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# Abstract <br> Differentials in school attendance in South Africa: A household situational analysis across the Provinces 
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The thesis examines the patterns of school attendance across the nine Provinces of South Africa. With reference to individuals of eligible age, school attendance is conceived of three statuses: effective attendance (those who are presently attending an educational institution), definitive non-attendance (those with no intentions of going back to school), and temporary non-attendance (possibility of going back to the educational system within a specified time frame). The focus of the study is on the primary and secondary levels of schooling. A household based approach is pursued to profile the extent to which young people aged 20 years and below either who attend/do not attend schooling institutions in each of the nine Provinces. Differentials in school attendance are examined along the lines of some socio-demographic and spatial variables drawn from the 2004 general household survey conducted by Statistics South Africa. The core hypothesis is that school attendance is subjected to the influence of both individual attributes and household characteristics. The study also attempts to profile the causes of non-attendance (definitive and temporary) through a set of instrumental variables. To complement this subjective profiling, appropriate statistical methods are used to assess the significance of contributing factors to non-school attendance at the household level.
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## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

## Background of the Study

The Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948, Act 26) and The Declaration on the Rights of the Child (1959) calls for access to free and compulsory education for all. The demand for the provision of free and compulsory schooling in South Africa was prominent in the Freedom Charter adopted by the Congress Alliance in 1955.

The South African educational system owes much to the Western tradition of education, but has many facets that are of its own making (Behr, 1988). The South African Schools Act (SASA) of 1996, which forms the legal foundation for schools in the country, makes schooling compulsory for all learners aged (7-15 years). This Act also states that compulsory education is the cornerstone of any modern and democratic society that aims to give all its citizens fair and equal opportunities in life. Moreover, the government is bound by the Constitution to progressively improve access to Further Education and Training (FET) (which are Grades 10 to 12 in schools).

The current programme to expand the reception grade year (Grade R ) into all public primary schools, following the recommendations of Education on Early Childhood Development (ECD), will result in compulsory schooling that begins in Grade R, and continues to Grade 9.

The history of education in South Africa during the latter half of the $19^{\text {th }}$ century and the early part of the 20th century clearly reflects the educational adaptations of a
changing society. In this new era, the school system had to be adapted to provide adequate facilities for secondary, technical, vocational and university education.

## Differences in School Attendance

Compulsory school attendance for the former White education applies from the beginning of the year in which a child reaches the age of seven years until the last school day of the year in which he/she reaches the age of sixteen years or until the child successfully completed the twelfth level, or whichever is the earlier (Behr, 1988).

On the other hand, the provision in respect for compulsory school attendance in the Coloured education was set out in the Coloured Persons Education Amendment Act, 1983 (Act 85 of 1983). In 1974, this Act stipulated that school attendance was compulsory, and this was only applicable in certain urban areas in the Cape Province and Natal. This Act was, however, amended in 1980 (Behr, 1988).

In the Indian education policy, compulsory school attendance was between the ages of ( $7-15$ years) and it was instituted by regulations promulgated in the Government Gazette of 1973 and 1978. However, the attractiveness and holding power of the schools for Indian children were such that even prior to the promulgation of these regulations it was estimated in 1970 that some 99 \% of all educable Indian children between the ages of 6-13 years were at school (Behr \& Macmillan, 1966).

The legislation pertaining to Black education under the Department of Education and Training (DET) provides for the introduction of compulsory education in designated areas. The DET in its annual report for 1985 stated that compulsory school attendance
had been introduced "in all areas where school committees requested this to be done" (DET, 1985). This meant that Black education did not have Acts which stipulated school compulsory school attendance. Therefore, it meant that schooling was encouraged by the parents, and in cases where the parents did not request for schools in a particular area, it meant there was no schooling which implied school absenteeism among the learners.

Absenteeism is associated with temporary non-attendance of learners at schools. According to the Learner Absenteeism Report (2008), the Department of Education established the prevalence of learner absenteeism in South African schools to be 5$15 \%$. The study adopted a sample of absenteeism as a situation where a learner is not at school for an entire day. In developed countries, absenteeism rates usually range between 6-8 \%. However, the rates in African countries have been found to be high, sometimes as high as $50 \%$.

The study also reported that reasons for learner absenteeism generally fall into three categories: personal, (illness, learning difficulties); socio-economic (transport, lack of parental involvement, dysfunctional families, the impact of HIV/Aids, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy); and school-based (boredom, punishment for late coming, bullying and violence in schools).

## Statement of the Problem

Even with the Compulsory Education School Act, Access, and Equity, school attendance remains a major factor that impacts on learner's educational attainment. Learners across the different strata of the society are still not taking the opportunity of
free schooling hence; school attendance remains a challenge for the authorities. Therefore, the different and various questions which arise during this research would be answered based on tested evidences. The central questions to this study are as follows:

- Does the family background affect school attendance?
- How does the child's environment affect school attendance?
- Does parents' survival affect school attendance?
- What are the roles of parents with regards to school attendance?
- What demographic characteristics affect school attendance?
- What household characteristics affect school attendance the most?
- How does the school environment affect school attendance?
- What age group do learners drop out the most?
- How does poverty and malnutrition affect school attendance?
- What Provinces have the highest and lowest school attendance rates?


## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to review the 2004 General Household Survey to examine the issues of school attendance and non-attendance across the nine Provinces of South Africa. The study will analyze school attendance among the nine Provinces, and based on the results obtained it will help to proffer solutions towards reducing nonattendance among learners even if it can not be completely resolved. The study will highlight the issue of learner's absenteeism and the various problems associated with it. Therefore, this study sets out to critically examine the major differentials in school attendance and learners absenteeism along socio-demographic and spatial variables.

## Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- To measure the level of school attendance across the household situation.
- To investigate the effect of some demographic characteristics on school attendance.
- To investigate the level of school attendance across the nine provinces in South Africa.
- To determine the major reasons for non-attendance among learners particularly among the grades 9 and 10 .
- To proffer solution to the problem of non-attendance among learners.
- To find out how the conditions at the schools affect school attendance.


## Statement of Hypothesis (or Hypotheses)

- Learners who reside in urban areas are more likely to have higher rates of attendance than those in the rural areas.
- School distance influences regular attendance
- Well-fed learners are more likely to assimilate better and attend school regularly than children who are under fed.
- High family income encourages school attendance.
- Limited resources (human and physical) affects school attendance.
- The demise of the parents determines school attendance.
- School attendance is determined by the sex of the learner.


## Significance of Study

This study will generally look into the issue of school attendance at the high school level across the nine provinces of South Africa. This study brings to focus the trend of attendance in the past, the present, and the future consequence if not checked in time. This research is significant as the 2004 General Household Survey questionnaire was used to thoroughly examine the issue across the nine provinces of South Africa. Also it will add to the growing volume of literature on the subject matter.

## Scope and Limitation of Study

Although non-attendance could be experienced at any educational level, this study will focus and be limited to the high school level particularly among grades 9 and 10 who are of 20 years of age and below across the nine provinces of South Africa.

## Definition of Keywords

School Attendance: This can be defined as attendance at any regular accredited educational institution or programme, public or private, for organized learning at any level of education at the time of census or, if census was taken during the vacation period at the end of the school year, during the last school year (Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, Revision 1, United Nations, New York, 1998, paragraph 2.150).

For the purpose of this study, the following terminologies were used to refer to different categories of school attendance by learners in the survey:

Current attendance: These are learners currently attending school or are in an educational institution. This will be examined along the various problems usually encountered by the learners at their different schools where they currently attend, and the reference period is within twelve months.

Non-attendance and indefinite non-attendance: These are learners, who have attended school before, but they are presently not in school, and more importantly, they have no intention on going back to school.

Indefinite non-attendance: Those who do not know when they would return to school. Such learners fall under the categories such as; ever attended school, period when last attended school, any intentions of going back to school, the main reason for not attending, and lastly the age at which they left school.

Absenteeism: This is a situation where a learner is not at school for an entire day.

South Africa: South Africa is divided into nine Provinces: Eastern Cape, Free State, Gauteng, KwaZulu Natal, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Northern Cape, North West, and the Western Cape. Each of these Provinces has its own Legislature, Premier and Executive Council (Department of Welfare, 1998). The country has a population of 40.1 million, with more than a third of the population ( $34 \%$ ) aged less than 15 years, implying that South Africa has a young population (Statistics South Africa, 1998).

Household: The household is the number of persons occupying a private dwelling. A category in which a person lives alone or a group of persons occupying the same dwelling is called the household type (Statistics South Africa). A household consists of a single person or a group of people who live together for at least four nights a week, eat together and share resources.

Household Variables: The household variables comprise variables which in which questions that concerned the father and the mother of the household were asked, and also the children in the respective households. The questions were posed in order to find out the literacy level of each household member, and also to find out the school attendance rate of each child of the household.

Poverty: Otherwise called penury is the deprivation of common necessities that determine the quality of life. These necessities include food, clothing, shelter and safe drinking water. Poverty may also include deprivation of opportunities to learn, to obtain better employment, and/or to enjoy the respect of fellow citizens. Orshansky (1963) stated that "to be poor is to be deprived of those goods and services and pleasures which others around us take for granted". The Oxford English Dictionary defined poverty as a state of being very poor, the state of being in lack both in quality or amount.

General Household Survey: The General Household Survey (GHS) is an annual household survey specifically designed to measure various aspects of the living circumstances of South African households. The key findings reported here focuses on the five broad areas which include: education, health, activities related to work and unemployment, housing and household access to services and facilities (GHS, 2005).

Schooling: According to the Oxford English Dictionary ( $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition), it is defined as the education received at school.

Educational systems: are established to provide education and training, often for children and the youth. A curriculum defines what students should know, understand and be able to do as result of receiving education. A teaching profession delivers teaching which enables learning and a system of policies, regulations, examinations, structures; while funding enables teachers to teach to the best of their abilities. Sometimes education systems can be used to promote doctrines or ideals as well as knowledge, which is known as social engineering.

Policy: A "policy" can be defined as a deliberate plan of action to guide decisions and achieve rational outcome. It can also be used to denote what is actually done, even though it is unplanned.


Province: A Province in South Africa is a territorial unit, almost always an administrative division.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews literature relating to school attendance. In this chapter, a review of related works which provides the analytical framework for this study is undertaken. School attendance is examined along various differentials, therefore, this review of literature has been organised into the following subheadings;
i. Definition of school attendance
ii. School attendance across different contexts.
iii. The home environment
iv. The schooling environment.

### 2.2 Definition and Meaning of School Attendance

The Glossary of Statistical Terms defined school attendance as attendance at any regular accredited educational institution or programme, public or private, for organized learning at any level of education at the time of the census or, if the census is taken during the vacation period at the end of the school year, during the last school year (Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, 1998). Enrolment number compared against absenteeism determines school attendance hence; school attendance could also be defined in terms of the enrolment ratio. The gross enrolment ratio is the total enrolment regardless of age, to the population of the age group that officially corresponds to the level of education shown. Estimates are based on UNESCO classification of education levels. Tertiary attendance requires as a minimum condition of admission, the successful completion of education at the second level or evidence of attainment of an equivalent level of knowledge and is provided at a university or college (UNESCO, 2006).

### 2.3 School Attendance across Different Contexts

Education is generally regarded as a powerful means for reducing poverty and achieving economic growth. In many Western countries, it is perceived as a means to empower people, improve individuals' earning potential, promote a healthy population, and build a competitive economy (Hanushek and Wossmann, 2007; UNESCO, 2006). In the developing world, despite considerable progress, millions of young children are not in primary education. To improve this situation, it is of fundamental importance to gain a better understanding of the factors that influence the educational enrolment of children in the developing world.

In much of the developing world, the education provided to children is of an abysmal quality. The things most parents in the developed countries take for granted are beyond the wildest dreams of their counterparts in the developing world. For example, schools in much of sub-Sahara region of Africa are usually without access to clean water and are often without toilets. Millions of children are being taught by poorlytrained teachers in classrooms lacking blackboard, chalk, chairs or desks (UNESCO, 2004).

According to the human capital theory, the participation of a child in education is an investment in human capital because of the expected returns later in life (Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1958). For most of the young children in the developing countries, the investment decision is generally made by the parents. Edmonds (2006) states that the direct costs of going to school and the value parents attach to education are influenced by many factors, both at the level of the household and in the context in which the household lives. As a result, parents weigh off the future benefits of sending their children to school against the immediate costs. These include the direct costs of
books, school fees, uniforms and travel as well as the opportunity costs of the children not being able to help at home, in the household, or at the family business, or to earn additional money with child labour (Admassie, 2003; Basu, 1999).

Furthermore, schooling level and work situation may influence the way children value education; the number and gender of the children may influence how scarce resources for education are distributed. Culture may also affect the willingness of local people to educate their daughters; while the quantity and quality of the local educational facilities determine whether it is possible and expedient to send children to school. The local labour market structure affects the perceived benefits of education; cultural practices, like marriage traditions, may also influence the returns to education of daughters versus sons (Fafchamps and Wahba, 2006; Ersado, 2005). These examples make it clear that educational enrolment of children in the developing world may be influenced by many factors and these determine the extent of school attendance.

It is a common trend that children from a background with more socio-economic resources have a higher probability of being in school (Edmonds, 2006). The cost of education, such as fees, books, and uniforms, are less likely to be problems to wealthier families. The opportunity costs of children not being able to help at home, at the family farm, or by earning additional income through child labour are also likely to be less important to them (Basu, 1999). Moreover, wealthier families are less affected by financial constraints. Poverty has been found to be a major obstacle for the education of children from poor families (Edmonds, 2006; Ersado, 2005; Thorbecke and Charumilind, 2002).

As a result, the household income, and the occupation and education of the parents are said to play a role in the education of the children of the household. For example, parents earning good salaries, are more aware of the benefits of children's education, and therefore make efforts to send them to school (Breen and Goldthorpe, 1997). Considering the educational level of the parents, there is ample evidence that children from better educated parents more often attend and remain in school (Buchmann and Brakewood, 2000; Colclough et al., 2000; Ersado, 2005). Parents who have reached a certain educational level may want their children to achieve at least the same level (Breen and Goldthorpe, 1997).

However, the gender of parents also plays a role in determining the schooling of the child in the home. In traditional homes, fathers normally decide which child attends school and usually it is the male child. The female child is then left to contribute to the household earnings (Lawko, 2007). The educational enrolment of girls is dependent on the education of the mother. Mothers who have succeeded in completing a certain level of education and have experienced some level of education know that it is within the reach of girls to complete that level. Therefore, it is expected of them to use the insights derived from their higher education to make sure that their daughters get educated (Emerson et al., 2007).

Furthermore, Lakwo (2007) found that most Ugandan women generated some income through their access to micro-credit activities. And this indicates that mothers who are gainfully employed and hence contribute to the household income have more influence on family decisions than women who are not employed. It seems likely that such more independent women may be better able to create the possibility for their children and especially for their daughters to go to school. On the other hand, when
the mother is forced to work because of poverty, the daughters may have to take over her household tasks and therefore have fewer chances to go to school. The effects of a mother's employment may thus differ depending on the circumstances.

The number of children in a family is also very important. In Western societies and some developing countries, family size tends to be negatively correlated to educational enrolment, probably because the available resources have to be divided among more children (Buchmann and Hannum, 2001; Pong, 1997).

However, this is not the case in all situations. For example, in the rural part of Botswana, the number of children (7-14 years) in the household was found to be positively related to enrolment (Chernichovski, 1985). The reason for this may be that with more children, there are also more helping hands at home, which increase the chance that at least some children can go to school. However, some of the children with absent parents from the household were more inclined not to be in school, because they might have to replace the work done by absent parent. Also, in situations where children are required to do household chores or to contribute to the household income, the possibility existed that adopted or foster children if present, may be required by parents to perform those duties instead of their own children (Fafchamps and Wahba, 2006).

Buchmann and Brakewood (2000) observed the impact of globalization, including the diffusion of value patterns that stress the importance of education and equality among sexes. In urban areas, the road and transport infrastructure are much better, the state influence is generally stronger and there may be more pressure on parents to send their children to school. Families living in cities may also have moved there because
of the better educational opportunities for the children there. Fafchamps and Wahba (2006) found in Nepal that children living near towns and cities are more likely to attend school. Both educational enrolment in general and enrolment of girls compared to boys are thus expected to be higher in more developed and urban areas.

### 2.4 School Attendance in South Africa

South Africa can be said to be close to achieving Universal Basic Education (96.6 \% enrolment for 7-15 years in 2003 (Department of Education, 1996d) with almost all children of school-going age entering school and the majority reaching the end of grade 9. However, the Ministerial Committee on Learner Retention found that there was a high failure rate, repetition and drop-out in grades 10-12.

South Africa is also a society that has witnessed remarkable changes. It has moved from being an authoritarian, undemocratic, racially segregated society in which economic power was in the hands of a few, to a more open and inclusive society. In particular, the changes in the field of education have been remarkable and spectacular. The educational changes in South Africa critically consider the debates about the most appropriate form, content and knowledge base for educational management development (EMD) (Department of Education, 1996d).

Educational policy developments have been wide-ranging and comprehensive, and a number of important policies have been introduced since 1994. These include the restructuring of the curriculum, the move toward outcomes-based learning, the integration in education and training through the National Qualification Framework (NQF) and the restructuring of the higher education system through the Higher Education Act (Kallaway et al., 1997). The White Paper on Education and Training
(DOE, 1995d) emphasizes the provision of access to schooling of all children of school-going age in South Africa. The WPET prioritises access to schooling as a means in which education would serve as a form of reconstruction in the new South Africa (Karlsson et al., 1996). Furthermore, the South African Schools Act (1996), which replaced Education Acts of the apartheid government, asserted that all learners have right to access basic and quality education without discrimination of any sort. Therefore, "no learner may be denied admission to an ordinary school on any grounds, including grounds of disability, language, learning difficulty or pregnancy" (SASA, 1996).

The Schools Act (1996) further requires that the quality of education received by all learners must be improved. This implies there must be better provision of facilities, better-trained educators, and better methods of teaching and learning and improved school conditions. Learners must also be better motivated and disciplined to take their education seriously and to use the opportunities that are now open to them.

The South African Schools Act has paved the way for a single, non-racial school system. It also makes schooling compulsory for children aged 6-14 years. It provides for two types of schools namely, public and independent schools. A significant change introduced by the Act is that the previous differentiation of state-funded schools no longer exists, and admission for learners to public schools and for governance of public by school governing bodies. These governing bodies have functions as stated in Section 20 of the Act (South African Schools Act, 1996).

The establishment of democracy in South Africa has necessitated the democratisation of the educational system. As such, it is important to locate the current educational reforms within wider processes of transition. The politics of negotiation have brought to the fore particular modes of representation and participation, which have also resonated in the process of educational reform. For example, between the first two decades of the Bantu Education (1960-1970), there was notable increase in African enrolment (Badat, 1997; Chisholm 1997; Chisholm and Fuller, 1996; Department of Education, 1998).

At present there are about 250000 black students at these Model C schools (former white schools). These students come from the small but growing black middle class. Meanwhile, the majority of black children continue to attend schools of poor quality, while about 2 million children of school-going age are not in school. White and Indian education are generally well-endowed. Coloured education is also in a parlous state while African education is by far worse off. In the various school subsystems, there thus exists a racial hierarchy of unequal provision to which in-school children are subjected (Chisholm, 2004).

On the one hand, Africans and Coloureds most often have incomplete secondary education while Asians and whites are most often in possession of a Matriculation Certificate. The rise in the proportion of individuals with no Matriculation certificates is clearly evident amongst Africans and Coloureds, and is accompanied by declining proportions of individuals in these groups with only primary education and no formal education. However, no significant shifts were observed in the proportions of

Africans and Coloureds with tertiary education, such that by year 2003 only $8 \%$ had post-school qualification (Vally and Spreen, 1998; Motala, 1997).

In contrast, amongst whites, tertiary qualification rates increased from 4-35 \%, while less than $1 \%$ did not have secondary education. Between 1995 and 2003, there were marked improvements with regard to educational attainment. The proportion of the population with no schooling fell in both group cohorts in urban and rural areas. The proportion of individuals with no formal education aligns relatively well with the proportion of individuals who are illiterate (defined as being unable to read or write in any language).

Carrim (1992) emphasises that the designation of school began in 1985 in the former House of Delegate and House of Representatives schools. The enrolment of black learners only began in 1990 in the former Transvaal Education Department (TED), when it was announced by the House of Assembly that white state schools could enrol black (African, Indian, and Coloured) learners. This ensured that all the former departments began to officially enrol learners from all race groups. There are opinions that if these schools (former TED, HOD and HOR) had not enrolled African learners, they would have been under-utilised and therefore, forced to close and or make educators redundant.

Learner enrolment in Township schools (formerly African area) has not decreased but rather increased over the years and this can be attributed to a number of factors. One of such factor is the enforcement of the South African Schools Act of 1996 that ensured access to schools by learners and this has resulted in an increase of African learners in schools by 69 \% in 1996 to $74 \%$ in 2002. Demographic trends in the
population as a whole comprise a second factor. For example, whenever learners transferred out of Township schools, these schools enrolled other learners who came into these areas from outlying and rural areas. A discussion on school attendance around these provinces: Western Cape, Kwazulu-Natal, and The Eastern Cape showed the Western Cape is a largely 'white' and 'coloured' area with many well resourced ex-model C schools (ex-white schools). In schooling terms the province has an interesting form of deracialization with ex Model C schools, which is marked along class lines with more 'coloured' and a few middle-class 'African' students being admitted to such schools (McPherson and Dlamini, 1998).

### 2.5 The Home Environment

According to the October Household Survey (Statistics South Africa, 1998), the household size is very important in determining and contributing to school attendance. Parents play an important role in determining the educational outcomes of their children, and the educational attainment of children is often similar to that of their parents. A popular belief dictates that school attendance of pupils is directly proportional to the level of education of their parents. This may be due to the fact that better educated parents place a higher value on the education of their children, encourage the children to stay in school, and remove the need for the children to contribute financially to the up-keep of household (as they usually have better-paying jobs themselves) (Wolpe et al., 1997).

### 2.5.1 Family Income and Poverty

Everatt and Orkin (1993) estimated that $66 \%$ of Africans, $51 \%$ of coloured, $53 \%$ of Indian and $43 \%$ of young whites drop out of school, thus suggesting that poverty is the cause of the high rates of 'drop-outs', especially among the Africans. It was
further inferred that the inability of their parents and caretakers to provide such things as uniforms and food preyed on their minds and directly led to a number of youth leaving schools. This was quite true among the rural learners as violence and harassment led to the increase in drop-out rates and low attendance at school. The study also showed that $3 \%$ of the youths are forced out of school as a result of pregnancy, especially among Africans and Coloureds. The children in the rural areas (usually home to the poorest of the population), are also exposed to the poverty around them.

An investigation by Carnegie showed that malnutrition, destitution and ill health impeded the educational attainment of "poor whites" in South Africa. Further investigation between 1982 and 1984 conducted among Africans examining broad social conditions relating to poverty revealed, among many other things that "both adults and school children value education highly". It was seen as a way out of poverty trap, an opening to employment and a chance to leave impoverished rural areas (Christie, 1997).

### 2.5.2 Parental Involvement in Children's Education

The South African Schools Act (SASA) among other things, provides for the establishment at all public schools of School Governing Bodies (SGBs) composed of the principal and elected representatives of parents, teachers, on-teaching staff, and (in secondary school) learners (South African Schools Act, 1996). A basic set of functions and powers are assigned to all SGBs, including the determination of admissions policy, the recommendation to the province of teaching and non-teaching appointments, the financial management of the school, the determination of school fees and additional fundraising. Additional powers can be assigned if the governing
body meets certain criteria. Under the Act, SGBs are juristic persons. Parents must be in the majority and chair the body.

### 2.5.3 Gender Factor in Education

The formation of the Gender Equity Task Team of 1996 marked the beginning of a process of the Department of Education that meaningfully tackled and eliminated gender inequality throughout the whole educational system in South Africa (Wolpe et al., 1997). Schooling, with its high numbers of learners and educators, is obviously a major sector in any gender equity programme.

When it comes to general school attendance, there are problems specific to girls e.g. the attendance of girls, particularly in rural areas may not seem to be as important as the attendance of boys. Girls may be asked to remain at home to look after young children or to do housework or both (Department of Education, 1998). However, boys in rural areas may be called on at certain times to dip cattle or to do other farm-related issues. There are strong implications arising from the nature of girls' domestic labour. It has been traditional in certain schools for girls to arrive early to clean, wash the floors and so on. This reinforces the notion that girls' domestic roles are "normal", while boys' studies are accorded more importance (Wolpe et al., 1997).

### 2.6 The Schooling Environment

### 2.6.1 Transportation and Geographical Location

The Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, in a white paper released by the Department of Education on $14^{\text {th }}$ June 2003, titled "A Plan of Action: Improving access to free and quality basic education" states that infrastructure development in the schooling system is closely linked to the matter of scholar transport. The goal of
the Department of Education should not just be to provide school buildings, but also to ensure that infrastructure that makes schooling easily accessible to all learners of compulsory school-going age are in place. Government believes that no poor learner should walk more than one hour away from the closest school (Wolpe et al., 1997).

### 2.6.2 Impact of HIV/AIDS and other IIInesses

The impact of HIV/AIDS on the quality of education has become an issue of major concern (Epstein et al., 2003; Moletsane et al., 2007; Morrell et al., 2001). HIV/AIDS is now recognised as a global crisis, particularly among the youth of school going age, and young women emerging as the most vulnerable group (UNAIDS, 2002). The situation in Southern Africa is currently at epidemic proportions with the incidence rate among South African youths at 22.9 \% and with the incidence amongst girls of schooling age more than three-quarter times higher than amongst boys and young men (Chisholm \& September, 2005).

School age children form a relatively small proportion of the total population infected with HIV: amongst children aged 2-18, HIV prevalence is around $5.4 \%$ (Motala et al., 1997). However, school attendance might be disrupted by illness, both among children themselves and among their care-givers. In the latter instance, children might miss school because they need to remain at home to look after sick relatives.

### 2.6.3 Condition of Schooling Facilities

Significantly, earlier policy documentation notes that the success and efficacy of decentralisation is measured according to different perspectives. A persuasive way in the South African context is that the process of decentralisation should not be seen as an end in itself but rather promote improvements in the quality of learning (Wolpe et
al., 1997; Motala et al., 1997). Millions of children and young adults attend schools daily yet, the facilities available vary dramatically. For most South African learners, the guarantee of access to basic education exposes them to poor facilities, overcrowded classes and almost no learning resources. Most schooling takes place in extremely poor conditions, lacking basic amenities such as tap water or toilets. Many have no textbooks, in a system which has been traditionally text-dependent (Wolpe et al., 1997). General conditions in many schools are not conducive to learning and development. The task team recognises the need to make amends, but at the same time urges the prioritising the former will not obliterate and sideline gender equity programs (Department of Education, 1997).

### 2.6.4 Qualification and Competence of Teachers

Teachers play a crucial role in transmitting all forms of knowledge, including those parts that reinforce the learners. The teacher audit program of 1996, revealed that many teachers are under-qualified, and this coupled with poor physical and structural conditions in so many schools, does not bode well for learners. At the same time, there are dedicated teachers who against all odds are engaged in creative work aimed at overcoming these inherent difficulties (Wolpe et al., 1997).

Teacher quality is a critical aspect of overall school quality but depends on the number that the school manages to recruit which, in turn depends on resources (Fiske and Ladd, 2002). With the 1999 amendment of Section 5 of the National Education Policy Act of 1996, the School Governing Body (SGB'S) authority appears to be eroded with regard to personnel appointments. Limits were placed on the SGB power and authority to recommend appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts (South

African Schools Act, 1996). The 1999 amendment to the Employment of Educators Act of 1998 placed the limit of two months for the SGB'S to respond to a request for a recommendation for an appointment.

Several of the legislative amendments are double-edged, bringing to light contacts between the goals of promoting democratic participation and equity. Therefore, the National Department claims it needs the freedom to deploy teachers as needed across the system, especially to rural schools that have difficulty in recruiting teachers (RSA, 2007).

### 2.6.5 Class Size and Pupil- (Learner) - Teacher Ratio

The variation in class sizes was one of the most conspicuous manifestations of the inequalities of the previous dispensation in education in South Africa (Wolpe et al., 1997). Hence, this becomes the first aspect to be tackled as attempts were made to move towards equity in educational provisioning. Yet, equitable personnel provisioning scales notwithstanding, enormous discrepancies continue to be manifest in reality, not simply across schools or communities, but also between subjects and grades in the same school affect class size on academic performance.

There are volumes of credible research which seem to suggest that class size is not really a factor in learner performance (Blatchford et al., 2007; Blatchford, 2005; Blatchford, 2003a; Blatchford, 2003b; Blatchford et al., 2002). This is, however, a simplistic interpretation of such research, and the reality is that:

- There is absolutely no doubt that smaller classes are preferable to excessively large ones.
- While class size may not be a major negative factor in educational outcomes achieved by learners within certain limits, it emerges clearly that there are cut off points above and below which variations in class size do become critical. Small classes become a major advantage only below about 15 learners, while large classes become a significant obstacle to performance at about 50 .
- While large classes may not be a major negative factor per se, they are a very definite obstacle to acceptable performance where facilities are not designed for large classes: cramming 48 learners into a room designed for 28 certainly have some negative influence on outcomes (Blatchford et al., 2002).


### 2.6.6 School Feeding Programme

The primary school feeding scheme was introduced in 1994 as one of the presidential lead projects for the country. According to the RDP White Paper 1994, the aim then was to contribute to the improvement of education quality by enhancing learning capacity, school attendance and punctuality among primary school pupils and to contributing to general health development by alleviating short term hunger. The school feeding programme was part of the Integrated Nutrition Programme (INP), managed at the national level by the Departments of Health and Education. At the provincial level, it was managed more by the Department of Health than by Education. Locally, it was operationalized by entities such as school project committees, school governing bodies (SGB's), non-government organizations (NGO's) and community-based organisations (CBO's). The over-arching goals of the National Schools Nutrition Programme (NSNP) are to alleviate short-term hunger and enhance learning capacity among primary school learners. The objectives are to:

- contribute to enhanced learning capacity through school feeding;
- generate food production and economic activities in school communities in order to improve household food security;
- strengthen nutrition education in the school curriculum and the community in general.

It is therefore the responsibility of SGBs and Department of Education Officials to ensure the efficiency and success of NSNP objectives by using a monitoring tool and then submit the report to the relevant District office of the school visited (Morrel et al., 2001).

### 2.6.7 Tuition Fees and Cost of Education

Historical disparities in the funding of schools were based on race and region, with secondary learners being funded at a higher level than primary school learners. The availability of more funds has resulted in better targeting and distribution within the provinces, in particular for the three poorest leaner quintiles. However, insufficient allocations made to middle quintile schools remain a problem and these schools continue to bear the brunt of the redress aspects of the funding norms (Wildeman, 2002a).

Schools in higher socio-economic quintiles (as determined by the school funding norms) were better off than financially in a variety of ways (Porteus et al., 2001; Van der Berg, 2001). These schools' higher personnel costs (a function of more experienced and qualified educators) were accompanied by higher school income through private contributions and user fees.

Furthermore, the National Norms and Standard of School Funding (NNSSF) provided the instruments to address inequalities among schools within provinces. Firstly, it provides for exemption from fees for parents who are unable to afford paying (DoE, 1998). More so, capital expenditure on new schools or additional classrooms and facilities is to be based on a ranking of geographical areas by need. This funding covered three categories of expenditure: maintenance of school buildings, municipal services and utilities, and learning support materials. Provinces are free to develop their redistribution mechanism within the national government framework (Wildeman, 2002b).

### 2.6.8 The State of the Health of Learners

The Department of Education has recognised the importance of promoting good health among learners and has therefore undertaken a range of activities as part of its health promotion programme. A national framework on health and wellness has been developed and aims to improve the understanding of health-related issues among educators and learners. The Department of Education, in partnership with the Department of Health organized a HealthWise Day in 2006 as part of the celebration of World Teachers' Day. Peer-education programmes have been used to educate youths about HIV and AIDS prevention, care, treatment and abstinence. Guidelines for the management and prevention of drug use/abuse by learners in public schools and further education and training institutions were launched and distributed to schools.

Quality education means enough classroom space, clean water, electricity, and sanitation for learners. The provision of a safe and comfortable infrastructure
improves the performance of learners, and increases the attendance rate particularly in rural and poor areas. The elimination of the phenomenon of "learners under stress" and in unsuitable conditions will improve attendance among learners (Morell et al., 2001).

### 2.6.9 Teenage Pregnancy

Like in many developing countries, teenage pregnancy is one of the major problems to the educational success of girls in sub-Saharan Africa (Swainson et al., 1998). Recent studies in South Africa showed that by the age of 18, more than $30 \%$ of teens have given birth at least once (Mahy and Gupta, 2002). Mokgalabone (1999) stated that pregnancy is among the most serious causes of school disruption, particularly at the secondary school level and in many cases, the birth of a baby marks the end of schooling for the teen mothers (Grant and Hallman, 2006).

### 2.6.10 Discipline and the Safety of Learners

Promoting and ensuring the safety of learners and educators in schools has been one of the biggest challenges facing the education system. Government has introduced numerous programmes to stem the tide of violence besetting schools. For example, in 2007, the Minister of Education identified nine schools (one per province) facing huge challenges of safety and security. With the support of the Royal Netherlands Embassy and the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention (CJCP), safety infrastructure and support programmes were provided to these schools. All nine schools were equipped with perimeter fences, security lights and gates and were provided with security guards, some with hand-held metal detectors. In addition,
school management teams and learners participated in training programmes aimed at assisting them in dealing with crime and violence (Morell et al., 2001; OECD, 2008).

### 2.6.11 Absenteeism and Truancy in Schools

Absenteeism rates in South Africa have been found to vary between 5 and $15 \%$. A baseline attendance study conducted by the Provincial Education Department in the Eastern Cape found that average learner attendance is $95 \%$ (absenteeism rate $5 \%$ ). Similar study conducted in Limpopo revealed a lower absenteeism rate of $2.2 \%$. Large-scale surveys found higher rates of absenteeism, although these studies are based on different sampling techniques and do not calculate rates on the basis of the number of learners enrolled at a school, but on the basis of a sample of respondents. The 2006 Labour Force Survey found that, $96 \%$ of children aged 10-17 years were attending school or were enrolled at school, of which $8 \%$ had been absent from school for more than five days over the past 12 months. Further analysis found that in February and October (months in which there are no vacations) the attendance rate at South African schools was $85 \%$ ( $15 \%$ absenteeism rate).

The Provincial Education Department attempted to address the needs of this group of young people. Naturally it has been estimated that 780 , 000 people failed to matriculate between 1991 and 1994, of which $96 \%$ were from former Department of Education and Training schools. Around 85000 of these young people are thought to reside in Gauteng, and the province established a youth college in 1996 with four branches. Approximately, 2,000 students enrolled in 1997 for two years to obtain a Senior Certificate. The college decided to provide practical and theoretically based subjects, rather than to repeat normal Matriculation subjects. Other provinces have a wider target grout among out-of-school youth. They are attempting to create multiple
routes for previously disadvantage learners to secure employment in a wide range of jobs (Department of Education, 1997).
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# CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF EDUCATION POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA 

## Introduction

According to (Lungu, 2001), post-apartheid South Africa has attempted to put in place elaborate and inclusive public policy processes in South Africa. The 'stakeholder' approach to policy-making adopted by the democratic government in 1994 has led to the evolution of an elaborate, multi-stage process that attempts to enlist as much input from the public as possible. This elaborate policy apparatus does not come as a surprise for three fairly obvious reasons.

Firstly, the long history of racial discrimination, and later apartheid policies which systematically excluded non whites from policy structures and process, has led to a strong desire in the democratic movement to create more inclusive and transparent policy processes. Secondly, the fact that South Africa was among the last African states to achieve majority rule meant that it had the opportunity to observe and learn from the achievements, mistakes and omissions of other African states. Returning exiles, and the presence of a sizeable group of experts and scholars from non-African and other African countries, brought useful comparative insights into the processes of governance generally, and policy-making in particular. Thirdly, South Africa is relatively well resourced, by African standards to finance and manage elaborate policy structures and processes.

However, despite these positive aspects of the policy process, policy making in postapartheid South Africa still faces a number of challenges and constraints. Firstly, there are variations between government departments on the use of established processes;
while some attempt to be as inclusive as possible; others confine participation in the policy process to certain stakeholder groups, leaving out the others. Moreover, a policy area as large as education with thousands of institutions, nine regional departments, a number of labour unions and interested non-governmental organizations (NGOs) literally affects almost the entire population.

Adequate representation of all these stakeholders is structurally limited. Secondly, the quality of the policy process is affected by attitudes of the sponsoring departments, the inputs and views of stakeholders. Thirdly, stakeholder input pre-supposes that participants have the knowledge, skills and interest to engage effectively in policy debates.

The term "policy process" is ambiguous within the terminology of policy analysis. In one sense, 'policy process' can refer to one of the models of policy-making, namely the 'policy process model' in which policy making is viewed as a series of activities. According to Dye (1998), the process model does not emphasize "the content of public policy to be studied, but rather the process by which public is developed, implemented and changed". Hence, "policy process" is a nomenclature given to a specific model applied to the making arrayed through time.

According to Jones (1997) and Anderson (1984), the policy process has the following stages: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy assessment. In the latter sense, the policy process consists of logically sequential phases, implying that it is a rational process. Indeed, several authors identify these stages as part of the generic process of policy making.

## Policy Process in South Africa

As in the case with other countries, post-apartheid South Africa has both formal and informal policy process. Reference has already been made to the fact the country has one of the most elaborate formal policy processes on the African continent. Broadly, the South African formal policy process can be divided into parts, first being what could be termed as the White Paper process, and the other, the legislative process (Lungu, 2001).

The South African policy making process can be described as the White paper process due to the great emphasis on formulating national policies through this type of government document. The process begins with the publication by a national department of a discussion document, usually a product of the think-tank assembled by the minister, after which extensive research is conducted. The research consists of exploring various dimensions of the policy issue by the think-tank to various national locations and other countries and institutions abroad, consultation with other government departments and relevant stakeholders.

The next stage in the policy making process is that of the Green paper. Essentially, this document raises a number of issues and questions regarding a given policy, and after approval by the national cabinet, it is published for general comment. This is followed by provincial workshops, parliamentary portfolio committee hearings, and workshops on selected topics culminating in a national conference. After this event the finalized policy options are published in the form of a White Paper. From this stage, public policies can follow either the parliamentary process, beginning with a draft bill, or go the department concerned. An example of the first route was the South

African Schools Act of 1996, and an example of the second route was Curriculum 2005, which was announced as an executive policy in 1997 (Department of Education, 1997). The White Paper process conforms in several respects to Dunn's agenda setting and policy formulation stages described above. The emphasis in this process is on problem identification and definition, and generating a broad consensus on policy proposals and strategies.

## The National Education Policy (or Act) of 1996

The National Education Policy Act is pivotal in facilitating the democratic transformation of the national system of education into one that serves the needs and interests of all the people of South Africa and upholds their fundamental rights. The Act gives the Minister of Education the power to determine the national education policy for the planning, provision, financing, staffing, co-ordination, management, governance, programmes monitoring and evaluation and general well-being of the system. In determining the policy, the Minister should take into account competence of the provisional legislatures and the relevant provisions of any provisional law relating to education. Also, the provisions of the Constitution within the education sector are operationalized through the National Education Policy Act (NEPA) of 1996. It is the outcome of the discussions of two prior versions that were passed as White Papers in 1994 and 1995. The major thrust of NEPA is to define the powers and duties of the national and provincial education ministries. In these specifications of NEPA, a particular expression of educational decentralization and modes of representation and participation are noticeable.

The demarcation of nine Provinces means that the educational system can now be constituted by one national and nine provincial educational ministries, as opposed to the 19 racially and ethnically defined Departments of Education during apartheid era. The powers and the duties constituted in NEPA give Provincial Educational Ministries the primary role of ensuring adherence to constitutional provisions, establishing and monitoring norms and standards of education in the country and providing support for provincial activities. Provincial ministries are free to determine educational policies, curricula, manage educational institutions as they see fit, employ educators and utilize educational budgets as they deem necessary. The NEPA allows for the decentralization of powers from the centralized national ministry to provincial ministries. This is in keeping with the constitutional agreement that democracy in South Africa would be better served by recognizing provincial autonomy, thereby preventing centralized decisions being imposed on provincial contexts, which are characterized by significant differences in resources, both human and material.

## The South African Schools Policy (or Act) of 1996

The South African Schools Act (1996), which replaced Education Acts of the apartheid government, asserts that all learners have a right to access basic and quality education without discrimination of any sort. Hence, no learner may be denied admission to an ordinary school on any grounds, including grounds of disability, language, learning difficulty or pregnancy (Department of Education, 1997). The Schools Act (1996) further requires that the quality of education received by all learners must be improved. This implies that there must be a better provision of facilities, better-trained educators, and better methods of teaching and learning and
improved school conditions. Learners must also be better motivated and disciplined to take their education seriously and to use the opportunities that are now open to them.

The South African Schools Act has paved the way for a single, non-racial school system. It also makes schooling compulsory for children aged 6-14 years. It provides for two types of schools namely public and independent schools. A significant change introduced by the Act is that the previous differentiation of State-funded schools no longer exists, and now these schools are all referred to as Public Schools. It also provides for conditions of admission for learners to public schools and for governance of public schools by school governing bodies. These governing bodies have general functions as stated in Section 20 of the Act.

The SASA stipulates that all school governing bodies should be composed of 'representatives' from the school's parent 'community', the teaching staff, the student body and non-teaching staff, such as school administrative staff, caterers and janitors. The principal of the school is an ex-officio member of the school governing body. The SASA also stipulates that all major decisions of the school be evidence of attempts to obtain the views of stakeholders.

Whereas the constitution depicts representative modes of democracy at the national level; and NEPA at the provincial level, SASA takes representative democracy to the school level; the local level. At the same time, bringing representative democracy to the level of the school implies a greater degree of participation by more people. The SASA empowers principals, teachers, students, parents and other school staff. It binds provincial ministries to ensure that policy decisions in the school are arrived at by taking into account the interests of all these stakeholders. Participatory democracy in
the Constitution, the NEPA and the SASA also suggests notions of an active citizenry. Citizenship in this instance is viewed as partaking actively in the affairs of one's life, and this is viewed as a basic human and democratic right.

In the participatory mode of democracy, citizens are active and critical. This is discussed quite extensively by Bobbio (1996). In the following section, and with the above background in mind, the notions are that of 'participation' that are emerging within the educational context, through a consideration of the modes of representation that at work.

## Role and Composition of the School Governing Body

The Hunter Committee Report (DOE, 1995c) proposed that parents should comprise the largest grouping in governing bodies, but was explicit about whether or not they should be the majority. Possibly because of pressure from the South African Federation of State Aided Schools and other parent representatives, and possibly also because of opinion within the Education Ministry, the White Paper (DOE, 1995d) and the Bill \{Section 21(4)\}, proposed that the majority was not specified.

The South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) and the Congress of South African Students (COSAS) were both strongly opposed to this proposal. Both had originally supported equal representation of forming the largest grouping as long as it was not a majority. The idea of a parental majority, however, found favour in the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee. The chairperson pointed out that the majority of parents were working class and other poor people who had been sidelined by apartheid and needed to be empowered.

Eventually, the committee amended the Bill to read: ‘The number of the parents must comprise one more than the combined total of other members of a governing body who have voting rights' (Section 23(9)). Thus, the parental majority was endorsed but, in response to SADTU and COSAS submissions, the size of the majority was limited to the minimum people.

## Admission Programmes in Public Schools

Section 3, the South African Schools Act (Act 84, 1996) stipulates that every learner must attend school "from first school day of the year in which such learner reaches the age of seven years until the last school day of the year in which such learner reached the age of fifteen years or the ninth grade, whichever occurs first". Furthermore, the right of every child to be admitted to the public school is stated in the South African Schools Act, Section 3 5(1): "A public school must admit learners and serve their educational requirements without unfairly discriminating in any way."

Provisions for conditions of admission of learners to public schools as well as age grade norms are further elaborated in the Admissions Policy for Ordinary Public School (Department of Education, 1999) which came into effect in January 2000. By Grade 9, which marks the end of compulsory basic education, the learner should be 15 years old. Recognizing that the problem of over-age learners will not be eliminated immediately, the policy states that the onus will be on schools to place learners who are above the normal age for grade in a 'fast-track facility' to help bring them in line with their peer group.

Learners over the age of 16 who want to attend school will be referred to adult education centres. To improve the system, a new Assessment Policy came into effect
in January 1999 stating that learners will be able to repeat a year only once in each phase of the school cycle. This policy aims at improving the internal efficiency of the system by curbing high repetition rate that presently characterizes the system. The democratic movement was opposed to school governing bodies being allowed to control admissions policy for those affluent (mainly white) communities who could use their power to exclude poorer (mainly black) children. This position prevailed in the Hunter Committee Report which recommended that provincial authorities should make regulations on admissions policy within national norms (DOE, 1995d).

The government, through the second White Paper (DOE, 1996d), proposed to give governing bodies the right to determine admissions policies for their schools 'in consultation with provincial education departments' and in keeping with national norms and provincial regulations \{Para 2.9(3)\}. Section 5 of the Schools Bill tabled in Parliament modified this position by circumscribing the power of governing bodies. At the Portofolio Committee stage the Bill was amended considerably, largely on the basis of submissions from the ANC aligned organizations. The Act empowers school governing bodies the right to determine admissions policy, but prohibited them from unfairly discriminating against any learners. Furthermore, it prohibited schools administering admission tests or refusing any learner admission because his/her parents were unable to pay the fees.

## School Language Policy

Allied to the issue of admissions policy is that of language policy. Neither the Hunter Committee Report nor the government's Draft White Paper mentions who should have the power to determine the language policy of a school. However, in the second White Paper and the Bill, government gives such a right to governing bodies but
makes it clear that this power would have to be exercised within national and provincial policy frameworks and should not be used to as a cover for racial discrimination. The insertion of such a right for governing bodies was probably due to demands of Afrikaner parents and organizations as they, more than anyone else, considered this important.

The other democratic movements feared that formerly privileged schools that wanted to maintain an exclusive admissions policy would be able to use their power over language policy as a way of restricting admissions on a racial basis. These fears were no doubt exacerbated by the much-publicized example of some Afrikaans schools in small towns such as Potgietersrus and Groblersdal that tried to exclude black people in defiance of provincial education departments, ostensibly on the basis of language or culture. In an attempt to prevent similar incidents in the future, the Parliamentary governing bodies to determine a school's language policy.

## School Funding Strategies

The government's policy regarding the funding of Public schools was only partially finalized with the adoption of the South African Schools Act in 1996. The issue of funding was probably the most difficult for the new government to come to terms with, largely because of the difficulty in reconciling the aims of equity and improved quality education with the constraint of insufficient state funding.

The relatively small size of the more privileged sectors (mainly the previously White, Coloured and Indian schools) meant that merely equalizing expenditure would not result in any significant improvement in the schools that served the African majority.

The options for government were to increase the size of the education budget or to find ways of utilizing private sector funds for public education. The first option was not tenable because government had adopted economic policies that emphasized the importance of reducing the deficit and government departments were under enormous pressure to cut spending. Indeed, although educational expenditure is the largest single item in the budget after debt repayment, educational spending in real terms was falling (Greenstein, 1997), and was deemed unlikely to rise over the following three years (Naidoo, 1998). As a result of this, the African National Congress (ANC) and allied educational organizations reluctantly accepted the second option some time before the Schools Bill was drafted.

It had been argued by the Model C lobby group as well as by some within the broad democratic movement that school fees would bring private resources into the school system and thus government would be free to channel state resources to those schools in greatest need. This argument was made in numerous submissions to the Hunter Committee, as well as in discussions the committee had with officials of the Department of Finance (Pillay, 1991; Donaldson, 1992; NEPI, 1992). It was also made, albeit less explicitly, in the government's 1996 macroeconomic strategy document, Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) which says that: With spending on education at nearly $7 \%$ of the GDP there is a need to contain expenditure through reductions in subsidizations of the more expensive parts of the system. This will concentrate public resources on enhancing the educational opportunities of historically disadvantaged communities (Department of Finance, 1996b).

## Decentralization of Schools

According to Karlsson (2001), South Africa's school reform has entailed a major redistribution of power to the new provinces and to school. It would, therefore, be useful to examine briefly the concepts of decentralization and centralization and to discuss their relationship to some key issues and policy goals both in an international context and in South Africa. Much of the literature on decentralization of education distinguishes between three (or sometimes four) different forms of decentralization (Davies, 1990; Winkler, 1989; Govinda, 1997).

The first form is documentation, which involves a shift of responsibility by central authority and not to the local population. This may actually give greater control to the centre, but it may also help ensure that decisions are informed by, and are more suited to, local conditions. The second form of decentralization is delegation. This involves the transfer of decision making power to regional or local bodies, which may or not be democratically elected without actually transferring authority. The central authority can withdraw delegated power without new legislation being enacted. The third form of decentralization is devolution, whereby power is transferred to local bodies, for example, provincial or local governments or even schools by means of legislation. Because these bodies have their power as a result of a Constitution or an Act of Parliament, it cannot be withdrawn except through legislative change. Davies (1990) adds a fourth form of decentralization: privatization. Here, the power to make decisions is decentralized to the owners of educational institutions. However, although it has peculiarities of its own, privatization could be considered as a variant of either delegation or devolution, depending on the legal arrangements by which it is allowed.

Winkler (1989) referred to the education policy of some countries whereby decision making is neither fully centralized nor fully decentralized. A country may operate one part of its education system according to a decentralized model while another part is more centralized. It is also conceivable that different sectors of the same national system of education. Furthermore, it is indeed possible that there are many examples of this i.e. certain functions (such as curriculum or certification) are controlled by a central authority.

## Transformations in Education System

After 1994, South Africa embarked on a massive development of educational policy aimed at the redress of the injustices of apartheid education. These changes incorporated many international trends in regard to school governance (decentralization), curriculum reform (Curriculum 2005, Outcomes Based Education (OBE), qualifications (a National Qualifications Framework (NQF), and the introduction of a wide variety of initiatives to improve the human resource capacity in line with the Growth Empowerment And Reconstruction (GEAR) economic policy which reflected many of the global changes in educational policy that had become a feature of neo-liberal politics. The challenges of poverty alleviation through education competed with a strong push to improve economic productivity in the modern sector of the economy. A race-based educational policy was gradually being replaced by one that allowed for market forces to operate in education. 'Choice' (for those who could afford it) came to replace race as a means of selection for the limited places available in quality secondary and higher education.

By the year 2005, there were signs of new policy trends which seem to mark the shift away from the "one-size-fits-all" approach of the structural adjustment era despite the difficulties of crafting policies sensitive to local dynamics and regional politics in a context starved of an efficiency and effective bureaucracy (Kallaway et al., 1997).

## The Higher Education Policy (or Act) of 1999

The White paper was approved in July 1997. Its major focus was the transformation of the higher education system to redress the inequities of apartheid and meet the needs of a new South Africa with fundamentally changed economic, social and political structures. These changes were to be implemented within a new single coordinated system. In the white paper, government made a commitment to equity, justice and a better life for all.

Higher education was expected to promote modernization through internationally competitive research and high quality programmes. There was emphasis on the commitment to high and ensures that the disadvantaged institutions of the past did not continue to have second-class status. The White Paper also focused on effectiveness and efficiency. Academic freedom received much greater role for government than in the past, putting special responsibility on document focused on developing a new kind of 'institutional culture' which is centred on a learning that eschews racism and sexism, and guarantees the safety of all (but with special attention to women) on campus. The emphasis on student financial needs was in sharp contrast to the old order which did little to assist majority of the students. It marked a major shift in funding priorities with rapidly increasing government commitments, especially in terms of poor and disadvantaged students.

Hence, the Higher Education Bill was tabled in Parliament and passed after careful debate by the members of Parliament. The foci of the bill include a means of redressing equity and the provision of financial muscle for the previously disadvantaged students. It also led to the classification of some higher institutions of learning as "Historically Black Universities (HBUs) or Historically Disadvantaged Universities (HDUs)". These sets of schools receive about double financial help from the government to train students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

### 4.1. Introduction

This chapter describes and explains methods, techniques, and procedure used in the collection of vital information relating to this study. The following items namely: study and research design, sample and sampling techniques, validity and reliability of instrument, procedure for data collection, and procedure for data analysis, are all discussed.

### 4.2. Study design

The study design is cross-sectional in nature, being designed to find out from across sectional analysis and various households the differentials in school attendance across the nine provinces of South Africa. The research design adopted a descriptive survey. A descriptive survey involves the descriptive recording, analyzing, and interpretation of existing conditions. This type of research design investigates phenomenon in their natural setting and describes the true picture of the event (Kothari, 1990) i.e. the observation of the subset of a population of items in all aspects related to the households in South Africa.

### 4.3. Research setting

The study used the General Household survey 2004. The target population was only on private households, in all the nine provinces of South Africa.

### 4.4. Study population

The study population will include only private households across the nine provinces of South Africa.

### 4.5 Instrument

The instrument used in this study was based on the questionnaires of the 2004 General Household Survey.

### 4.6. Study variables

## i. Age group

This first variable focused on the age group of each member the household. The question was classified into eighteen categories:
$1=0-4 \mathrm{yrs}$
$2=5-9 \mathrm{yrs}$
$3=10-14 \mathrm{yrs}$
$4=15-19 \mathrm{yrs}$
$5=20-24 \mathrm{yrs}$
$6=25-29 \mathrm{yrs}$
$7=30-34 \mathrm{yrs}$
$8=35-39 \mathrm{yrs}$
$9=40-44 \mathrm{yrs}$
$10=45-49 \mathrm{yrs}$
$11=50-54 \mathrm{yrs}$
$12=55-59 \mathrm{yrs}$
$13=60-64 \mathrm{yrs}$
$14=65-69 \mathrm{yrs}$
$15=70-74 \mathrm{yrs}$
$16=75-79 \mathrm{yrs}$
$17=80-84 \mathrm{yrs}$
$18=85+y r s$

## ii. Gender

The question used was "is (person) male or female" If the person was absent as at the time of interview, the enumerator will then ask other family members about the sex of the absent member. The question was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$

## iii. Population group

The question asked to determine the population group of persons from the selected dwellings was classified into five categories:

1= African/Black
$2=$ Colored
3= Indian/Asian
4= White
$5=$ Others

## iv. Ability to read

This question was asked to find out the literacy level of the members of households was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=$ No

## v. Ability to write

This question was asked to ascertain the literacy level of respondents and was classified into two categories
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$

## vi. Highest level of education successfully completed

This question was applicable to all household members and was classified into thirteen categories:
$0=$ No schooling
$1=$ Grade R/O
$2=$ Sub A/Grade 1
3= Sub B/Grade 2
4= Grade3/Standard 1
5= Grade 4/Standard 2
6= Grade5/Standard 3
$7=$ Grade $6 /$ Standard 3
8= Grade7/Standard 4
9= Grade $8 /$ Standard 5
10= Grade 9/Standard7/Form 2
11= Grade10/Standard8/Form3
12= Grade 11/Standard9/Form4
13= Grade12/Standard 10/Form5/Matric

## vii. Is he/she currently attending school or any other educational institution?

This question was asked despite the qualifications of people. The interest of this question was to find out how many are currently attending any educational institution.

It was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$
viii. Which of the following educational institutions does he attend?

The question was only applicable to those who answered "Yes" in (vii.) above.
Distance learning and correspondence education was included in this question, which was classified into eight categories:
$1=$ Pre-School (including day care, crèche, pre-primary)
$2=$ School
3= University
4= Technikon
5= College
6= Adult basic education and training/literacy classes
7= Other adult educational classes
$8=$ Other than any of the above
ix. How long does it take to get to school/educational institution where he/she attends?

The time taken by learners currently attending school to get to their schools was also asked. This was classified into six categories:
$1=$ Less than 15 minutes
$2=15-30$ minutes
$3=$ More than 30 minutes
4= Don't know

## x. What is the total amount of tuition fees paid for in a year?

This question was only relevant to people registered with the educational institution.
It was classified into thirteen categories:
$1=\mathrm{R} 1-\mathrm{R} 100$

xi. During the past 12 months, what problems, if any, did he or she experience at the school?

This was classified into 7 categories:
$1=$ Lack of books
$2=$ Poor teaching
3= Lack of teachers
4= Facilities in bad conditions
5= Classes too large/too any learners
6= Fees too high at the school
7= Others
xii. What is the main reason why he or she is currently not attending school or any other educational institution?

The reasons why people were not attending school or any other educational institutions were ascertained. The answers were classified into twelve categories:
$1=$ Too old/Young
$2=$ Have completed school/education
3= School/education institution is too far away
$4=$ no money for fees
$5=\mathrm{He} /$ she is working
6= Education is useless or uninteresting
$7=$ Illness
8= Pregnancy
9= Failed exams

$10=$ Got married
11= Family committment
12 $=$ Others
xiii. What is he/she's relationship to the head?

The question was asked to find out the child's relationship to the head of the family.
It was classified into nine categories:
1= Head/Acting Head
2= Husband/Wife/Partner
3= Son/Daughter/Stepchild/Adopted child
4= Brother/Sister
5= Father/Mother

6= Grand parent/Great grand parent
7= Grand child/Great grand child
$8=$ Other relatives
9= Non-related persons

## xiv. Is the father alive?

The question was asked to find out if the father of the household was alive.
It was classified into three categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$
3= Don't know

## $x v$. Is the mother alive?

The question was asked to find out if the mother of the household was alive.
It was classified into three categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$
3= Don't know

## xvi. Is the father part of the family?

If the father of the household lives with his family, the answer was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$

## xvii. Is the mother part of the family?

To find out if the mother of the household lives with her family, answer gotten was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=$ No
xviii. Does the child get free food to eat at school?

The response to whether the child always had food to eat at school was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=$ No
xix. Does the child usually take food to school or money to buy food to eat?

The response to whether the child always had food to take to school was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=$ No

## xx. Does the child have access to text books?

The answer to whether the child always had access to textbooks was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$

## xxi. Did he/she ever attend school?

The response to whether the child ever attended school or not was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$
xxii. When last did he/she attend school?

When last the child attended school was classified into six categories:
$1=$ This year
2= Last year
$3=$ Two years ago
4= Three years ago
5= Four years ago
6= More than four years ago
xxiii. Does he/she intend going back to school?

To ascertain whether the child intend going back to school at a later time or not, the response was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{No}$
xxiv. When does he/she intend going back to school?

When does the child intend on returning to school. This was classified into three categories:
$1=$ Next year
$2=$ Within two years
3= Don't know
xxv. In the past 12 months, has he/she experienced other problems at the school?

This question was asked to find out if the child experienced any other problems at the school or not. Response was classified into two categories:
$1=$ Yes
$2=\mathrm{NO}$

## xxvi. Is he/she doing the same grade as last year?

This question was asked to find out why the child is doing the same grade in a new year. Response to this was classified into twelve categories:
$1=$ Failed to reach minimum pass requirements
2= Changed residence
$3=$ Health reasons
4= Pregnancy
5= Teacher's decision
6= Parent's decision
7= Learner's decision
8= Expelled due to lack of discipline
9=Absconded
$10=$ No money for fees
11= Lack of school facilities
$12=$ Other

### 4.7. Data used/Sample size

The research used the data of the 2004 General Household Survey in which the questionnaire contained information on school attendance of learners aged 5-24 years across the nine provinces of South Africa.

### 4.8. Analysis of Data

After obtaining the data from the 2004 General household questionnaire, the data were coded, organized and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Frequency tables, and cross tabulations were used to analyze the data and results.

The data will be presented in tables.

## Rates

The analysis involved the use of frequency tables and cross-tabulations across the variables in order to measure the level of school attendance. More so, it involves calculating the attendance rates across the nine provinces in order to determine the highest and lowest rates of attendance across the provinces. This is one way of expressing the proportion of students excluded from the system to the total population of eligible schooling age population.

Bivariate and multivariate analyses were also used; bivariate helped to measure the level of attendance across two major variables, while the multivariate involved more than two variables which helped to measure school attendance across different variables.

$$
\text { Attendance rate }=\frac{\text { Population Attending x } 100 \%}{\text { Pop.Att. }+ \text { Pop. Not Att. }}
$$

Non Attendance rate $=$ Population Not- Attending x $100 \%$ Pop.Att. + Pop. Not Att.

## CHAPTER FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter sets out to analyse school attendance across the nine Provinces of South Africa, and the age considered in these analyses ranges between 5-24 years. In order to examine school attendance, it will be divided into sub-sections examining the different variables which comprised of household, educational (schooling attendance), and demographic data.

### 5.1 Patterns in school attendance across the provinces

The distribution of learners attending and not attending school according to gender and Provinces is shown in Table 5.1. Estimates of attendance and non-attendance rate across all Provinces were depicted. Hence, among the males, Limpopo had the highest attendance of $49 \%$, while the Northern Cape had the least attendance rate of $28 \%$. Conversely, the Northern Cape had the highest non-attendance rate of $72 \%$, while Limpopo with $51 \%$ had the least non-attendance rate among males who did no attend schools. Among the females, highest attendance was $38 \%$ observed for Limpopo, while the Northern Cape and Gauteng had the highest rates of non-attendance which stood at $72.6 \%$. Furthermore, it can be inferred that there are more males ( $36.4 \%$ ) than females ( $32.0 \%$ ) in schools across all the Provinces of the country.

Table 5.1: Distribution of learners according to gender and Provinces

|  | MALE |  |  | FEMALE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Provinces | Attending | Not <br> Attending | Total | Attending | Not <br> Attending | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W.C | 1456 | 645 | 4863 | 1480 | 3883 |  |
| $(29.9 \%)$ | $(28.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(27.6 \%)$ | 5363 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $32.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |  |  |
| E.C | 2730 | 3916 | 6646 | 2631 | 4902 | 7533 |
|  | $(41.1 \%)$ | $(58.9 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(34.9 \%)$ | $(65.1 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| N.C | 645 | 1626 | 2270 | 669 | 1775 | 2444 |
|  | $(28.4 \%)$ | $(71.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(27.4 \%)$ | $(72.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| F.S | 1202 | 2469 | 3671 | 1240 | 2675 | 3915 |
|  | $(32.7 \%)$ | $(67.3 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(31.7 \%)$ | $(68.3 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| KZN | 2981 | 4874 | 7855 | 2795 | 6340 | 9135 |
|  | $(38.0 \%)$ | $(62.0 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(30.6 \%)$ | $(69.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| NW | 1560 | 2966 | 4526 | 1598 | 3304 | 4902 |
|  | $(34.5 \%)$ | $(65.5 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(32.6 \%)$ | $(67.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| G | 1867 | 4532 | 6399 | 1746 | 4628 | 6374 |
|  | $(29.2 \%)$ | $(70.8 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(27.4 \%)$ | $(72.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| MP | 1644 | 2629 | 4273 | 1631 | 3085 | 4716 |
|  | $(38.5 \%)$ | $(61.5 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(34.6 \%)$ | $(65.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| LIM | 2705 | 2856 | 5561 | 2550 | 4138 | 6688 |
|  | $(48.6 \%)$ | $(51.4 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(38.1 \%)$ | $(61.9 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| TOTAL | 16970 | 29274 | 46064 | 16340 | 34730 | 51073 |
| $(36.4 \%)$ | $(63.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ | $(32.0 \%)$ | $(68.0 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |

Table 5.2: Distribution of school attendance among learners by age and population grouping

| Population |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24 yrs | Total |
| African/Black | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 6922 \\ (26.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9413 \\ (36.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7617 \\ (29.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2120 \\ (8.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26072 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not Attending | $\begin{gathered} 984 \\ (12.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1475 \\ (18.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5413 \\ (67.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8040 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 7906 \\ (23.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9581 \\ (28.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9092 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7533 \\ (22.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34112 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Coloured | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 901 \\ (30.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1242 \\ (41.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 762 \\ (25.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \\ (2.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2993 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not Attending | $\begin{gathered} 197 \\ (12.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (1.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 396 \\ (25.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 960 \\ (61.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1572 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 1098 \\ (24.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1261 \\ (27.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1158 \\ (25.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1048 \\ (23.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4565 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Indian/Asian | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ (23.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 164 \\ (34.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 161 \\ (33.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (8.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 482 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not <br> Attending | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (7.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ (23.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 138 \\ (69.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 200 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (19.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{164}{(24.0 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 208 \\ (30.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 180 \\ (26.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 682 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| White | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 452 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 594 \\ (35.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 491 \\ (29.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 156 \\ (9.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1693 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not Attending | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 8.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82 \\ (18.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 333 \\ (73.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 453 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 490 \\ (22.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 594 \\ (27.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 573 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 489 \\ (22.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2146 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Others | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (22.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (40.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (25.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (11.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not <br> Attending | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $P_{(14.3 \%)}^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (85.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (14.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (26.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (22.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (36.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 5.2 shows the distribution of learners currently attending (and not attending) school according to their age group and population group. Depicted in the distribution is an increase in school attendance across the age groups 5-9 years and 10-14 years through all population groups; and a decrease between 15-19 years and 20-24 years. Conversely, among those not attending schools, a decrease across the age groups 59 years and 10-14 years across all population groups; and an increase between ages 15-19 years and 20-24 years was observed. Across population groupings, the Coloureds have the highest rate of school attendance and non-attendance which stood at $41.5 \%$ and $25.2 \%$ respectively.

Appendix 1.0 depicts the attendance rates of learners across the provinces according to their age group, gender and strata (rural and urban). Deduction from this appendix revealed that the rate of school attendance is generally higher in the urban areas than in the rural areas between the age groups 5-9 years and 10-14 years having the highest rate for both sexes. The table shows that the total rates of attendance in the urban Western Cape was $70 \%$ respectively among the males and females, and both also had an attendance rate of $70 \%$.The total rates of attendance in the non-urban Western Cape were $64 \%$ among the males and $63 \%$ among the females, while both had an attendance rate of $63 \%$. The attendance rate was higher among the females when compared with the males, it was also evident that the rates increased between the age groups 5-9 years and 10-14 years but decreased between the age groups 15-19 years and 20-24 years.

The non-urban Northern Cape province had the lowest total attendance rate among the nine provinces, with a $48 \%$ among the males and $53 \%$ among the females and both sexes had $50 \%$ attendance rate. It was also evident from the table that the Mpumalanga province had a total attendance rate of $94 \%$ among the male learners, while the females had a total rate of $96 \%$ and $95 \%$ for both respectively. The total rates of attendance in the non-urban area of Mpumalanga were $99 \%$ for the males likewise the females and both sexes also had an attendance rate of $99 \%$. The province had the highest attendance rates for learners among the nine provinces both in the urban and non-urban areas. A satisfactory level of attendance can be attained especially in the rural areas, if factors such as good transport system, adequate feeding scheme and improved schooling facilities are put in place.

## Some Problems Associated with School Attendance

## Range of Tuition Fees Paid by Learners

The different range of tuition fees paid by learners attending school and stratified by their gender is shown in Table 5.3. It was observed that the highest rate of $51.6 \%$ of males paid tuition between the ranges of R1-R100, which is closely followed by 51.3 \% still among the males, which paid nothing towards the fees. More so, the highest number of females accounting for $55.0 \%$ paid tuition between the ranges of R8001-R12000. The number of female learners which do not pay any fees still remains very high (49.7 \%). The study showed that tuition among learners had always been a problem; parents most times do not have sufficient funds to pay the tuition of their children or wards. Often, parents and to a large extent, learners depend on the subsidies from the government, which in most cases may not be available or sufficient enough to pay for the learners. The rates from the distribution are satisfactory; this is because majority of the learners paid fees between R1-R100 and together with those who paid nothing, showed that attendance rate will be higher, which indicates that most parents could afford that. Furthermore, with the majority paying that rate, then it signifies that government had subsidized tuition fees for the learners. In essence, this would encourage school attendance among learners, and also reduce the problems of payments among parents and guardians of the learners.

Table 5.3: Distribution of learners by gender according to the range of tuition fees paid

| Tuition fees paid | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| R1-R100 | $9170(51.6 \%)$ | $8599(48.4 \%)$ | $17769(100 \%)$ |
| R101-R200 | $2936(50.7 \%)$ | $2855(49.4 \%)$ | $5791(100 \%)$ |
| R201-R300 | $894(50.3 \%)$ | $883(49.8 \%)$ | $1777(100 \%)$ |
| R301-R500 | $644(47.5 \%)$ | $711(52.5 \%)$ | $1355(100 \%)$ |
| R501-R1000 | $632(49.2 \%)$ | $679(51.8 \%)$ | $1311(100 \%)$ |
| R1001-R2000 | $543(49.0 \%)$ | $545(50.5 \%)$ | $1088(100 \%)$ |
| R2001-R3000 | $455(49.5 \%)$ | $464(50.5 \%)$ | $919(100 \%)$ |
| R3001-R4000 | $355(49.8 \%)$ | $358(50.2 \%)$ | $713(100 \%)$ |
| R4001-R8000 | $470(47.5 \%)$ | $520(52.5 \%)$ | $990(100 \%)$ |
| R8001-R12000 | $213(45.0 \%)$ | $260(55.0 \%)$ | $473(100 \%)$ |
| More than 12000 | $230(51.3 \%)$ | $218(48.7 \%)$ | $448(100 \%)$ |
| None | $163(50.3 \%)$ | $161(49.7 \%)$ | $324(100 \%)$ |
| Don't know | $67(46.9 \%)$ | $76(53.1 \%)$ | $143(100 \%)$ |

## School Feeding Programme

The distribution of learners who got free food at school according to age and gender is shown in Table 5.4. It could be deduced that learners who got free food at school increased through the age groups 5-9 years and10-14 years, but decreased through the age groups 15-19 years and 20-24 years. Also observed is that the rates were seen to be higher among males than females.

Table 5.4: Distribution of learners who enjoyed free food at school according to age and gender

| Gender | Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5-9 years | $\mathbf{1 0 - 1 4}$ years | 15-19 years | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 4}$ years | Total |  |
|  | 2645 | 2846 | 636 | 48 | 6175 |  |
|  | $(42.8 \%)$ | $(46.1 \%)$ | $(10.3 \%)$ | $(0.8 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |
| Male | No | 1450 | 2860 | 4029 | 1094 | 9433 |
|  |  | $(15.4 \%)$ | $(30.3 \%)$ | $(42.7 \%)$ | $(11.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Total | 4095 | 5706 | 4665 | 1142 | 15608 |  |
|  | $(26.2 \%)$ | $(36.6 \%)$ | $(29.9 \%)$ | $(7.3 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |
|  | 2607 | 2596 | 472 | 48 | 5723 |  |
|  | $(45.4 \%)$ | $(45.6 \%)$ | $(8.2 \%)$ | $(0.8 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |
| Female | No | 1431 | 3032 | 3816 | 1078 | 9357 |
|  |  | $(15.3 \%)$ | $(32.4 \%)$ | $(40.8 \%)$ | $(11.5 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
|  | Total | 4038 | 5628 | 4288 | 1126 | 15080 |
|  | $(26.8 \%)$ | $(37.3 \%)$ | $(28.4 \%)$ | $(7.5 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |  |

More so, the distribution of learners who usually took money to buy food at school according to their age groups and gender is shown in Table 5.5. The same pattern of distribution could be seen as in Table 5.4 whereby there is an increase in the number of learners who take money to buy food through the age groups 5-9 years and1014 years, but decreased through the age groups 15-19 years and 20-24 years for both sexes. These results have shown that the school feeding programme initiated by the government has become effective in increasing school attendance among the learners. Hence an improvement in this programme by government and non-governmental organizations (NGO's) would increase the rate of school attendance among learners.

Table 5.5: Distribution of learners who usually take money to buy food at the schools according to age and gender

| Gender |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 years | 10-14 years | 15-19 years | 20-24 years | Total |
| Male | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 2345 \\ (25.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3219 \\ (35.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2841 \\ (31.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 712 \\ (7.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9117 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | No | $\begin{gathered} 1754 \\ (27.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2488 \\ (38.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1827 \\ (28.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 431 \\ (6.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6500 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 4099 \\ (26.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5707 \\ (36.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4668 \\ (29.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1143 \\ (7.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15617 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 2329 \\ (25.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3367 \\ (36.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2867 \\ (30.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 741 \\ (8.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9304 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | No | $\begin{gathered} 1709 \\ (29.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2258 \\ (39.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1429 \\ (24.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 385 \\ (6.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5781 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 4038 \\ (26.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5625 \\ (37.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4296 \\ (28.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1126 \\ (7.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15085 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Moreover, studies have shown that some learners go to school hungry due to the poverty level in their families. As a result of hunger and tiredness posed to the learners, concentration in the classroom becomes very difficult, and subsequently, there is a threat to the health of the learner. The above explained the Department of Education through the Minister of Education to initiate the school feeding programme which brings to light the effect of the nutritional needs of learners on academic performance.

## Other problems associated with School Attendance

Learners currently attending school may be faced with problems such as lack of books, teaching method at school, lack of teachers, conditions of facilities, high tuition fees and affordability, class size and pupil-teacher ratio, and distance to school. Hence, these parameters are measured and the results shown in Table 5.6. Learners tend to lose interest in learning when there are no teachers or qualified teachers to teach them at the schools and sometimes they tend to stay at home. In some cases where there are lack of teachers at the schools, teachers may be forced to take more than one subject he or she specialised in, and they tend to show no mastery of such subject because they were not trained in the particular field of study. Hence, from the study population, females associate this to a school attendance than males. $51.2 \%$ of females see it as a problem leading to poor school attendances as against $48.8 \%$ of males. Poor teaching style might lead to reduced school attendance among the learners. From this study, more males ( $51.5 \%$ ) believed it could be a reason for poor school attendance than females ( $48.5 \%$ ).

Conditions of school facilities go a long way in determining school attendance. This is because when school facilities are in bad conditions, there is usually poor attendance or no attendance at all. In the rural areas, the schools have no sufficient funds to provide the needed facilities at the school hence, attendance might be low. Compared to the urban areas, where the standard of living is much better, schools could afford to provide the basic facilities, which is always with the help of the School Governing Body (SGB) and through contributions of parents. Hence, results from this study showed that males ( $51.2 \%$ ) compared to $48.8 \%$ of females see facilities in bad conditions at school as affecting school attendances.

High tuition fees is one major problem learners attending school face, and it in most cases, parents/guardians bear the burden because they are responsible for their children or wards. Sometimes in cases where tuition fees are too high, the learners tend to stay at home because their parents may not be able to afford such high fees. The results from this study showed that males ( $50.6 \%$ ) believed this is a cause of poor school attendance than females (49.4 \%) Among those who experience the problem of class size, males (51.1 \%) believed it leads to high rate of school drop-outs than females ( $48.9 \%$ ).

Table 5.6: Distribution of learners by age and gender according to the different problems encountered at school


## Availability of Textbooks to Learners

Access to prescribed textbooks helps in improving learning among learners. This is because they have all the detailed information on each subject matter in their textbooks thus; the learning process is enhanced because the learners could easily master the particular subject being taught. The distribution of learners who attend school and have access to text books by gender is shown in Table 5.7. Here, it was shown that among both sexes, about half of the learners have access to textbooks while the other half does not.

Table 5.7: Distribution of learners by gender according their access to textbooks.

| Access to textbooks | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| Yes | $13418(50.9 \%)$ | $12921(49.1 \%)$ | $26339(100 \%)$ |
| No | $2176(50.5 \%)$ | $2134(49.5 \%)$ | $4310(100 \%)$ |
| Total | $15594(50.9 \%)$ | $15055(49.1 \%)$ | $30649(100 \%)$ |

## Distance learners Cover to School

Long distance walks poses great threat to the health of learners, and subsequently, school attendance. In situations where learners need to walk several kilometres to and from school, the parents may decide they stay at home. For example in the rural areas where learners need to cross the rivers, broken bridges etc in order to get to school, parents of such learners would prefer their children to sit at home than risk their lives on the way to school.

The distribution of the distance covered to school by the learners according to their age groups, and gender is shown in Table 5.8. Among male learners, those within the age group 10-14 years makes up the highest number of those who walks less than 15 minutes and 15-30 minutes to get to school, while learners within the age group 1519 years constitutes the larger proportion of those who walks more than 30 minutes and those who don't even know how much distances they walk to school. Among female learners, those that cover a particular distance to school are within the age group 10-14 years. On the whole, the proportion of male learners who walked to school is more than that seen in females.

We, however, conclude that the major distance covered to school by the learners as seen from the table was between $15-30$ minutes, which is quite a distance to cover to school for learners. Considering the ergonomic stress such endeavour will put on the health of learners, and its consequent reduction in the rate of attendance among the learners, it is therefore expedient that measures are put in place by the government to check the long distances covered by learners to schools, especially in the rural areas, where it has become common practice that learners walk long distances in order to attend schools.

Table 5.8: Distribution of learners by age and gender according to the different distances covered to school.

|  | Age group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24 yrs | Total |
| Less than 15 mins | $\begin{gathered} 1896 \\ (32.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2199 \\ (38.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1442 \\ (24.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 246 \\ (4.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 5783 $(100 \%)$ |
| 15-30 mins | $\begin{gathered} 1703 \\ (25.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2471 \\ (36.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 2071 $(30.8 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 479 \\ (7.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6724 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| More than 30 mins | 590 $(18.7 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1039 \\ (33.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1107 \\ (35.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 411 \\ (13.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3147 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Don't know | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (20.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 4 $(16.7 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (45.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 4 $(16.7 \%)$ | 24 $(100 \%)$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 4194 \\ (26.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $5713$ (36.4 \%) | $4631$ $(29.5 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1140 \\ (7.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15678 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 15 mins | $\begin{gathered} 1779 \\ (33.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $2157$ $(40.0 \%)$ | $1210$ $(22.4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 249 \\ (4.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5395 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 15-30 mins | $\begin{gathered} 1727 \\ (26.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 2410 $(37.0 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1898 \\ (29.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 470 \\ (7.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6505 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| More than 30 mins | $\begin{gathered} 605 \\ (19.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1038 $(32.7 \%)$ | 1147 $(36.2 \%)$ | 380 $(12.0 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 3170 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Don't know | 5 $(23.8 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (28.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (33.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 3 $(14.3 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 4116 $(27.3 \%)$ | 5611 $(37.2 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 4262 \\ (28.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1102 \\ (7.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15091 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Factors Responsible for Learners Doing Same Grade as in the Previous Year

Learners currently attending schools may be doing the same grade as the previous year due to myriad of reasons like failure to reach the minimum pass requirements, change of residence, health issues, pregnancy, decisions taken by teacher's, parents and learners themselves, abscondment, inability to pay tuition fees, and lack of facilities in schools. The distribution regarding the above reasons is shown in Table 5.9. Promotion of learners to the next grade depended on their ability of reach a minimum pass requirement. Inability to attain this level may lead to the learner doing the same grade all over. Hence in the study, more males (58.2 \%) than females (41.8 \%) believed this is a major reason which makes learners to repeat classes.

Change in residence goes a long way to affect regular attendance. In cases where the learner relocates from one residence to the other, it might become hard to travel to school easily because there may be no proper transportation arrangement in the new area. In rural areas, where most residences are far from school, learners find it very challenging to get to school because of long distance walks to and from the school; which might be unsafe for them to walk alone. From the study, more females (53.8 \%) than males $46.2 \%$ ) see this reason as a cause of stagnation in their academic progress. This result is not surprising because male learners might see walking the long distances as a source of bonding with fellows learners and making new friends in their new area than females. More so, there are more males (51.3 \%) doing the same grade due to health reasons as compared to the females (48.7 \%). Pregnancy is a major problem among female teenage learners currently attending school; especially among age group 14-19 years. As expected, our result showed that more females (97.1 \%) are repeating grades due to their falling pregnant while still at school.

Teachers are most times in the best position to determine if a child would do the same grade as the previous year or not. Teachers are able to determine the academic strength and weaknesses of a learner because they deal with them on a day to day basis. Our result showed that more males ( $63.6 \%$ ) than females ( $36.4 \%$ ) are doing the same grade as the previous year due to their teacher's decision, while having been advised by the teachers, more males ( $66.7 \%$ ) than females ( $33.3 \%$ ) repeat the same grade due to their parents following the advice from their teachers. However, a learner may decide to do the same grade as the previous year if he/she does not cope with the level of study for a particular year, or the academic achievement at the end of a given year does not benefit him/her. Therefore, such learners may decide willingly to do the same grade again. Result from our study showed more males ( $68.0 \%$ ) than females $(32.0 \%)$ made the decision to stay in the same grade from the previous year.

Expulsion due to lack of discipline is usually characterised among the male child particularly among learners aged 14-19 years in Grades 9 and 10. They tend to exhibit a level of truancy, and easily get distracted by peer pressure and groups, and in most cases, violate the school rules and regulations. As expected, our result follows a trend in which $59.1 \%$ of males compared to $40.9 \%$ of females repeat grades due to this reason. Absconding from school due to contributing factors such as poverty at home, peer pressures, broken homes, and sometimes psychological disorders is the leading cause of grades repeat among male learners (83.3 \%) than female learners (16.7 \%).

Table 5.9: Distribution of learners doing the same grade as the previous year by gender.


Table 5.9(contd): Distribution of learners doing the same grade as the previous year by gender.

| Doing same grade as last year |  | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total |
| Learner's decision | Yes | 17 (68.0 \%) | 8 (32.0 \%) | 25 (100 \%) |
|  | No | 1487 (56.0 \%) | 1169 (44.0 \%) | 2656 (100 \%) |
|  | Total | 1504 (56.1 \%) | 1177 (43.9 \%) | 2681 (100 \%) |
| Lack of discipline | Yes | 13 (59.1 \%) | 9 (40.9 \%) | 22 (100 \%) |
|  | No | 1491 (56.1 \%) | 1168 (43.9 \%) | 2659 (100 \%) |
|  | Total | 1504 (56.1 \%) | 1177 (43.9 \%) | 2681 (100 \%) |
| Absconded | Yes | 10 (83.3 \%) | 2 (16.7 \%) | 22 (100 \%) |
|  | No | 1493 (56.0 \%) | 1175 (44.0 \%) | 2668 (100 \%) |
|  | 717 | $\underline{117 m m i n}$ |  |  |
|  | Total | 1503 (56.1\%) | 1177 (43.9 \%) | 2680 (100 \%) |
| No money for fees | Yes | 19 (55.9 \%) | 15 (44.1 \%) | 34 (100 \%) |
|  | No | 1485 (56.1 \%) | 1161 (43.9 \%) | 2646 (100 \%) |
|  | Total | $1504(56.1 \%)$ | 1176 (43.9 \%) | 2680 (100 \%) |
| Lack of school facilities | Yes | 8 (44.4 \%) | 10 (55.6 \%) | 18 (100\%) |
|  | No | 1496 (56.2 \%) | 1167 (43.8 \%) | 2663 (100 \%) |
|  | Total | 1504 (56.1 \%) | 1177 (43.9 \%) | 2681 (100 \%) |

## FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGH LEVELS IN SCHOOL DROP-OUT

## Previous experience with School attendance

The distribution of learners with previous experience of school attendance stratified according their gender is shown in Table 5.10. It was deduced from this distribution that females have the higher proportion of those who have at a particular time in the past ever attended school than shown among males.

## Main reasons why learners fail to attend School

The main reasons given by learners regarding why they fail to attend schools and across gender divide is shown in Table 5.11. Results showed that majority (3203) of the learners do not attend schools due to inability to pay tuition fees. This proportion of learners was closely followed behind by those who responded that they were not attending schools due to the fact that they have just completed their education. Among the females, pregnancy was given as the leading reason for those who were not attending school. The females having been married and have families to look after, or having fallen pregnant at a teenage age (usually between the ages 14-19 years), do not see the need to attend school and ultimately, drop out of school.

Table 5.10: Distribution of learners regarding their previous experience with
school attendance

|  | Gender |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Previous <br> experience with <br> school <br> attendance | Yes | 3921 | 4532 | 8453 |
|  |  | No | $76.4 \%)$ | $(53.6 \%)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $(53.1 \%)$ | 621 | 1323 |
|  | Total | 4623 | 5153 | 9776 |
|  |  | $(47.3 \%)$ | $(52.7 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |



Table 5.11: Distribution of learners regarding the main reasons why learners fail to attend school by gender.

| Main reasons for not attending school | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| Too old/young | $\begin{gathered} 471 \\ (52.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 426 \\ (47.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 897 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Has completed school/education | $\begin{gathered} 745 \\ (47.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 818 \\ (52.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1563 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| School is too far away | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (48.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 54 $(51.4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No money for fees | 1494 $(46.6 \%)$ | 1709 $(53.4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 3203 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\mathrm{He} /$ she is working (at home/job) | $\begin{gathered} 570 \\ (63.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 327 \\ (36.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 897 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Education is useless/uninteresting | 462 <br> $(66.6 \%)$ | $\underset{(33.4 \%)}{232}$ | $\begin{gathered} 694 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Illness | $\begin{gathered} 226 \\ (52.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 209 \\ (48.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 435 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Pregnancy | - | $\begin{gathered} 531 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 531 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Failed exams | $\begin{gathered} 353 \\ (58.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 255 \\ (41.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 608 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Got married | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (10.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 134 \\ (89.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 150 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Family commitment (child minding etc) | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (14.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 378 \\ (89.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 442 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other | $\begin{gathered} 165 \\ (64.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ (35.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 255 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 4626 \\ (47.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5154 \\ (52.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9780 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Time Lapsed since Leaving School

The distribution and time duration of learners when they last attended school according to gender is shown in Table 5.12. Results from the distribution shown revealed there is no clear difference in the proportion of males compared to females as regards when last they attended school. However, the survey year witnessed more females attending schools. This may be due to awareness campaign by the government in sensitizing the girl child to attend school in order to take her place in the society. Regarding the males, low attendance may be connected to introduction into some forms of truancy, and indiscipline which makes them to drop out of school, where they begin to roam the streets. Learners sometimes do not attend due to other problems like the death of their parents, poverty in the family, sickness etc. Also among the males in the rural areas where they may be subjected to farming and sometimes fending for themselves and their family, may also result in difficulty in combining schooling and those chores together. All the aforementioned reasons, pose great threats to regular school attendance among youths.

Table 5.12: Distribution of learners by gender and according to the year they last attended school.

| Year attended school | Gender |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female |
| This year | $168(4.3 \%)$ | $238(5.3 \%)$ |
| Last year | $830(21.2 \%)$ | $1023(22.6 \%)$ |
| Two years ago | $891(22.8 \%)$ | $995(22.0 \%)$ |
| Three years ago | $647(16.6 \%)$ | $754(16.7 \%)$ |
| Four years ago | $560(14.3 \%)$ | $646(14.3 \%)$ |
| More than four years | $813(20.8 \%)$ | $865(19.1 \%)$ |
| Total | $3909(100 \%)$ | $4521(100 \%)$ |

## Intentions of Learners Regarding Going Back to School

Table 5.13 showed the distribution of learners who intended going back to school by age group and gender. Going back to school for both sexes increased across their age groups with the highest intentions of going back to school between ages 15-19 years. However, there is rise in the proportion of learners who refused to attend schools between ages 20-24 years. This is true for both sexes, but $80.5 \%$ of the females not having the enthusiasm in returning to school. With more females falling pregnant, the stresses of motherhood combine with culture in cases where the girls are not encouraged to attend schools like males. Regarding males, truancy and lack of indiscipline is the bane, where many believe they have attained adulthood and hence, get lured into gangs and fraternities.

Table 5.13: Distribution of learners' crosstabulated with their intentions on going back school, age, and gender

| Gender | Response | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 years | 10-14 years | 15-19 years | 20-24 years | Total |
| Male | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (3.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 297 \\ (24.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 854 \\ (70.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1205 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | No | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 568 \\ (21.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2097 \\ (78.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2689 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 865 \\ (22.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2951 \\ (75.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3894 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (0.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 497 \\ (26.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1330 \\ (71.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1865 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | No | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (0.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 497 \\ (18.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2130 \\ (80.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2645 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 994 \\ (22.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3460 \\ (76.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4510 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Time Frame for Going Back to School

Table 5.14 shows the distribution according to gender and the age groups of those who do not attend in order to find out when they intend going back to school. Result showed that the learner's intentions on their time to return to school increased by their age group for both sexes, and a high intention rate within the duration of a year.

Table 15.14: Distribution according to gender and the age, of learners who do not attend in order to find out when they intend going back to school.

| Gender | Response | Age Group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24 yrs | Total |
| Male | Next year | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (5.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 193 \\ \quad(28.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 443 \\ (65.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 681 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Within 2 years | $\frac{2}{(1.4 \%)}$ | $\frac{25}{(17.6 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ (81.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 142 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Don't <br> know | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1.3 \% \\ & \hline(1.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 77 <br> $(20.4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 295 \\ (78.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 378 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (3.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 295 \\ (24.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 853 \\ (71.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1201 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | Next year | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 383 \\ (31.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 793 \\ (65.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1206 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Within 2 years | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (19.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 168 \\ (79.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 212 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Don't know | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (16.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 365 \\ (82.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 441 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 496 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1326 \\ (71.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1859 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

The main reason why learners left school is shown in Table 5.15. Clearly, lack of money for fees remains the biggest cause, followed by the fact that a lot of them had completed their studies, and then pregnancy. These complete the top three reasons why a lot of learners are not in school presently. Lack of money to pay fees being the main reason showed the level of poverty in the South African society and the effect on even the minors in the society. More so, the fact that a lot of learners had completed their studies but not yet gainful employed showed the level of unemployment in the society. The proportion of learners (male and female) who were currently not attending school, and the age which they left school is shown in Appendix 3.0.


Table 5.15: Distribution of learners and the main reason why learners leave school

|  | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main reasons for leaving school | Male | Female | Total |
| Failed to reach minimum pass | 407 | 327 | 734 |
| requirement | $(55.4 \%)$ | $(44.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Finished studies | 805 | 894 | 1699 |
|  | $(47.4 \%)$ | $(52.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| To work at home | 87 | 70 | 157 |
|  | $(55.4 \%)$ | $(54.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| To work away from home | 176 | 85 | 261 |
|  | $(67.4 \%)$ | $(51.0 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Health reasons | 143 | 149 | 292 |
|  | $(49.0 \%)$ | $(51.0 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Pregnancy | 14 | 801 | 815 |
|  | $(1.7 \%)$ | $(98.3 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Teacher's decision | 13 | 9 | 22 |
|  | $(59.1 \%)$ | $(40.9 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Parent's decision | 80 | 100 | 180 |
|  | $(44.4 \%)$ | $(55.6 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Learner's decision | 385 | 282 | 667 |
|  | $(57.7 \%)$ | $(42.3 \%)$ | $(100 \%)$ |
| Expelled due to indiscipline | 43 | $(78.2 \%)$ | $(21.8 \%)$ |\(\left(\begin{array}{c}55 <br>

<br>
\hline Abscond <br>
\hline Nack of school facilities <br>
\end{array}\right.\)

## Parental Survival and Children's Education

The distribution of learners attending school cross-tabulated by gender and parental survival is shown in Table 5.16. About $80.0 \%$ of males had their fathers alive, and a greater proportion ( 91.7 \%) still have their mothers' alive. Among the females, 80.0 \% had their fathers alive; a small proportion (7.3 \%) had already lost their mothers. A greater proportion of males than females do not know if either of their parents is still alive. Parental survival is an important household factor to consider when measuring the level of school attendance. Literature has it that most homes where the mothers were alive experienced higher rates of attendance as compared with those homes where the mothers were not alive.

Table 5.16: Distribution of learners by gender and parental survival


## CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The aim of the study is to examine the differentials in school attendance across the nine provinces of South Africa. In order to achieve this, the study focused on demographic variables such as the household and schooling environment. The 2004 General Household Survey was used and response from learners between ages 524 years was used. The major issues in this study were to examine the problems associated with school attendance and non-attendance. The study also sought to identify the extent to which these problems differ according to the geographical location, gender, age group, and the environment in which the child lives.

The objective of the study was to measure the level of school attendance across the household situation, investigate demographic characteristics on school attendance, and to profile other differentials that influenced school attendance across the nine provinces in South Africa. The analyses of this study were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Cross-tabulation was carried out across the chosen age groups (5-24 years), gender, provinces, and strata (urban and rural areas) to find out the level of school attendance.

A brief summary of the findings from the study shows that;

- The rates of attendance showed that the Limpopo Province had the highest rates of attendance with a $48.6 \%$ and $38.1 \%$ among males and females respectively, while the Northern Cape had the lowest rate of school attendance.
- Females within age group 14-20 years did not attend school due to teenage pregnancy. High rate of non-attendance were observed especially among
males (15-19 years) due to the influence of peer pressure and or attainment of independence in life.
- High rate of non-attendance in the rural areas of the provinces was seen to be due to long distance to school and difficulties in transport system.

The calculations of the attendance rates across the provinces helped to express the proportion of learners excluded from the schooling system in the total population. The deduction showing urban areas as having higher rates of attendance when compared with rural areas revealed a link between school attendance and the geographical location of the child. The study showed that learners attended schools more in the urban area due to availability of infrastructure put in place by the school and the School Governing Body (SGB) as compared to the rural areas where not all infrastructures were put in place for learning.

Learners who attended school were faced with various range of problems such as lack of tuition fees; distance to school; condition of school facilities; repetition of same grade as the previous year due to their own decision, parent's decision; and in some cases due to change in residence. High tuition fees was seen to be a determining factor for learners attendance, as there was a relationship between the family income, poverty and school attendance. Homes with higher paying jobs could afford to pay high tuition fees for their children. Poverty within the family meant that there was no schooling in that particular home.

The study also showed that family background was a determining factor for school attendance. This was found that the more educated the parents of the home were, the more the learners of the home attended school. It owes to reasons such that well-
educated parents placed greater priority on the education of their children (Quinlan and Martinez, 1997). Feeding was also a factor that reduced school attendance, as the study showed that hungry learners could not pay attention to what they were taught in the classroom. As a result of malnutrition and improper feeding among learners at schools, the government put in place school feeding programmes to reduce such problems. The condition of the school facilities such as classrooms, teaching conditions, availability of teachers, size of classroom, and the sanitation of the school were viewed in the study as factors that determined school attendance.

Some learners were also challenged by certain issues such as distance to school, particularly in the rural areas where most schools were far from the homes and the learners had to walk long distances to get to school. More so, learners did the same grade as the previous year due to reasons such as change in residence, learners, and teacher's, and parents decisions. The study examined certain reasons why learners did not attend school and such factors comprised of pregnancy, completion of schooling, and family commitment particularly on the part of the female learners who might be married and needed to take care of her family. The males sometimes in the rural areas had commitments to farm or tend the flocks which mean these chores did not allow them attend school. Pregnant learners most times had to drop out of school and sometimes did not come back to school due to many responsibilities attached to that stage of life.

Non-attendance in school can be classified either as temporary non-attendance or indefinite non-attendance. Some of the learners within these two categories hinted about returning to school within a specified time frame, which was between a year and four years and in some cases over four years. However, these expected returns to
school were faced with challenges such as lack of tuition fees, poverty, and family commitments as mentioned earlier. Conversely, some learners did signify never to return to school as they believe they could make a living for themselves on the streets hence, they were referred to as school drop-outs.

The Community Agency for Social Research (CASE) revealed in 1994 that the number of out-of-school youths across all ethnic groups aged between 16-30 years was 11 million and of this number was 3.5 million out-of-school youths. About $65 \%$ of the above population had left school earlier than they wanted to, but that they wished to continue the studies. This study led to the attempt of the Provincial Education Department, the needs of this group of young people by trying to get them back to schools.

## Recommendations

This research has identified different problems associated with school attendance such as distance and transportation problems, tuition fees, teenage pregnancy, poor teacher quality and facilities. The study has shown that school attendance in the rural areas is quite low when compared with the urban areas. This is because most of the learners in the rural areas cover long distances in order to get to their schools; there are also no transport schemes or sufficient transportation to convey the learners to school. In the urban areas, the government in conjunction with the schools have put in place transport schemes and buses to convey the learners to their different schools. However, it is sometimes found that most of the learners still have problems in accessing their schools from their different homes due to reasons such as transport organisations not being paid in time or fully by the government. Consequently, they
cease to operate and the learners find it difficult to reach their different schools. Hence, it is imperative for further studies to look into these issues in order to proffer solutions or better approach to the transportation system of school learners.

School facilities need to be put in proper conditions at schools in order to enhance quality teaching and learning among learners. Most schools in the rural areas do not have proper schooling facilities and infrastructure as compared with the urban areas, where the School Governing Bodies (SGBs) always monitor the schooling facilities and they make sure they are at optimum standard. The facilities at the rural areas for schools do not encourage learners to attend school, e.g. in cases where learners attend classes under shades and trees, lack proper hygiene because there are no good sanitary facilities, power failure, and poor feeding of the learners. The SGBs could also be put in place in the rural areas to monitor the schools and the environment of the schools like it is practised in the urban areas where they oversee the running of the schools which includes school financing, teacher recruitment, maintenance of facilities and selection of the school principals, and always ensure that the learning environment are conducive for the learners. Therefore, the government should see to it that proper and hygienic environment are created in the rural places, so as to encourage school attendance among the learners. Further research could also be conducted in this regard.

Furthermore, the issue of teaching and teachers need to be re-emphasised at the schools or at the governmental level through the Department of Education. The research found that some learners repeated the same grade due to lack of teachers and poor teaching quality and style. The Department of Education should endeavour to place qualified teachers in the schools so as to improve the day to day learning and
teaching of the learners and thereby improving school attendance. The size of the classroom was also part of the problems the learners encountered at the schools. The schools should see to it that the class size conforms to the subject matter of the learners, and also that the teachers are able to manage the class size whether large or small.

The availability of books was also evident in the research to enhance school attendance. Some learners who attended schools faced problems at the schools due to lack of books. They sometimes were not able to move at the pace of their teachers in the classroom with what they were taught. It is important therefore, for the government to make sure that the learners get adequate supply of books all through the year, at all provinces including the rural areas. This is because some parents may not be able to afford the cost of textbooks and other learning materials. The government could also subsidize these materials for the learners in order to encourage schooling and regular attendance among the learners.

Further research could be carried out on the school feeding programmes. Though there are feeding schemes which the government have put in place at the schools particularly in the urban areas, such programmes need to adequately extend to the children at the rural areas. More programmes could be created by the government and the Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in order to cater for the nutritional needs of learners who are not well fed. The study showed that pregnancy has also been a major problem among the teenage girls. Most of these girls dropped out of school due to teenage pregnancy, and often find it difficult to return to school afterwards because of the many commitments associated with being a teenage mother.

Further studies need to be carried out on this menace which is fast robbing school age girls of their educational attainment and goals in life. Some other times, family commitments on the part of the female child do not allow them attend school regularly especially in cases where a girl got married at an early age.

The issue of high tuition fees have also reduced school attendance among learners and forced many to stay back at home, or get occupied with menial jobs in order to raise their tuition fees. In some cases, the government subsidises the fees on education at public schools in order to allow most parents afford the cost of tuition. But in cases where there were no subsidies, it becomes difficult for most parents or guardians to pay high cost on the fees of their children. Also in some cases, the tuition fees are decided by the SGBs particularly in private schools where it is not easy for some learners to pay up the school fees. Consequently, they end up becoming school drop outs. It is therefore recommended that further research be done as regards the tuition of schools, and the inequalities associated with it.

The study revealed that most of the school drop outs particularly among the males drop out at the ages of 15-19 years, most times as a result of peer pressure and other forms of truancy. The school, policy makers and parents through the SBGs should enforce firm policies to keep these learners in school. Gender issues need to be thoroughly researched along the lines of education among learners. Some parents in the rural areas generally believe that the girl child should be at home doing the household chores and taking care of the family commitments rather than sending her to school. Therefore, studies could come up in the future as regards gender issues in education and balancing education among the boy/girl child. The government through
the Department of Education should see to these issues and make it compulsory that every child is entitled to school. The Education for All initiative emphasised that every child have the rights to be in school and be educated. Likewise the Millennium Development Goals emphasised that all child be educated by 2015. It would be important that future studies be carried out in this regard in order to address education in the rural areas.
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## APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Distribution of learners by age, gender, \& strata (urban and rural).

| Age group | Province | Attending |  | Not <br> Attending |  | Total |  | Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 5-9 yrs | W.C | $\begin{gathered} 297 \\ (27.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 297 \\ (26.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (8.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (8.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 337 | 332 | 88.1 | 89.5 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 411 \\ (38.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 415 \\ (38.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (1.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 417 | 418 | 98.6 | 99.3 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 307 \\ (28.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 289 \\ 26.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110 \\ 24.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ 21.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | 417 | 386 | 73.6 | 74.9 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (5.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (7.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 298 \\ (65.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 321 \\ (70.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 353 | 405 | 15.6 | 20.7 |
| Total |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1070 \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1085 \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 454 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | 456 | 1524 | 1541 | 70.2 | 70.4 |
| 5-9 yrs | W.C Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ (31.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 104 \\ (34.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (23.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (12.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 136 | 127 | 70.6 | 81.9 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 129 \\ 42.9 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126 \\ (41.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 132 | 129 | 97.7 | 96.7 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (23.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69 \\ (22.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{45}{(26.8 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (22.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 116 | 110 | 61.2 | 62.7 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (1.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \\ (47.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 114 \\ (63.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 85 | 118 | 5.9 | 3.4 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 301 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 303 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 181 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 161 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 482 | 469 | 62.6 | 64.6 |
| 5-9 yrs | E.C | $\begin{gathered} 222 \\ (26.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 226 \\ (25.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (6.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (8.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 241 | 250 | 92.1 | 90.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 295 \\ (35.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 306 \\ (35.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 297 | 310 | 99.3 | 98.7 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 256 \\ (30.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 240 \\ (28.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73 \\ (26.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \\ (20.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 329 | 302 | 77.8 | 79.5 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ (7.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \\ (9.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 187 \\ (66.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 209 \\ (69.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 253 | 289 | 26.1 | 27.7 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 839 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 852 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 281 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 299 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1120 | 1151 | 74.9 | 74.0 |
| 5-9 yrs | E.C Non urban | $\begin{gathered} 497 \\ (27.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 499 \\ (30.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (18.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (14.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 581 | 566 | 85.5 | 88.2 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 662 \\ (39.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 637 \\ (39.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (6.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 690 | 641 | 95.9 | 99.4 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 504 \\ (26.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 391 \\ (24.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125 \\ (26.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 124 \\ (27.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 629 | 515 | 80.1 | 75.9 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 160 \\ (7.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \\ (5.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 229 \\ (49.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 264 \\ (57.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 335 | 350 | 31.6 | 24.6 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 1769 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1613 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 466 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 459 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2235 | 2072 | 79.1 | 77.8 |
| 5-9 yrs | N.C | $\begin{gathered} 139 \\ (33.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ (21.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (24.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (13.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 185 | 167 | 75.1 | 80.8 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 204 \\ (45.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 217 \\ (40.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 206 | 219 | 99.0 | 99.1 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 131 \\ (19.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 155 \\ (28.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (17.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (17.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 165 | 195 | 79.4 | 79.5 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (7.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (5.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 108 \\ (56.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 161 \\ (68.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 145 | 191 | 25.5 | 15.7 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 511 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 537 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 190 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 701 | 772 | 72.9 | 69.6 |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { group } \end{gathered}$ | Province | Attending |  | Not <br> Attending |  | Total |  | Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 5-9 yrs | N.C Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (33.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (29.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (12.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (18.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 51 | 44 | 70.6 | 63.6 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (45.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ (50.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (2.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 52 | 49 | 94.2 | 98 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (19.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (3.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (27.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (22.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 53 | 35 | 39.6 | 45.7 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (3.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (57.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (57.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 69 | 52 | 2.9 | 5.8 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 108 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 117 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 85 | 225 | 180 | 48.0 | 52.8 |
| 5-9 yrs | F.C | $\begin{gathered} 197 \\ (25.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 188 \\ (23.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (10.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 29 \\ (12.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 220 | 217 | 89.5 | 86.6 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 242 \\ (31.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 285 \\ (36.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (2.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 248 | 287 | 97.6 | 99.3 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 252 \\ (33.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 246 \\ (31.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (13.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (12.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 281 | 275 | 89.7 | 89.5 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ (9.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ (8.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 159 \\ (73.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 175 \\ (74.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 229 | 245 | 30.6 | 28.6 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 761 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 789 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 217 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 978 | 1024 | 77.8 | 77.1 |
| 5-9 yrs | F.C Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 103 \\ (28.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110 \\ (29.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (16.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (8.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 128 | 125 | 80.5 | 88.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 125 \\ (34.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 140 \\ (37.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (3.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 130 | 143 | 96.2 | 97.9 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 109 \\ (30.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ (26.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (22.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (17.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 142 | 126 | 76.8 | 77.0 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (6.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (6.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \\ (58.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 122 \\ (58.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 112 | 147 | 22.3 | 17.0 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 362 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 372 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 150 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 169 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 512 | 541 | 70.4 | 68.8 |
| 5-9 yrs | KZN | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (22.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (24.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (10.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (7.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 272 | 267 | 86.4 | 88.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 359 \\ (34.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 364 \\ (38.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (1.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 362 | 369 | 99.2 | 98.6 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 338 \\ (32.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 270 \\ (28.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ (17.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (1.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 401 | 365 | 84.3 | 74.0 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 106 \\ (10.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \\ (8.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 249 \\ (70.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 283 \\ (68.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 355 | 366 | 29.9 | 22.7 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 1038 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 952 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 415 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1390 | 1367 | 74.4 | 69.6 |
| $5-9 \mathrm{yrs}$ | KZN Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 500 \\ (27.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 471 \\ (26.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ (20.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \\ (13.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 601 | 557 | 83.2 | 84.6 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 711 \\ (38.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 647 \\ (37.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (4.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (3.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 734 | 669 | 96.9 | 96.7 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 506 \\ (27.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 504 \\ (28.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 102 \\ (21.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 148 \\ (23.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 608 | 652 | 83.2 | 77.3 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (7.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126 \\ (7.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 257 \\ (53.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 382 \\ (59.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 387 | 508 | 33.6 | 24.8 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 1847 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1748 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 483 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 638 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 2330 | 2386 | 79.3 | 73.3 |

## Appendix 1 (contd.)

| Age group | Province | Attending |  | Not Attending |  | Total |  | Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 5-9 yrs | N.W | $\begin{gathered} 166 \\ (26.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 199 \\ (29.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (11.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (10.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 186 | 220 | 89.2 | 90.5 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 227 \\ (36.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (34.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 231 | 238 | 98.0 | 98.7 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 194 \\ (30.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 191 \\ (28.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (12.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (14.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 216 | 221 | 89.8 | 86.4 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (8.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (8.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127 \\ (73.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 150 \\ (73.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 178 | 204 | 28.7 | 26.5 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 638 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 679 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 173 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 204 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 811 | 883 | 78.7 | 76.9 |
| 5-9 yrs | N.W Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 233 \\ (27.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 243 \\ (29.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (16.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (12.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 284 | 279 | 82.0 | 87.1 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 312 \\ (36.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 321 \\ (39.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (3.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 316 | 330 | 98.7 | 97.3 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 242 \\ (28.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 220 \\ (26.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ (14.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (18.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 289 | 275 | 83.7 | 80.0 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (6.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (4.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 214 \\ (67.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 191 \\ (65.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 272 | 227 | 21.3 | 15.9 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 845 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 820 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 316 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 291 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1161 | 1111 | 72.8 | 73.8 |
| 5-9 yrs | G | $\begin{gathered} 403 \\ (24.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 371 \\ (24.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (10.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (8.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 460 | 421 | 87.6 | 88.1 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 599 \\ (36.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 528 \\ (34.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (1.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 602 | 534 | 99.5 | 98.9 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 471 \\ (28.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 493 \\ (31.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ (13.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 109 \\ (17.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 548 | 602 | 85.9 | 81.9 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 168 \\ (10.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 152 \\ (9.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 427 \\ (75.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 455 \\ (73.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 595 | 607 | 28.2 | 25.0 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 1641 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1544 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 564 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 620 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2205 | 2164 | 74.4 | 71.3 |
| 5-9 yrs | G Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (25.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (6.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 8 | 12 | 87.5 | 75.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (40.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (13.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (13.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (26.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16 | 18 | 87.5 | 72.2 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (34.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (25.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (60.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (40.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 24 | 20 | 50.0 | 45.0 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (20.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (18.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 17 | 23 | 11.8 | 17.4 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 49 | 50 | 71.4 | 70.0 |
| 5-9 yrs | MP | $\begin{gathered} 184 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 159 \\ (23.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 186 | 161 | 98.9 | 98.8 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 224 \\ (32.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 245 \\ (36.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (14.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (12.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 250 | 271 | 89.6 | 90.4 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 224 \\ (32.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 189 \\ (27.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 132 \\ (75.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 169 \\ (79.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 356 | 358 | 62.9 | 52.8 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (8.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (12.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 174 \\ (17.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (10.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 232 | 296 | 25.0 | 28.0 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 690 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 677 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 736 | 707 | 93.8 | 95.8 |

## Appendix 1 (contd.)

| Age group | Province | Attending |  | Not Attending |  | Total |  | Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 5-9 yrs | MP <br> Non- <br> urban | $\begin{gathered} 229 \\ (16.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 226 \\ (15.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (2.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (2.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 235 | 232 | 97.4 | 97.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 297 \\ (34.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 308 \\ (36.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 170 \\ (63.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 200 \\ (68.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 343 | 365 | 86.0 | 84.0 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 264 \\ (30.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 258 \\ (30.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 170 \\ (63.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 200 \\ (68.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 434 | 458 | 60.8 | 56.3 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (8.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (7.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 268 \\ (11.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 293 \\ (14.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 339 | 353 | 20.9 | 17.0 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 861 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 852 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 874 | 865 | 99.0 | 98.5 |
| 5-9 yrs | LIM | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ (26.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 145 \\ (30.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 135 | 146 | 100.0 | 99.0 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 188 \\ (37.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 162 \\ (34.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (11.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (9.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 201 | 171 | 93.5 | 94.7 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 143 \\ (28.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 123 \\ (25.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \\ (77.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69 \\ (75.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 232 | 192 | 61.6 | 64.1 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (8.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (9.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ (9.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92 \\ (7.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 156 | 138 | 26.3 | 33.0 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} 507 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 476 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 543 | 515 | 93.4 | 92.0 |
| 5-9 yrs | LIM Nonurban | $\begin{gathered} 556 \\ (26.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 516 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (2.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 564 | 519 | 98.6 | 99.4 |
| 10-14 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 711 \\ (34.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 667 \\ (34.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69 \\ (18.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \\ (15.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 780 | 746 | 91.2 | 89.4 |
| 15-19 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 661 \\ (31.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 572 \\ (29.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 261 \\ (69.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 377 \\ (75.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 922 | 949 | 71.7 | 60.3 |
| 20-24 yrs |  | $\begin{gathered} 157 \\ (7.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 174 \\ (9.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 374 \\ (17.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 498 \\ (19.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 531 | 672 | 29.6 | 25.9 |
| Total |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2085 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 192 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 872 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2801 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 4886 | 1064 | 42.0 | 20.0 |

Appendix 2: Distribution of learners by age, gender, \& strata (urban and rural).

| Provinces |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24yrs | Total |
| W.C | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 594 \\ (27.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 826 \\ (38.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 596 \\ (27.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 139 \\ (6.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2155 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 75 \\ (8.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 207 \\ (22.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 619 \\ (68.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 758 \\ (24.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 669 \\ (21.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 835 \\ (27.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 803 \\ (26.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 758 \\ (24.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3065 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 88.8 | 99.0 | 74.2 | 18.3 | 70.3 |
| W.C <br> Non- <br> urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 200 \\ (33.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 255 \\ (42.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 140 \\ (23.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (1.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 604 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ (18.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \\ (24.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 194 \\ (55.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 349 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 263 \\ (27.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 261 \\ (27.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 226 \\ (23.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 203 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 953 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 97.7 | 61.9 | $44.3$ | 63.4 | 91.2 |
| E.C | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 448 \\ (26.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 601 \\ (35.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 496 \\ (29.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 146 \\ (8.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1691 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (7.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ (23.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 396 \\ (68.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 580 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 491 \\ (21.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 607 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 631 \\ (27.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 542 \\ (23.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2271 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | $91.2$ | $99.0$ | $\mathrm{P}^{78.6}$ | 26.9 | 74.5 |
| E.C <br> Non- <br> urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 996 \\ (29.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1299 \\ (38.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 895 \\ (26.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 192 \\ (5.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3382 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 151 \\ (16.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (3.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 249 \\ (26.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 493 \\ (53.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 925 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 1147 \\ (26.6 \% 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1331 \\ (30.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1147 \\ (26.9 \% 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 685 \\ (15.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4307 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 86.8 | 97.6 | 78.2 | 28.0 | 78.5 |
| N.C | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 274 \\ (26.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 421 \\ (40.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 286 \\ (27.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (6.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1048 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 78 \\ (18.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \\ (17.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 269 \\ (63.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 425 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 352 \\ (23.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 425 \\ (28.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 360 \\ (24.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 336 \\ (22.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1473 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 7.8 | 99.1 | 79.4 | 19.9 | 71.1 |


| Provinces |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24yrs | Total |
| N.C <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (31.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ (47.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (18.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (2.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 203 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (15.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (25.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 116 \\ (57.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 202 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (23.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ (24.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \\ (21.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ (29.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 405 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 67.4 | 96.0 | 42.0 | 43.1 | 50.1 |
| F.S | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 385 \\ (24.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 527 \\ (34.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 498 \\ (32.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 140 \\ (9.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1550 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (11.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (1.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (12.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 334 \\ (73.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 452 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 437 \\ (21.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 535 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 556 \\ (27.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 474 \\ (23.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2002 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 88.1 | 98.5 | 89.6 | 29.5 | 77.4 |
| F.S <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 213 \\ (29.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 265 \\ (36.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 206 \\ (28.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (6.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 734 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (12.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (2.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \\ (19.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 209 \\ (65.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 319 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 253 \\ (24.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 273 \\ (25.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 268 \\ (25.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 259 \\ (24.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1053 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 84.1 | 97.0 | 76.9 | 19.3 | 69.7 |
| KZN | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 470 \\ (23.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 723 \\ (36.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 608 \\ (30.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 189 \\ (9.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 69 \\ (9.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (1.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 158 \\ (20.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 533 \\ (69.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 768 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 539 \\ (19.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 731 \\ (26.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 766 \\ (27.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 722 \\ (26.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2758 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 87.2 | 98.9 | 79.4 | 26.2 | 72.2 |
| KZN <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 971 \\ (27.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1358 \\ (37.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1010 \\ (28.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 256 \\ (7.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3595 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 187 \\ (16.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (4.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 250 \\ (22.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 639 \\ (57.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1121 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 1158 \\ (24.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1403 \\ (29.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1260 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 895 \\ (19.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4716 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 83.9 | 96.8 | 80.1 | 28.6 | 76.2 |


| Provinces |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24yrs | Total |
| N.W | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 365 \\ (27.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 462 \\ (35.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 385 \\ (29.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (8.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1317 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (10.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (1.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (13.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 277 \\ (73.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 377 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 406 \\ (24.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 469 \\ (27.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 437 \\ (25.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 383 \\ (22.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1694 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 89.9 | 98.5 | 94.8 | 27.5 | 77.7 |
| N.W <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 476 \\ (28.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 633 \\ (38.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 462 \\ (27.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 94 \\ (5.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1665 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} \hline 87 \\ (14.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (2.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 102 \\ (16.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 405 \\ (66.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 607 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 563 \\ (24.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 646 \\ (28.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 564 \\ (24.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 499 \\ (22.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2272 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 84.5 | 97.9 | 81.9 | 18.8 | 73.3 |
|  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| G | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 774 \\ (24.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1127 \\ (35.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 964 \\ (30.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 320 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3185 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 107 \\ (9.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (0.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 186 \\ (15.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 882 \\ (74.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1184 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 881 \\ (20.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1136 \\ (26.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1150 \\ (26.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1202 \\ (27.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4369 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 87.9 NI | E 99.2 I | of 83.8 | 26.6 | 72.9 |
| G <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 16 \mathrm{~F} \\ (22.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (39.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (29.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (8.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (67.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (19.0 \% 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (24.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (27.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 80.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 20.7 | 67.6 |
| MP | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 343 \\ (25.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 469 \\ (34.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 413 \\ (30.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 142 \\ (10.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1367 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (7.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ (13.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 301 \\ (78.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 386 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 372 \\ (21.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 473 \\ (27.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 465 \\ (26.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 443 \\ (25.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1753 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 92.2 | 99.2 | 88.2 | 32.1 | 77.9 |


| Provinces |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5-9 yrs | 10-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24yrs | Total |
| MP <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 445 \\ (26.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 605 \\ (35.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 522 \\ (30.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 131 \\ (7.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1713 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 76 \\ (13.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (2.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 103 \\ (18.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 370 \\ (66.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 561 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 531 \\ (23.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 617 \\ (27.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 625 \\ (27.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 501 \\ (22.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 227 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 85.7 | 98.0 | 83.5 | 26.1 | 75.3 |
| LIM | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 280 \\ (28.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 350 \\ (35.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 266 \\ (27.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \\ (8.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 983 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (12.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (10.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 158 \\ (76.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 207 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 306 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 351 \\ (28.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 288 \\ (24.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 245 \\ (20.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1190 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 91.5 | 99.7 | $92.4$ | 35.5 | 82.6 |
| LIM <br> Non-urban | Attending | $\begin{gathered} 1072 \\ (26.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1378 \\ (34.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1233 \\ (30.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 331 \\ (8.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4014 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Not attending | $\begin{gathered} 75 \\ (8.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (1.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 148 \\ (17.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 638 \\ (73.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 872 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 1147 \\ (23.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1389 \\ \hline(28.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1381 \\ (28.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 969 \\ (19.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4886 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Rate(Both) | 93.5 NI | E 99.2 T | of 89.3 | 34.2 | 82.2 |

Appendix 3: Distribution of learners by gender and age when they left school

| Age | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| 5 | $\begin{gathered} 870 \\ (17.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 844 \\ (17.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1714 \\ (17.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 | $\begin{gathered} 880 \\ (17.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 879 \\ (18.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1759 \\ (18.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 7 | $\begin{gathered} 1076 \\ (21.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1012 \\ (21.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2088 \\ (21.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 8 | $\begin{gathered} 1044 \\ (21.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 989 \\ (20.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2033 \\ (21.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 9 | $\begin{gathered} 1033 \\ (21.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1004 \\ (21.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2037 \\ (21.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 4903 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{4728}{(100 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9631 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | $\begin{gathered} 1117 \\ (19.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1094 \\ (19.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2211 \\ (19.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 11 | $\begin{gathered} 1095 \\ (18.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1073 \\ \hline(18.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2168 \\ (18.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 12 | $\begin{gathered} 1172 \\ (20.0 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { RSI } 1143 \\ R(19.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2315 \\ (19.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 13 | $\begin{gathered} 1185 \\ (20.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1199 \\ (20.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2384 \\ (20.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 14 | $\begin{gathered} 1299 \\ (22.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1235 \\ (21.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2534 \\ (21.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 5868 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5744 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11612 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 15 | $\begin{gathered} 1139 \\ (20.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1046 \\ (19.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2185 \\ (19.8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 16 | $\begin{gathered} 1152 \\ (20.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1085 \\ (20.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2237 \\ (20.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 17 | $\begin{gathered} 1067 \\ (18.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1072 \\ (19.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2139 \\ (19.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 18 | $\begin{gathered} 1204 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1150 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2354 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Appendix 3 (contd.)

| Age | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| 19 | $\begin{gathered} 1095 \\ (19.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1036 \\ (19.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2131 \\ (19.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 5657 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5389 \\ (100 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11046 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 20 | $\begin{gathered} 905 \\ (20.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1076 \\ (21.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1981 \\ (21.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 21 | $\begin{gathered} 937 \\ (21.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1037 \\ (21.1 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1974 \\ (21.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 22 | $\begin{gathered} 947 \\ (21.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 993 \\ (20.2 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1940 \\ (20.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 23 | $\frac{817}{(18.7 \%)}$ | $\frac{930}{(18.9 \%)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1747 \\ (18.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 24 | $\begin{gathered} 758 \\ (17.4 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 879 \\ (17.9 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1637 \\ (17.6 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 4364 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4915 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9279 \\ (100 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

