of this Thermal Power Project. No study has earlier been carried out to find out availability of school education for children living in these villages. This research is to analyze education facilities available for children of villagers living in nearby villages to the Kalisindh Thermal Power Project. The researcher has gone through exhaustive amount of literature available related to this field of study. Very little research in this field has been carried out till now. This study is an endeavour to plug this gap.

Hypothesis

Following Hypothesis has been framed and tested in the study:-

H_{01}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to having no. of children 6-15 years old".

H_{02}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their all children go to school".

H_{03}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their children going to private school".

H_{04}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their children going to Government school".

H_{05}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their number of children do not go to school".

H_{06}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to why their children do not go to school".

H_{07}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to satisfaction with available education facilities for their children".

H_{08}: "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to problems/issues with available education facilities for their children".

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The type of research used here is descriptive in nature. A survey of villagers living in five villages i.e. Devri, Motipura, Nimoda, Singhania and Undal have been carried out by filling a structured questionnaire form. Convenience sampling has been used for selection of villagers. As there is not much difference among the people of villages the Convenience sampling for this particular study is appropriate. Reliability analysis was done to identify internal consistency of the variables. Table – 1 shows Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was found to be greater than 0.7. This shows adequate internal consistency. Frequency, percentage, simple arithmetic mean and ANOVA are the statistical tools used for the analysis.

Data Analysis and Findings

As the result of Data Analysis following findings have emerged:-

Table – 2 shows that many respondents don't have children of age group 6 year to 15 year. It infers that their children are either studying in college or working somewhere. Few people have 1 or 2 children between ages of 6 years to 15 years. Very few people have 3 children or more than 3 children. It infers that people of villages are also aware about population control. Table – 3 shows that very few respondents said that their children are not going to school. Table – 4 shows that more children are going to Government school. It infers that in villages only Government schools are easily affordable and easily available near to the village.

Table – 5 shows that only very few children are not going to school. Table – 6 shows that very few children don't have interest in studies, hence not going to school. Very few parents' economic condition doesn't permit them to afford their children's education. Table – 7 shows that many respondents are satisfied with education facilities available near to their villages but few respondents are not satisfied with available education facilities. It infers that they expect better education facilities for their children.

Interpretation of ANOVA

The ANOVA table is interpreted as below:-

No. of children 6-15 years old

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and no. of children 6-15 years old is 1.323 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to having no. of children 6-15 years old. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to having no. of children 6-15 years old" is not rejected.

All Children go to school

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and all children goes to school is 0.774 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to their all children goes to school. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their all children go to school" is not rejected.

Children going to private school

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and children going to private school is 1.902 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to their children going to private school. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their children going to private school" is not rejected.

Children going to Government school

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and children going to Government school is 0.810 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to their children going to Government school. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their children going to Government school" is not rejected.

Number of children do not go to school

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and no. of children do not go to school is 0.768 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to their number of children do not go to school. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to their number of children do not go to school" is not rejected.

Reason for children do not go to school

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and why children do not go to school is 0.729 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to why their children do not go to school. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to why their children do not go to school" is not rejected.

Satisfaction with available educational facilities

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and satisfaction with educational facilities is 0.874 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to satisfaction with available educational facilities. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to satisfaction with available education facilities for their children" is not rejected.

Problem/issues with available educational facilities

Table – 8 shows that f value of interaction between the villages and problems/issues with educational facilities is 2.229 with degree of freedom 4, which is not significant. It means that there is no significant difference in the villagers with respect to problems/issues with available education facilities for their children. In the light of this the null hypothesis namely "There is no significant difference among the villagers with respect to problems/issues with available education facilities for their children" is not rejected.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Many children of these villages are going to Government school. Government schools are easily available near to these villages and affordable by villagers. Very few children don't have interest in studies, hence not going to school. Very few parents' economic condition doesn't permit them to afford their children's education. Few parents are not satisfied with available education facilities in villages as they expect better education facilities for their children. It seems only few villagers are aware about better education for their children; hence not satisfied with the available facilities. Most of villagers are actually not aware about education system due to low literacy level in villages.

These days for better education people rush towards private schools, hence education level in Government schools decreases. Government shall improve their study pattern so that education level may improve. Private schools have opportunity to open branches of their school in vicinity of these villages so that villagers of these villages can take benefit of these schools for education of their children. Also management of Private schools shall prepare some scholarship plans for promoting education of such children whose parents' economic condition doesn't permit them to afford education of their children. It can help to build career of those students who want to study and touch the zenith.

Limitations of the Study

The study has following major limitations

- The study is limited to the villagers living in villages located near to the Kalisindh Thermal Power Plant only; therefore findings may not be valid for other areas.
- Non probabilistic Convenience sampling has been used for collecting primary data from villagers for the study and it has its own limitations.
- Results cannot be generalized.

REFERENCES

Eric A. Hanushek & Lei Zhang, 2006. "Quality-Consistent Estimates of International Returns to Skill," *NBER Working Papers 12664, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., Nov*.

Hanushek Eric 2005. "The Economics of School Quality", *German Economic Review*, 2005, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pg. 269-286.

Kingdon G., 1994. "An Economic Evaluation of School Management-types in India: A Case Study of Uttar Pradesh", *Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Economics Department, Oxford University.*

Kingdon Geeta Gandhi, 2007. "The progress of school education in India", *Oxford Journals Social Sciences Oxford Review of Economic Policy, March, Volume 23, Issue 2, pg. 168-195.*

Kingdon, G. 1998. "Does the Labour Market Explain Lower Female Schooling in India?", *Journal of Development Studies*, October, Vol. 35, No. 1, pg. 39-65.

Kingdon, G. and Jeemol Unni. 2001. Education and Women.s Labour Market Outcomes in India., *Education Economics*, 9, No. 2: 173-195, August.

Kingdon, G., 1996b. "The Quality and Efficiency of Public and Private Schools: A Case Study of Urban India", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, Feb. Vol.* 58, No.1, pg. 55-80.

Kingdon, G., R. Cassen, K. McNay and L. Visaria 2004. .Education and Literacy., Chapter in T. Dyson, R. Cassen, and L. Visaria (eds) *Twenty-First Century India . Population, Economy, Human Development and the Environment*, Oxford University Press, London.

Kremer M., N. Chaudhury and F. H. Rogers, K. Muralidharan, and J. Hammer 2005. "Teacher Absence in India: A Snapshot", *Journal of the European Economic Association.* Vol. 3, No. 2-3: 658-667.

Muralidharan K. and M. Kremer 2006. "Private and Public Schools in Rural India", Mimeo, Harvard University, March.

Peshkin, Alan 1982. The Imperfect Union. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Peshkin, Alan. 1978. Growing Up American: Schooling and the Survival of Community. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pratham 2006. "ASER 2005 - Annual Status of Education Report", Pratham, New Delhi, February 2006.

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

Tooley J., and P. Dixon 2005. "Private Schools Serving the Poor: A Study from Delhi, India" The Center for Civil Society, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom.

Appendix

Table – 1: Reliability Statistics

Name of Village	Cronbach Alpha
Devri	0.735
Motipura	0.771
Nimoda	0.724
Singhania	0.757
Undal	0.809

Table 2. No. Of Children between 6-15 years old

Village	Not Applicable (%)	1 child (%)	2 children (%)	3 children (%)	More than 3 children (%)
Devri	56	12	22	6	4
Motipura	43	23	23	9	2
Nimoda	61	17	15	7	0
Singhania	64	18	12	6	0
Undal	55	20	15	7	3

Table – 3: All children go to school

Village	Not applicable (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Devri	56	42	2
Motipura	43	57	0
Nimoda	61	37	2
Singhania	64	32	4
Undal	55	43	2

Table 4: If children go to school, private school / Government school

Village	Private School			Government School		
	Not applicable (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not applicable (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Devri	56	16	28	56	32	12
Motipura	43	21	36	42	45	13
Nimoda	63	13	24	63	28	9
Singhania	64	22	14	64	12	24
Undal	55	8	37	55	38	7

Table 5. If children do not go to school, how many do not go to school

Village	Not Applicable (%)	1 child (%)	2 children (%)	3 children (%)	More than 3 children (%)
Devri	98	2	0	0	0
Motipura	100	0	0	0	0
Nimoda	98	2	0	0	0
Singhania	96	2	2	0	0
Undal	98	2	0	0	0

Table – 6. Why do not children go to school?

Village	Not applicable (%)	Parents don't want to educate them (%)	No school is nearby vicinity (%)	Economic condition doesn't permit (%)	Children don't want to go to school (%)	Parents don't want to educate girls (%)
Devri	98	0	0	0	2	0
Motipura	100	0	0	0	0	0
Nimoda	98	2	0	0	0	0
Singhania	96	0	0	2	2	0
Undal	98	0	0	2	0	0

Table – 7: Education facilities satisfaction / problems / issues

Village	Satisfied with education facilities			Problems/issues with education facilities		
	Not applicable (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not applicable (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)
Devri	56	30	14	56	14	30
Motipura	43	57	0	43	0	57
Nimoda	63	37	0	63	0	37
Singhania	62	22	16	62	14	24
Undal	55	33	12	55	12	33

Table – 8: ANOVA

			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Education							
1.	No. of children 6-15 years old	Between Groups	6.036	4	1.509	1.323	.262
		Within Groups	282.857	248	1.141		
		Total	288.893	252			
2.	Do all your children go to school?	Between Groups	.898	4	.225	.774	.543
		Within Groups	71.995	248	.290		
		Total	72.893	252			
3.	If yes, are they going to private school?	Between Groups	5.747	4	1.437	1.902	.111
		Within Groups	187.328	248	.755		
		Total	193.075	252			
4.	If yes, are they going to Government School?	Between Groups	1.628	4	.407	.810	.520
		Within Groups	124.546	248	.502		
		Total	126.174	252			
5.	If no, state how many of them do not go to school.	Between Groups	.096	4	.024	.768	.547
		Within Groups	7.762	248	.031		
		Total	7.858	252			
6.	If no, why do not some/any of your children go to school?	Between Groups	.582	4	.146	.729	.573
		Within Groups	49.528	248	.200		
		Total	50.111	252			
7.	Are you satisfied with these educational facilities?	Between Groups	1.488	4	.372	.874	.480
		Within Groups	105.540	248	.426		
		Total	107.028	252			
8.	Problems/issues with educational facilities	Between Groups	7.708	4	1.927	2.229	.066
		Within Groups	214.410	248	.865		
		Total	222.119	252			

****