

Rethinking Assessments in Schools

DISHA NAWANI

This article examines the nature of two varied forms of assessments like the continuous comprehensive evaluation and end-of-the-year exams, studies the variations in the principles underlying them and presents a case for an assessment that is more suited to the varied contexts, needs and educational levels of a large majority of Indian children.

Since “assessment reforms” have taken centre stage in the Indian education system, it is important to understand some critical concerns being raised in the debate between the *pedagogic efficiency* of a traditional one-off, end-of-the-term examination (exemplified in its most extreme and celebrated form in the board exams) and the *reformatory, non-threatening and comprehensive* school-based, teacher-guided form of assessment (clubbed under the banner of “continuous and comprehensive evaluation” or CCE). While theoretically these two forms of assessment are positioned as being mutually exclusive, in practice it may not be entirely possible to separate their form, nature and purpose in an either-or manner. However, it is also important to understand the fundamental differences in the way they have been conceptualised and not confuse issues of their implementation with the inherent nature of their design and purpose. This article, therefore, attempts to examine the nature of these two varied forms of assessments, study the variations in the principles underlying them, examine the validity of assumptions on which they are based (given above in italics) and present a case for an assessment which is perhaps more suited to the varied contexts, needs and educational levels of a large majority of Indian children.

1 Assessment as Commonly Understood

Assessment is an integral part of any education system. Equally important as the curriculum, syllabus and its pedagogic transaction, is a system to gauge whether “what was intended”, i.e., educational objectives, is achieved and whether the manner in which it was “conceptualised and transacted”, i.e.,

syllabus, teaching-learning resources and pedagogic experiences, were effective in achieving those objectives (Tyler 1949). It is possible that in the light of assessment evidence collected, either those “learning or educational” objectives are revisited or the pedagogic experiences redesigned. However, in practice, learning objectives once decided are rarely ever modified, at least within the course of an academic year. The pedagogic techniques are also not altered. The attempt most often is to assume the sanctity of those objectives and approaches and locate the reasons for their non-fulfilment to the unpreparedness or unwillingness on part of the students to learn. The parental backgrounds and cultural contexts of students, especially from the socially disadvantaged backgrounds, are often held responsible for those who do not succeed. While the learning environments and experiences may vary across children depending on their sociocultural and economic locations, assessment in most school systems treats everyone at par. The nature of questions, responses expected and conditions under which assessment takes place are uniform for all the students. Once assessed and judged, the responsibility for performance rests entirely with the student. The form, nature or even timing of that assessment is rarely ever questioned as it stands opposed to anything to do with the student (learning styles, learning approaches, sociocultural-economic backgrounds or even health/mental frame of the student at the time of assessment) who is merely an “object” to be tested.

1.1 Reflection of a Colonial Past

The present school examination system in India which celebrates uniformity, objectivity, reliability and most importantly, the impersonal nature of assessment methods has its roots in a colonial context. The colonial system in India replaced an indigenous curriculum, flexibly-paced pedagogy and teacher-guided evaluation of students’ learning with an alien (western culture and English language) curriculum, time-bound

Discussions with Suresh K Reddy helped me retain my focus and sharpen my arguments. I also acknowledge that some of the ideas used in this article emerged from my informal discussions with Nargis Panchapakesan.

Disha Nawani (dishanawani@yahoo.com) is with the School of Education, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Deonar, Mumbai.

completion of syllabus and an external, impersonal examination system (Kumar 2005). While the official function of such a bureaucratic, centralised system of assessment was to evolve uniform standards of promotion, scholarships and employment (Shukla 1978 cited in Kumar), it served a far greater social purpose, i e, of presenting the public image of colonial rule as being just and impartial. There was little legitimacy awarded to the agency of the learner since what was taught and assessed was essentially memorisation of prescribed textbook content – none of which was even remotely connected to the child's world (Kumar 2005). The system of “impersonal-objective” assessment continued to be valued over a “personal-subjective assessment” even after India gained independence. An assessment which is formal and objective makes little concession to individual differences among learners, places uniform expectations on everyone, and awards success and penalises failure is one which is regarded as a more valid way of assessing students' learning over other relatively less formal and subjective ways of assessment. This assessment framework and results derived thus acquire a unique sanctity which nullifies the identities of both the teacher and the student and regards “sameness of treatment” and “remoteness of the examiner from the learner assessed” as being central to successful evaluation of learning.

2 Reforms Initiated

The past decade has witnessed some important developments in the area of school education in India, most important of which is the enactment of the historic Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE) in 2009 which gave elementary education the status of a fundamental right. Prior to this, the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) was reconstituted in 2005 by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), a curricular framework which legitimised the local knowledge of the child, underscored the need to relate the world of school with the world of the child and reiterated the agency of the learner to

construct knowledge. A few states also prepared their respective State Curriculum Frameworks (SCF) and both NCERT and a few State Councils of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) developed new/revised textbooks in the light of the new curricular framework. The NCF 2005 which had its roots in the “Learning without Burden” report (1993) had aptly located the load of students' learning on “incomprehensibility, where a lot was taught but little was learnt or understood” and observed that in such a system, “a child could even pass any examination without any understanding of the phenomena he or she had been told about in the books or in the classroom”. Therefore, besides several other curricular, pedagogic, infrastructure and teacher-related measures, both the NCF 2005 and RTE, 2009 proposed meaningful shifts in the assessment system.

Specifically with regard to assessment, the RTE, 2009 mandated:

- (i) No child admitted in a school shall be held back in any class or expelled from school till completion of elementary education.
- (ii) Continuous and comprehensive evaluation of a child's understanding of knowledge and his or her ability to apply the same.
- (iii) No child shall be required to pass any board examination till completion of elementary education.

These measures as opposed to the traditional policy of failing children and detaining them in the same class and conducting end-of-the-academic term examinations lie at the heart of assessment-related controversy presently brewing in the country. The subsections further down present an elaboration of these provisions, including challenges associated with their use.

2.1 No-Detention Provision

The no-detention provision (NDP) is not new and existed at various levels (Standards I-II, I-V, I-VII) in 28 states even before the passing of the RTE Act. Some states had a few conditions like minimum attendance, etc, attached to it. The rationale behind this provision is that by creating a non-threatening teaching-learning-assessment environment in

school, it essentially responds to the needs of the socially-economically and culturally disadvantaged child, who struggles to come to school and strives even harder to stay on in school. On failing and being detained in the same class, such a child faces humiliation, gets demotivated and often drops out of the school system. In an effort to universalise elementary education and minimise dropout rates, this provision was therefore made mandatory in the RTE. The Act also recognises the importance of addressing the conceptual lags of children promoted under this policy and the need for additional support to them beyond classroom hours. However, it is not difficult to imagine the inability of the already burdened schoolteacher teaching children who have little or no support at home to find additional time to perform these additional roles. Parents across a few states expressed¹ their discontent with this policy. According to them, it did not serve any useful purpose as it disguised the children's lack of learning and unconditionally promoted them, despite the fact that they were not adequately prepared/suited for higher grades.

While the concern over such parental anguish cannot be ignored, the cause of children's non-learning cannot be unilaterally attributed to this provision alone. It is important to understand that exams may perhaps test learning but need not ensure learning. For learning to happen, besides valid measures of assessment it is imperative that schools function properly, have a nurturant pedagogic environment, adequate infrastructural facilities, meaningful and contextual teaching-learning materials and, most importantly, competent, qualified and responsible teachers.

2.2 End-of-Year Exams

The end-of-the-year examination treats assessment as one mega event, placed either at the end or positioned strategically at middle/quarter of the academic year. Its purpose is to evaluate the extent of student learning which has taken place during the year. Performance at this exam and that too within a fixed time frame is crucial and there are awards (prizes, scholarships, promotion

to the next class, admissions to a course and some schools even have a different uniform or a symbol to separate such achievers from non-achievers) and punitive measures (retention in the same class, removal from school, etc) associated with individual performance. In such a system, secrecy in setting question papers, objectivity of questions and impersonality in conducting exams and evaluation of results are extremely important.

The assumptions underlying such a system are that evaluation ensures learning, instils a certain seriousness in students, makes teachers accountable, and, therefore, more responsible, is an impartial measure of a student's ability and effort, and a fair criteria for allotting/withdrawing rewards.

The central principles around which such an assessment revolves is that there is a definite meaning attached to learning, which can be manifested in concrete ways: if the student has learnt during the course of the year, which she should have, then she should be able to demonstrate that learning in the manner expected and, that the performance in such an assessment should be rewarded in substantial ways and vice versa.

This kind of a written examination system has been subject to intense critique in various Government of India reports (1966, 1986, 1991, 1992, 1993). The specific problems associated with this form of assessment are that they create enormous stress for students; mostly test students' ability to rote memorise but fail to test higher order skills; are inflexible as they are based on a "one size fits all" principle; make no allowance for different types of learners and learning environments; and do not serve the needs of social justice (MHRD 2006).

Since end-term examination is often a single large event influencing the life and career of a student, it acquires disproportionate weightage in a student's life, showing no grace or mercy to the erring student. Even a mild cough can jeopardise the performance of a student and the ruthlessness and enormity of such an exam puts inordinate pressure on students. While schools in India exist within a hugely differentiated framework

and there are children who learn in sub-minimal learning environments, the examination system treats them equally and has similar expectations from all. The neutrality of such examinations in fact is the biggest source of their iniquitous and unfair nature. Under such circumstances, a student's success and failure is often individualised. Celebrating individual success stories of poor children studying in challenging circumstances are often highlighted, conveying a message to several disadvantaged children like them that, "if they can do well, why cannot the others"? This conveniently shifts the blame from the system to the individual learner.

All these problems become manifold in the case of board examinations on account of the huge value attached to them, the large portions of syllabi to be covered, the urgency to study all the subjects at the same time and lack of disclosure and transparency in grades and marks allotted. The National Focus Group's position paper on examination reforms (2006) proposed several meaningful recommendations. Some of them were to introduce varied modes of assessment, including oral testing and group mode evaluation, differential testing in different subjects for students studying at different levels, on-demand exams depending on the candidate's convenience rather than the system's, reporting of relative performance, etc. While most of them remained on paper, the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) in 2011 made the Class 10 board examination optional² for those students who wanted to continue studying in the same school. While this was hailed by some as a progressive measure, it also invited scepticism from several quarters.³

2.3 School-Based CCE

The idea of CCE mentioned in the RTE, 2009 is not new but found mention in several commission reports and policies much before it took formal shape in this Act. "Continuity" in examination was supposed to ward off the evils of a singular exam on which hinged a child's future and "comprehensiveness" sought to give legitimacy to developing and

assessing the overall personality of a student. The idea was to reinstate faith in the agency of the teacher to assess her students on a regular basis using multiple modes of assessment and achieve the purpose of assessment which is to provide the student with timely and requisite support.

CCE is being proposed as a panacea for the ills associated with the traditional system of year-end examinations. It assumes that teacher knows all her students well; keeps track of their progress; knows the learning challenges faced by them and is competent (after receiving training) to provide them with adequate support. There is also the assumption that in a non-threatening "teaching-learning-assessment" environment, the learner would be driven much more by intrinsic motivation than the pressure of exams.

The central principle of this kind of assessment is that assessment is not separate from learning but is an integral part of the teaching-learning process and rather than merely "testing" the outcome of learning to reward or punish the child, the result should feed into improving his learning.

It must be noted that CCE is an umbrella term, encapsulating some of the features listed above. There is no uniform model of CCE in the country. The NCERT, CBSE and the different states – some with the help of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and others with the help of private organisations and individuals – have evolved their own models of CCE. Besides several problems with these varied conceptualisations (Nawani 2013), CCE is grappling with multiple challenges at the level of implementation. While teachers are being given some basic training in most states, there is still a lot of fuzziness around what and how children are to be assessed and the way in which these results are to be used for their further growth. Contrary to empowering the teacher, in most cases, CCE is being imposed on teachers from above like a diktat and they are made to attend a series of trainings. Teachers have also complained of CCE adding to their woes of maintaining registers, filling up assessment formats, tracking

students' growth, collecting evidence and writing detailed descriptive portfolios, etc. In some cases, CCE has also got translated into a project-making racket, with parents either buying ready-made projects from the market or children spending their time working on mindless projects. Some teachers complain that as a result of CCE, the focus has now shifted from teaching to maintaining assessment-related records. A few of them also point out that now they feel pressurised to project an enhanced progress of the students over the course of the year to ensure that their own performance appraisal does not get adversely affected. While students from a few private elite schools complain that their teachers suddenly acquired a lot of power, teachers from government schools complain that the children had become carefree and lackadaisical towards their learning.⁴

3 Examining RTE Provisions

With several states voicing their discontent with assessment-related reforms introduced in the RTE and the challenges faced by their schools, the Ministry of Human Resource Development in 2012 set up the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE)⁵ sub-committee to examine "Assessment and Implementation of CCE in the Context of the No-Detention Provision of the RTE 2009". It was chaired by Geeta Bhukkal, former education minister of Haryana.

Besides examining the existing literature on implications of non-detention and detention of students on their learning, the committee collected first-hand information from important stakeholders. It administered questionnaires to several states, incorporating questions for parents, teachers and the administrative staff. Thirteen states filled in the questionnaires while 12 others submitted separate reports sharing their experiences and voicing their concerns with regard to these provisions. In addition the committee also visited schools in several states and held meetings with teachers, students, parents and other community members.

Two central concerns that informed this committee's analysis of the provisions under study were (i) declining learning

level outcomes (LLO) of government schoolchildren, and (ii) migration of children from government schools to private schools as reported by the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER). The ASER clearly points out that the NDP in the public schools has proved to be a major deterrent in providing meaningful support to children in their education. This is because of the commonly misunderstood interpretation of the NDP as implying absence of assessment. It also points out that the CCE is also being misconstrued by schools in two diametrically opposite ways – either there shall be no examination and all children will pass till Class 7 or there shall be continuous examinations to constantly test the child's knowledge at shorter frequencies. While the first situation leads to a carefree attitude among both students and teachers, the second one creates far greater stress and anxiety among them. The committee also asserted that the popular perception among most teachers, parents and administrators of government schools is that both these provisions have jointly played havoc with the child's actual learning in school. Since the annual exam system was a well-understood one even by parents where the declaration of results certified a child's progress to the next level, this new scheme of assessment and unconditional promotion of the child to the next level is a little ambiguous and puts responsibility neither on the child to learn nor on the teacher to ensure that the child learns.

The root causes identified by the committee for declining learning levels of children are:

(i) No Detention Equals No Assessments: "Most schools have misunderstood the NDP to mean 'no assessments' or 'no relevance of assessment'. Since the child gets promoted irrespective of performance at the exams, the assessment loses its significance in the eyes of the child, teacher and parents since they assume that 'you cannot improve what you do not measure'."

(ii) No Detention Demotivates Students and Teachers: "With disengagement and

limited family capacity of a large number of government schoolchildren, NDP further exacerbates the motivation challenge of students as well as teachers. Since the message that gets spread around is that 'performance does not matter', it adversely affects the drive to excel and perform."

(iii) No Detention Reduces Teacher Accountability: "In spite of significant pay scale increases in the government sector across the country, teachers are not held accountable for student performance. No-detention has led to reduced accountability among teachers, especially at primary and upper primary levels."

(iv) No Detention Increases Multi-level Classrooms: "The NDP aggravates the multi-level environments in the classroom and current pedagogical practices, content of teacher-education and teachers' skill set, pupil-teacher-ratio, teaching-learning-materials and infrastructure do not sufficiently address the challenges thrown by such environments."

(v) No Detention Increases Teachers' Burden: "The challenges faced by teachers inside the classroom increase due to NDP and CCE. Already, teachers in government schools face a daunting challenge of ensuring learning by students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds, and by those who are first generation learners. NDP increases the number of such children at every grade, even though they are not learning commensurately, thus complicating teachers' tasks."

(vi) Ensure Systemic Support before Implementing NDP: "NDP is implementable in an ideal system-optimal resources at every level (sufficient number of teachers), seamless processes (CCE) and a supportive ecosystem (engaged parents/community who ensure full attendance of children and also drive and support students towards academic excellence)."

Let us now try and understand the assertions made by the committee and examine their implications. If NDP is being misunderstood to mean "no assessments" then clearly it is a misconception

that needs to be corrected. The objective behind this provision is to remove the fear of failure from those students' minds that are most likely to fail and leave the system. This is achieved by delinking promotion to next grade from the students' results. If it is being felt that this delinking has led to a lackadaisical attitude towards learning on the part of both teachers and students, then there is a clear problem with the kind of learning one is trying to promote and the reasons for which one is in school. Moreover, this provision neither de-emphasises learning nor assessments, it simply allows the potential dropout to stay a little longer in school than he otherwise would. Respecting the dignity of the learner, this provision does not penalise the learner for failing. However, it cannot be denied that the possibility of cumulative conceptual gaps in learning is probably higher in situations of non-detention and therefore, need to be addressed with greater urgency and responsibility.

On the one hand, a claim is made that government schools largely cater to children, whose parents "withdraw their children on a particular day at slightest cause" and where children have "limited support in terms of allocation of time for studying or guidance for homework". On the other hand, it says that NDP has a negative impact on their motivation to attend school and do well. It is difficult to imagine how a detention policy will motivate these children to strive to perform well if they are both irregular in attending school and constrained in getting parental support. The NDP on the contrary tries to make the school less threatening for these very children, who are likely to fail and leave never to return.

While teachers need to perhaps be held accountable for children's learning, it also needs to be recognised that there is no simple unilateral relationship between teachers' accountability and children's learning. Teachers need to be supported to spend maximum time inside the classrooms with students rather than being made to shoulder non-school-related administrative responsibilities outside the classroom or even outside the school. Conditions of distrust where

teachers' salaries/service conditions are linked directly to students' performance may also possibly lead to teachers adopting unscrupulous and unfair practices. Random inspections by education officials and sometimes by ministers and dismissal of teachers in cases of their students' inability to give appropriate answers to questions asked further aggravate the fear psychosis among teachers.

Multigrade environments exist not only because of NDP but because of shortage of teachers, inadequate number of students in schools and varying needs and support available to children either at home or in school. NDP does not by itself promote under-learning. It hinders the failing and incessant detention of children. In any case, even if "failing" children were detained and held back, besides being demotivated they would still continue to struggle in the same class unless substantial need-based support is provided to them.

The last point is like the classic chicken and egg syndrome. There is no denying that meaningful reforms cannot be seen in isolation and need several other processes to be in place, but then does it also mean that all such measures should be thwarted/postponed till every single variable in the education system is in order? The RTE in fact reiterates the need for several other rights-based provisions – school infrastructure, minimum qualifications for teachers, an appropriate pupil-teacher ratio, no non-academic activity for teachers, child-friendly curriculum, CCE and teacher training education, etc, which need to be initiated simultaneously.

Interestingly, the report also mentions that there is no research evidence to prove that detention helps in learning and points out a few research studies (Brimer and Pauli 1971; Education for All-Status and Trends 1998; Hammond et al 1994) which show that detention in fact negates learning and retention. Despite this the report in its recommendations⁶ takes a view against non-detention of children and recommends implementation of the provision in a phased manner. It recommends a system of state-wise assessment at Classes 3, 5 and 8 with no detention up to Class 5, provisional

promotion after Class 5 and detention after Class 8. The other suggestions are: measuring LLOs on a regular basis, catalysing a performance-driven culture, introducing pedagogical interventions that support NDP and changing the stakeholders' mindset and preparing them for new provisions.

There are three central assumptions that the report makes with regard to learning, role of teachers and motivation of students.

(i) There is no learning without assessment. (ii) motivation (on the part of children) to learn is largely driven by external variables, (iii) government schoolteachers do not bother about their students' learning, unless they are held accountable for it.

Summing Up

These assumptions are reflected in its analysis and unless some systematic longitudinal research supports them, there is little reason to believe in their validity. The tone of the report willy-nilly locates the blame for not learning either on the background of students studying in government schools or the lack of accountability on the part of teachers. The committee in its analysis splits the debate into two camps – academicians (who are pro-reforms) and practitioners (who draw our attention to challenges in implementing them). What is more important than dismissing the claims of either group is to evolve policies which are informed by both – perspectives of academics and challenges encountered by field-level practitioners.

Both CCE and NDP despite facing severe and real challenges are based on sound principles, which need to be recognised and supported rather than being dismissed in haste. To hold the child responsible for not attending the school regularly when the school in question does not inspire the child in any manner and detaining him for "not knowing adequately enough" when the system is probably at fault in delivering, may not be an appropriate solution for the malaise. For by blaming the child or the teacher alone, one personalises a structural malaise and shifts the onus entirely on them to perform. It is more important

to create a system which supports teachers to teach and students to learn rather than create a system based on fear of chastisement. Besides the fact that there is no research evidence to show that detention enables learning or any comparative study on learning achievements before and after no detention, three years is a short time to judge policy implications.

In the light of the above provisions it is also perhaps important to review the learning expectations that schools and society at large impose on all its students. While the ideas of “relevant” and “need-based curriculum” often get reduced to a watered-down curriculum, it is important to recognise that children may have varied interests in different subjects and may opt to study a less demanding curriculum in a particular subject and an advanced curriculum in another subject. This will neither lead to labelling nor placing uniform demands on all children to study the same curriculum in all subjects and be under stress to pass/perform well in all of them. While it is important that one reimagines learning, develops child-centred resources and also reconceptualises assessment and its implications, it is equally important to give that flexibility of choice to students relatively early in life. It is also possible that this kind of learning will not be pushed by fear of failing/underperforming in assessment but will be internally driven. It may perhaps make the task of teachers less stressful as well. Like similar such provisions in RTE, this will also reach out to the child, who may not necessarily be competent to handle equal curricular demands in all the subjects and will make learning more meaningful and less threatening/fear-induced. Needless to say there will be more roadblocks but rather than getting disillusioned by the probable challenges, it may be worthwhile to try ideas which respect the individuality and dignity of the child and facilitate school attendance, retention and most importantly, learning.

NOTES

- 1 Interactions with parents in Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan as part of CCE related studies that I have been engaged with.

- 2 Besides enacting the RtE, 2009, the decision to make Class 10 board exams optional and replacing it with CCE was one of the major changes effected by the previous United Progressive Alliance government.
- 3 This measure has received flak and a few national newspapers recently reported a few CBSE toppers meeting the Minister for HRD, expressing their grievances and requesting her to reintroduce the board exams as the CCE did not prepare them adequately for Class 12 board exams and prestigious engineering and medical exams.
- 4 As stated above, I have been researching on CCE for sometime now and during the course of my work have had detailed discussions with students and teachers teaching in both government and private schools. Insights in this section have been drawn from those interactions.
- 5 CABE is the highest decision-making body of education in the country.
- 6 Two members of the committee voiced their dissent with the committee's recommendations.
- (1986): *National Policy on Education* (New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education).
- (1991): *Report of the Committee for Review of NPE: Towards an Enlightened and Humane Society* (New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education).
- (1992): *Programme of Action* (New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education).
- (1993): *Learning without Burden, Report of the National Advisory Committee Appointed by the Ministry Human Resource Development* (New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education).
- (2009): “The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009”, Ministry of Law & Justice, New Delhi.
- Hammond-Linda Darling, A Lieberman, D Wood and B Falk (1994): *Transforming School Reform: Policies and Practices for Democratic Schools* (New York: NCREST Reprint Series, Columbia University).
- Kumar, K (2005 revised edition): *Political Agenda of Education: A Study of Colonialist and Nationalist Ideas* (New Delhi: Sage Publications).
- MHRD (2006): *Position Paper, National Focus Group on Examination Reforms* (New Delhi: NCERT).
- (2014): *Report of CABE Sub-committee on Assessment and Implementation of CCE and NDP (under the RtE Act, 2009)* (New Delhi: MHRD).
- Nawani, D (2013): “Continuously and Comprehensively Evaluating Children”, *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol XLVIII, 12 January, 33-40.
- Shukla, S (1978): “Education, Economy and Social Structure in British India”, *Varanasi National Journal of Education*, 1 (1 and 2): 70-80, 112-25.
- Tyler, R (1949): *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

REFERENCES

- Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) (2012)* (New Delhi: Pratham Resource Centre).
- Brimer, M A and L Pauli (1971): *Wastage in Education: A World Problem* (Switzerland: UNESCO).
- Education for All-Status and Trends (1998): *The UNESCO Wasted Opportunities: When Schools Fail Repetition and Drop-out in Primary Schools* (France: UNESCO).
- Government of India (1966): *Report of the Education Commission (1964-66): Educational and National Development* (New Delhi: Ministry of Education).

Economic & Political WEEKLY

Review of Women's Studies

April 26, 2014

Gender in Contemporary Kerala	– J Devika
Becoming Society: An Interview with Seleena Prakkanam	– J Devika
Struggling against Gendered Precarity in Kathikudam, Kerala	– Parvathy Binoy
Attukal Pongala: Youth Clubs, Neighbourhood: Performance of Religiosity	– Darshana Sreedhar
You Are Woman: Arguments with Normative Femininities in Recent Malayalam Cinema	– Aneeta Rajendran
Shifting Paradigms: Gender and Sexuality Debates in Kerala	– Muralreedharan Tharayil
Child Marriage in Late Travancore: Religion, Modernity and Change	– Anna Lindberg
Home-Based Work and Issues of Gender and Space	– Neethi P

For copies write to:

Circulation Manager,

Economic and Political Weekly,

320-321, A to Z Industrial Estate, Ganpatrao Kadam Marg,

Lower Parel,

Mumbai 400 013.

email: circulation@epw.in