



## Contributing factor of Educational Exclusion: A Study of South Punjab, Pakistan

**Zahid Zulfiqar**, Visiting Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, 59300 Pakistan

**Kamran Ishfaq**, Associate Professor & Chairman, Department of Sociology, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, 59300 Pakistan

**Tariq Mehmood Bhuttah**, Assistant professor (Education), Humanities and Social Sciences Department at Khwaja Fareed University of engineering and information technology, RYK,64200 (Punjab)

**Abdul Sattar Ghaffari\***, PhD Scholar (Statistics) Zhongtai Securities Institute for Financial Studies, School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China, [Sattarbzu@hotmail.com](mailto:Sattarbzu@hotmail.com)

**Abstract:** Education brings benefits both at micro and macro levels. It is the universal and basic right of every individual without discrimination. The objectives of the current research were to examine the household characteristics of the respondents; their attitude towards children's education; their satisfaction regarding the school facilities and to know the teachers related issues in South Punjab, Pakistan. The researcher used the quantitative data and 975 household heads whose children were aged between (05-09) years were selected for the study. 3 Divisions of South Punjab namely (i) Bahawalpur (ii) Multan and (iii) Dera Ghazi Khan were selected for data collection by using the multi-stage sampling. It was found that poor socio-economic background of parents; negative parental attitude, poor school facilities and teacher relate concerns played a vital role in the prohibiting of children in the studied area. It is suggested that educational awareness campaigns should start at union council level in which parents should sensitize towards children education and build unbiased attitude towards sons and daughters' education. The educational budget should increase, remove the schools deficiencies; hire new teachers on urgent basis and give them training for achieving the Universal educational targets.

**Keywords:** Education, Basic Right, Parental Attitude, School Facilities, Educational Budget

### I. INTRODUCTION:

It is generally viewed that educational exclusion of the children is a great dilemma of third world countries. There are multiple factors of educational exclusion among them some are structural and others are community based. Providing basic education is not priority of the third world countries due to lack of economic resources. Majority of the household of the third world countries also face low socio-economic status and cannot or hardly bear the expenditure of their children education (Arye & Eva, 2004; Baland & Robinson, 2000). It was highlighted that 57 percent out of school children were from the poorest family background (Alif Ailaan, 2016).

Other studies also found that lower socio-economic position of the parents excluded the kids from basic education and was also a motivating factor of child labor (Khan, 2001; Buchmann, 2000; Bass, 2004; Edmonds & Pavcnik, 2005; Bourdillon et al., 2010). Other studies highlighted the relationship between lower education status and educational exclusion of children (Huisman & Smits, 2009; Kurosaki et al., 2006; Mukherjee & Das, 2008).

It is reported that globally 8.018 percent children were excluded from the basic education; 8.954 percent girls were excluded from basic education and 7.153 percent boys were excluded from fundamental right of getting education in 2019. It was also reported that 19.60 percent children did not have persistence to 5<sup>th</sup> grade; 79.22 percent boys had persistence to last grade whereas 81.77 percent of the girls had persistence to last grade in 2018 at world level. There were 65.67 percent children persistence to last grade of primary; 64.34 percent boys had persistence to last grade of primary and 67 percent girls had persistence to last grade of primary in Pakistan in 2018 (The World Bank, 2020).

According to UNICEF (2021) there are 22.8 million (5-16 years old) children who do not attend schools. It was also highlighted that Pakistan was the 2<sup>nd</sup> worst country regarding the educational exclusion of school age children. It was further identified that 2.8 million girls and 3.6 million boys were at the lower secondary level.

It was identified by UNESCO (2018) that 34.3 million girls and 29.1 million boys were excluded from basic education throughout the world and the trickledown effect could be observed in South Asia that there 5.6 percent girls and 4.7 percent boys were omitted from basic education. Pakistan made a treaty of different national and international commitment to achieve universal primary education but unfortunately it is far away from achieving its goals. It was highlighted by NEMIS (2017) that 23 percent kids were not enrolled in the schools in Pakistan. It was reported by the (NEMIS, 2015-17) that at least 22.6 million children

were excluded from basic education in Pakistan among them 49 percent was female and 40 percent was male children.

The enrolment of privileged districts and metropolitan areas was higher than that of compare to unprivileged and rural areas. It was found that majority of the dwelling of Southern Punjab faced structural inequalities and children of those areas faced educational exclusion. Annual Status of Education Report (2017) identified that 18.2 percent children were excluded in Multan; 40.8 percent children were excluded in Rajanpur; 5.6 percent children were excluded from in Mianwali; 27.3 percent children were excluded in Dera Ghazi Khan; 17.8 percent children were excluded in Layyah; 16.7 percent children were excluded in Bhakkar; 21.6 percent children were excluded in Bahawalpur and 16.8 percent children were excluded from primary education in Lodhran.

It was highlighted by the researches that economic and gender inequalities are the main constraints in achieving the universal primary education and parents play an important role in deciding the career of children (Oxaal, 1997; Lewin, 2009; Chaudhry & Rahman, 2009; Azid & Ejaz, 2010). Other than lower socio-economic status of the parents the parents' attitude was also an important factor of children educational inclusion or exclusion. Saqib and Khan (1998) mentioned that parents' lack of educational interest and gendered attitude are responsible for exclusion of children from basic education. Sattar et al. (2012) also found that gendered attitude of the parents and cultural barriers created hindrance in the education of children in South Punjab, Pakistan. The girls were more excluded from the primary education than the boys in South Punjab (ASER, 2016). Parish and Willis (1993) found that among the sibling the elderly child was excluded in majority of the cases. The elderly girl helped in domestic work and elderly boy started economic contribution to help the family.

Shortage of School facilities was also an important factor. Different reports highlighted that due to structural inequalities the developing areas faced a lot of school deficiencies. Due to the shortage of school facilities parents considered it irrational to send their children in those schools and preferred to enroll their children in the Madras or involve them in earning activities. The deprived areas faced more school deficiencies (non-availability of the schools or more distance, rough roads, lack of public transportation) than urban schools (Arye & Eva, 2004; Lloyd, 2005; Allais, 2007; Hill, 2010; UNESCO, 2010; Farrah, 2013). There was a shortage of educational facilities (pure drinking water, classrooms, blackboards, school wall, doors, playground, lights, fans, electricity shortage of teachers, and shortage of schools in the developing countries (Hayes, 1987; Lloyd, 2007; Zulfiqar, 2019).

The essential missing facilities "over-crowded classrooms, shortage of teachers, lack of educational materials, lack of books, diaries, and modern books" of school were strongly contributing in the exclusion of children from primary education (Zulfiqar, 2019; Hayes, 1987). Habib (2013) also added that there were millions of children excluded from primary education due to the absence of essentials like pure drinking water, toilets and concreted roofs in the schools. Furthermore Memon (2007) also highlighted that untrained staff, fiscal crisis, electricity, weak examination system, library, lack of basic facilities like pure drinking water, laboratory were the responsible factors in the exclusion of children. The rural children faced more educational exclusion due to the non-availability of the schools, more distance from school to home and lack of transportation (Lloyd, 2005; Allais, 2007). Annual Status of Education Report 2015 (2016) also highlighted that the schools of districts of South Punjab were missing the primary facilities like pure drinking water, boundary wall, electricity, light, fans, classes, black boards and even teachers. Punjab examination commission 2015 prepared a report and allocated the rank to districts of Punjab. It was showed that the districts of South Punjab were low in the ranking due to the active and passive exclusion. District Mianwali ranked 21st ; Multan was on 26th Bahawalnagar was on 30th; Lodhran was on 31st; Bahawalpur was on 32nd; Rahim Yar Khan was on 33rd; Muzaffargarh was on 34th; Dera Ghazi Khan was on 35th and Rajanpur was on 36th number (Alif Ailaan and SDPI, 2016). It was also found that other than school facilities the teachers characteristics were also an important factor in the exclusion of the children from universal right of getting education.

The data showed that overall 18.96 percent teachers were untrained in 2019; furthermore it was also highlighted that there were 18.54 percent female and 19.8 percent male teachers were untrained in 2019 (The World Bank, 2020). It was also highlighted by the studies that negative teachers' attributes played a vibrant role in the children exclusion from basic education (Herz and Sperling, 2004; Bennell and Akyeampong, 2007; Baker et al., 2009; Farooq, 2016; Pakistan Education Statistics 2015-16, 2017; Zulfiqar, 2021).

## II. METHODOLOGY:

The researcher selected the Southern Punjab for the current study and furthermore three Bahawalpur,

Dera Ghazi Khan and Multan divisions were selected with the help of multistage random sampling (Punjab Bureau of Statistics, 2016). The researcher set the inclusion criteria of the sample and selected 975 family units in which 5-9 years old children were present. The researcher collected the data from household heads. Interview schedule was used as a tool for data collection because majority of the respondents were illiterate. The data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19. The researcher used the descriptive statistics which included percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviation and inferential statistics.

### III. RESULTS:

**Table Number 1: Demographic Information of the Respondents (n=975)**

Variables	Frequency and Percentage	Variables	Frequency and Percentage
		<b>Parents Information</b>	
<b>Age</b>		Both mother and father are live	573 (58.8)
< 46 Years	607 (62.3)	Father died	123 (12.6)
46-55 Years	346 (35.5)	Mother died	80 (8.2)
Above 55 Years	22 (2.3)	Both mother and father died	199 (20.4)
<b>Total Number of Children</b>			
< 3 Children	287 (29.4)	<b>Occupations of the household Heads</b>	
4-6 Children	529 (54.3)	Laborer	348 (35.7)
7-9 Children	120 (12.3)	Self-employee	338 (34.7)
> 9 Children	39 (4.0)	Private employee	54 (5.5)
<b>Academic Qualification of the household heads</b>		Government employee	76 (7.8)
Uneducated	513 (52.6)	Other	159 (16.3)
Primary	188 (19.3)	<b>Academic Qualification of the Household head Wife</b>	
Secondary	175 (17.9)	Uneducated	679 (69.6)
Higher Secondary and above	99 (10.2)	Primary and Above	296 (30.4)

The results depicted that out of 975 respondents 607 (62.3%) respondents were >46 years old; 346 (35.5%) were between 46-45 and 22 (2.5%) respondents were < 55 years old. Majority 529 (54.3%) of the families' had between 4-6 children. Majority 573 (58.8) of the families' had with both mothers and fathers, whereas there were 199(20.4) families' in which both mothers and fathers were absent. Majority 348 (35.7%) of the respondents were laborer whereas only 76 (7.8%) respondents were government employees. 513 (52.6%) respondents were uneducated and majority 679 (69.6%) of the wives or caring women were also illiterate (Table 1).

**Table: 2 Correlation between parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics**

Variables	M±SD	1	2	3
<b>Negative Parental Attitude</b>	44.40±5.87	1		
<b>School Facilities</b>	66.78±12.76	0.988**	1	
<b>Teacher Characteristics</b>	31.44±8.41	0.986**	0.980**	1

The above table 2 shows results of correlation between negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics. From the results we could conclude that all variables were significantly highly positively correlated with each other.

**Table: 3 Binary Logistic Regression**

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Constant	-75.905	8.035	89.242	1	.000	.000
Negative Parental Attitude	3.137	.382	67.581	1	.000	23.028
School Facilities	-.712	.197	13.002	1	.000	.491
Teacher Characteristics	-.477	.214	4.975	1	.026	.621

The above table 3 showed the results of binary logistic regression of exclusion of children on negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics. The p-values in the table indicated that negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics had significant effect on exclusion of children. So negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics were the main contributing factors in exclusion of children from schools. It was also conclude that as level of negative prenatal attitude increased the exclusion of children form school also increased, similarly as the school facilities increased as a result the exclusion of children from school decreased further more teachers characteristics increases then exclusion of children decreased.

**Table: 4 Mean, Standard Deviation and t- value for the Scores of Negative Parental Attitude between Parents of not Excluded Children (n=375) and Excluded Children (n=600)**

Variable	Children Exclusion	n	Mean	SD	T	P
Negative Parental Attitude	No	375	39.34	5.45	-29.08	0.000***
	Yes	600	47.57	3.38		

(df=973, \*\*\*p<0.001)

The above table showed the score of negative parental attitude among the parents whose children were excluded or not. The results showed that negative parental attitude was significantly different among the parents who excluded children or not.

#### IV. DISCUSSION:

The researcher asked the different questions to the household heads to examine the household characteristics of the respondents; their attitude towards children' education; their satisfaction regarding the school facilities and to know the teachers related issues in South Punjab, Pakistan. Table number 1 showed that the low socio-economic status of the respondents was one of the important educational exclusionary factors of school age children in Southern Punjab. The previous studies also verified the results that there was a strong relationship among the lower socio-economic status of the parents led towards educational exclusion of school age children (Baland & Robinson, 2000; Buchmann, 2000; Khan, 2001; Bass, 2004; Arye & Eva, 2004; Edmonds & Pavcnik, 2005; Kurosaki et al., 2006; Mukherjee & Das, 2008; Huisman & Smits, 2009; Bourdillon et al., 2010; Alif Ailaan, 2016).

Table number 2 depicted that the correlation between negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics were significantly highly correlated with one another with correlation coefficient r=.988 for negative parental attitude and school facilities, r=.986 for negative parental attitude and teacher characteristics and r=.980 for school facilities and teacher characteristics. These factors played a negative role in the enrolment as consistency of the children towards completing the primary education. According to UNICEF (2021) there were 22.8 million 5-16 years old children who did not attend school. It was also highlighted that Pakistan was the 2<sup>nd</sup> worst country regarding the educational exclusion of school age children. It was further identified that 3.6 million boys and 2.8 million girls at the lower secondary level.

The above table 3 showed the results of binary logistic regression of exclusion of children on negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics. The p-values in the table indicated that negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics had significant effect on exclusion of children with regression coefficients 3.137 for negative parental attitude. The previous studies also showed a strong relationship between the negative parental attitude and educational exclusion of the school age children (Oxaal, 1997; Lewin, 2009; Chaudhry & Rahman, 2009; Azid & Ejaz, 2010; ASER,

2016). The p-values in the table indicated that -.712 for school facilities. It was important to mention that the previous literature also highlighted the strong association between the shortage of school facilities and educational exclusion of school age children. The rural areas face more school deficiencies (non-availability of the schools or more distance, rough roads, lack of public transportation) than urban areas (Arye & Eva, 2004; Lloyd, 2005; Allais, 2007; Hill, 2010; UNESCO, 2010; Farrah, 2013, Zulfiqar, 2019). There was a shortage of educational facilities (pure drinking water, classrooms, blackboards, school wall, doors, playground, lights, fans, electricity shortage of teachers, and shortage of schools in the developing countries (Hayes, 1987; Lloyd, 2007; Zulfiqar, 2020).

The p-values in the table indicated that -.417 for teachers characteristics were with p-values .000, .000, and .026 respectively. The data exhibited that there were 18.96 percent inexpert teachers; 18.54 percent lady teachers were inexpert; 19.8 percent male teachers were inexpert in primary education in 2019 (The World Bank, 2020). It was highlighted that 1.9 million vacant posts were obligatory in primary level schools in 2015 (Education for All, 2010).

Due to shortage of teachers the teaching burden increase and it decreased the quality of education (Nestvogel, 1995; Saleem, 2002; Khalid, 1998; Saeed, 2013; Ahmad et al., 2013). Hayes (1987); Khan (2010) and ASER (2015) also recognized that lack of teachers was one of the one chief reason of children exclusion. Rana et al. (2003) found many issues challenged by primary schools that were similar with the above mentioned issues. Other studies also highlighted that negative teachers' attributes compelled the parents to keep away their children from education (Herz and Sperling, 2004; Bennell and Akyeamong, 2007; Baker et al., 2009; Farooq, 2016; Pakistan Education Statistics 2015-16, 2017; Zulfiqar, 2021).

So negative parental attitude, school facilities and teacher characteristics are the main contributing factors in exclusion of children from school. It is also conclude that 1 unit change in the level of negative prenatal attitude will positively change 3.137 in the exclusion of children form school similarly 1 unit change in the level of the school facilities will bring .712 negative change in the exclusion of children from school furthermore 1 unit change in the level of teachers characteristics will bring .417 negative change in the level of the exclusion of children from school.

Table number 4 results depicted that the average score of negative parental attitude of the parents whose children were not excluded was  $\bar{x} = 39.34$  while the average score of negative parental attitude of the parents whose children were excluded was  $\bar{x} = 47.57$  and the results were significant P value (0.000).

## V. CONCLUSION:

It could be concluded that poor socio-economic background of parents, negative parental attitude towards children education (gendered attitude, dogmatic beliefs, lack of importance and lack of ambitions related with children education), poor school facilities (pure drinking water, fans, school gate, light, playground, washrooms etc.) and teachers related concerns (lack of teachers especially female teachers, biased teachers attitude, prejudice attitude, abusive language used by teachers, corporal punishment, irregularity etc.) were the core issues of children exclusion.

## VI. SUGGESTIONS:

Educational awareness campaigns should start at union council level in which parents should sensitize towards children education and built unbiased attitude towards sons and daughters education.

The government of Pakistan should increase educational budget, remove the schools related deficiencies.

The government should have to hire new teachers on urgent basis and give them training for achieving the national and international educational targets.

## REFERENCES:

1. Alif Ailaan and SDPI. (2016). Pakistan District Education Rankings 2016. Islamabad: Alif Ailaan. vi-109 pp.
2. Allais, F. B. (2007). "Children's Work in Angola: An Overview." Understanding Children's Work Project Working Paper Series, December
3. Allais, F. B. (2007). "Children's Work in Angola: An Overview." Understanding Children's Work Project Working Paper Series, December
4. Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) (2015). Lahore, Pakistan.
5. Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) 2015. (2016). Lahore, Pakistan.

6. Arye L. Hillman & Eva Jenkner (2004). **Educating Children in Poor Countries**. International Monetary Fund
7. Azid, T., & Ejaz Ali Khan, R. (2010). Who are the children going to school in Urban Punjab (Pakistan)? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 37(6), 442-465.
8. Bass, L. E. (2004). *Child labor in sub-Saharan Africa*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
9. Bourdillon, M. F., Levison, D., White, B., & Myers, W. (2010). *Rights and wrongs of children's work*. Rutgers university press.
10. Buchmann, C. (2000), "Family structure, parental perceptions, and child labor in Kenya: what factors determine who is enroll in school?", *Social Forces*, Vol. 78 No. 4, pp. 1349-1378.
11. Chaudhry, I. S., & Rahman, S. (2009). The Impact of Gender Inequality in Education on Rural Poverty in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*. p.174,pp.174-188.
12. Habib, M. (2013). Education in Pakistan's Punjab: Outcomes and interventions. *The Lahore Journal of Economics, Pakistan*
13. Hayes, D. L. (1987). *The Crises of Education in Pakistan*, Vanguard Book, Ltd, Lahore, Pakistan.
14. Hill, M. (2010). No redress: Somalia's forgotten minorities: Retrieved from <http://www.minorityRights.org/10370/reports/no-redress-somaliasforgotten-minorities.html>.
15. [https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.PRSL.FE.ZS?locations=PK&name\\_desc=true](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.PRSL.FE.ZS?locations=PK&name_desc=true)
16. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/issues/issues33/>
17. Huisman, J., & Smits, J. (2009). Effects of household-and district-level factors on primary school enrollment in 30 developing countries. *World development*, 37(1), 179-193.
18. Kurosaki, T., Ito, S., Fuwa, N., Kubo, K., & Sawada, Y. (2006). Child labor and school enrollment in rural India: Whose education matters?. *The Developing Economies*, 44(4), 440-464
19. Lewin, K. M. (2009). Access to Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Patterns, Problems and Possibilities. *Comparative Education*, 45(2), p.151. pp. 151-174.
20. Lloyd, C. B. (ed.) (2005). *Growing Up Global: The Changing Transitions to Adulthood in Developing Countries*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press (Chapter 3).
21. Lloyd, C. B. (ed.) (2005). *Growing Up Global: The Changing Transitions to Adulthood in Developing Countries*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press (Chapter 3).
22. Memon, G. R. (2007). Education in Pakistan: The key issues, problems and the new challenges. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 47-55.
23. Mukherjee, D., & Das, S. (2008). Role of parental education in schooling and child labour decision: Urban India in the last decade. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(2), 305-322.
24. National Education Management Information System, *Pakistan Education Statistics 2015-16 (2017)*. Islamabad, Government of Pakistan.
25. Oxaal, Z. (1997). *Education and Poverty: A gender Analysis*. Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, England.
26. Parish, W. L., & Willis, R. J. (1993). Daughters, education, and family budgets Taiwan experiences. *Journal of Human Resources*, 863-898.
27. Retrieved on: 19 February, 2021 <https://www.unicef.org/pakistan/education>
28. Sattar, T. (2012). A sociological analysis of stumbling blocks infrastructure of education sector: A case of affiliated schools from board of intermediate and secondary education of Multan district (Pakistan). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 96-110.
29. The World Bank (2020). UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
30. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). (2018). "One in Five Children, Adolescents and Youth is Out of School." UIS fact sheet No. 48. Montreal: UIS.
31. UNICEF. (2021). *Education for Every Child*, Islamabad, Pakistan
32. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2010). *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the Marginalized*. UNESCO Publishing, Paris, France.
33. Zulfiqar, Z., Batool, Z., & Imran, M. (2021). Nexuses between Teachers Attributes and Children Exclusion: A Study of Southern Punjab, Pakistan. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)* 9 (3), 121-129.
34. Zulfiqar, Z., Shabbir, M., & Imran, M. (2020). Missing Facilities of Schools and Educational Exclusion of Children: A Study of Southern Punjab, Pakistan. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)* 8 (9), 187-194.