PD-AAA-150-A1

BR
372.981
S797f

512-037
01 (13) U

DROPOUT AND REPETITION IN BRAZILIAN PRIMARY EDUCATION

Project SUNY-AID/la-365

Study Number 1

Factors Affecting Dropout and Repetition in Brazilian Primary Education as Determined by a Sampling of 1965 Federal Data by School in Three States

Report Prepared by:

Harry R. White

Project Research Specialist

June, 1968

PREFACE

The study here reported was the first in a series of studies done as part of the work of a joint U.S.-Brazilian Team for Technical Assistance to Primary Education (EATEP) while in Brazil January 1966 to January 1968. The U.S. technicians were supplied by the State University of New York through a contract between the Research Foundation of the State University of New York and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The Brazilian counterpart technicians were supplied by the Brazilian National Institute for Pedagogical Studies (INEP). The project functioned as part of the work of INEP under the directorship of Dr. Carlos Correa Mascaro.

Members of the U.S. team were Frank T. Lano, Chief of Party, Edith Berner, Hall s Jackim, Harold J. Keeler, Charles S. Turner, and Harry R. White. The project was programmed by USAID through the Human Resources Office directed by Rosson L. Cardwell. Dr. Monroe D. Cohen of HRO was USAID Coordinator of the Project.

Members of the Brazilian counterpart team were Lyra Paixão, Chief of Party, Diva Moura Diniz Costa, Maria Yvonne A. De Araújo, Norma Cunha Osório, Wilson Hudson Pinto, and Zenaide Cardoso Schultz. The study here reported was designed by Harry White with Zenaide Schultz making arrangements for data to be made available and Wilson Pinto assisting in the transposition of federal data onto EATEP forms.

Thanks are due Dr. João Torres Jatobá and his assistant Dr. Ney of the Statistical Service of Education and Culture (SEEC) for making available the 1965 federal data. Dr. Howard Leavitt, HRO research specialist, gave invaluable advice and encouragement. Dr. Rudolfo Ullmann and his staff of Pontificial Catholic University (PUC) processed the collected data. Thanks are due also to all the others unmentioned here who gave of their time and efforts to realize this study.

HRW

HYPOTHESES

Factors affecting dropout and repetition in Brazilian primary education were grouped into six categories: pupil, teacher, curriculum, materials, time, and space. These six categories produced the following general hypothesis: Dropout and repetition in Brazilian primary education vary with: (1) the readiness of the pupil to learn, (2) the preparation of the teacher to teach, (3) the appropriateness of the curriculum to the pupils, (4) the availability of materials for instructional purposes, (5) the time available for instruction, and (6) the space available for instruction (see the Annual Report of the Project).

To test this general hypothesis information was taken from Ministry of Education Form SEP-01/1965. The information on this form was reported by school and did not make reference to individual pupils within the school. The information available on the form did not include items needed for a thorough testing of the general hypothesis. It was necessary for us to design other studies to collect this information (see subsequent reports). From this form we found eight items of information about the schools of interest to our investigation: (1) responsible authority, (2) location, (3) number of shifts, (4) number of classrooms, (5) number of teachers, (6) number of qualified teachers, (7) enrollment at the end of the year, and (8) number of students promoted at the end of the year.

Form SEP-01/1965 did not provide us with direct information about dropout and repetition. However, having enrollment at the end

of the year and the number of students promoted at the end of the year, we were able to determine promotion rates. We then used our other items of information to ascertain promotion rates in various types of schools: state/county/private; rural/urban; one shift/ two shift/ three shift/ four shift; one-room/ more-than-one-room; and school with various percentages of qualified teachers. In all cases we assumed no difference until our data showed otherwise (null hypothesis).

METHOD

After constructing a data collection form, we obtained permission from Dr. João Jatobá, Director of Statistical Service of Education and Culture (SEEC) to extract data from Form SEP-01/1965. We shuffled the card-sized forms for the state of Rio Grande do Sul and drew a 20% sample (every fifth card). We found that this resulted in a large number of one-room schools (1,890) and a smaller number of more-than-one-room schools (835). Since we wanted to get about an even number of one-room and more-than-one-room schools, we decided in the case of Espirito Santo and Pernambuco to take only a 10% sample of one-room schools but continue to take a 20% sample of more-than-one-room schools. From what we regarded as reliable advice we were assured that a 10% sample of one-room schools would be valid. Indeed, our own study of the characteristics of these schools from our Rio Grande do Sul data revealed a monotonous sameness.

On the same basis a larger sample of the more-than-one-room schools seemed needed in that the school-to-school variation was larger. Dr. Jatobá's procedures in regard to sample size served as a guide. Once collected, the data and analysis tables (Appendix) were presented to three contractors for bids on processing of the data. Dr. Rudolfo Ullmann of Pontificial Catholic University (PUC) was awarded the contract.

FINDINGS

Some of our findings are for general information only and are only vaguely related to either the general or the specific hypotheses. First we look at those findings most closely related to the hypotheses. Then we turn to the less relevant findings.

Is there any difference in promotion rates among state, county, and private schools? Our data were divided into percentage of promotion brackets as follows: (1) 0-20, (2) 21-40, (3) 41-60, (4) 61-80, (5) 81-100. When so divided we find the bracket means for one-room and more-than-one-room schools in Espirito Santo, Pernambuco, and Rio Grande do Sul to be as follows (see Tables 14 and 15 for all three states and combined):

Responsible authority	One-room schools				More-than-one-room schools			
	ES	P	RGS	C	ES	P	RGS	C
State	3.20	3.45	3.39	3.35	3.67	4.25	3.65	3.70
County	1.96	2.43	3.14	2.87	1.00	3.77	3.86	3.52
Private	4.50	3.29	3.60	3.46	4.83	4.03	4.30	4.25

From this table we can see a more or less consistent pattern for both one-room and more-than-one-room schools: promotion rates tend to be highest in private schools and lowest in county schools with state schools falling in between. Take Espirito Santo for example: One-room private schools have a bracket mean of 4.50 (90% promotion); more-than-one-room private schools have a bracket mean of 4.83 (90+ % promotion). One-room county schools have a bracket mean of 1.96 (20- % promotion); more-than-one-room county schools have a bracket mean of 1.00 (0% promotion). One-room state schools have a bracket mean of 3.20 (41+ % promotion); more-than-one-room state schools have a bracket mean of 3.67 (50+ % promotion).

Is there a difference in promotion rates between urban and rural schools? We find the bracket means for urban and rural schools to be as follows (see Tables 8 and 9 for all three states and combined):

Location	One-room schools				More-than-one-room schools			
	ES	P	RGS	C	ES	P	RGS	C
Urban	3.55	3.31	3.27	3.32	4.01	4.30	3.86	3.97
Rural	2.93	2.45	3.26	3.07	3.34	3.07	3.57	3.52

From this table we can see a consistent pattern for both one-room and more-than-one-room schools: in all instances the bracket mean is higher for urban than for rural schools. For example in Espirito Santo one-room urban schools have a bracket mean of 3.55 (50+ % promotion); more-than-one-room urban schools have a bracket mean of 4.01 (61+ % promotion). On the other hand one-room rural schools have a bracket mean

of 2.93 (40- % promotion); more-than-one-room rural schools have a bracket mean of 3.34 (41+ % promotion).

Is there a difference in promotion rates among one-shift, two-shift, three-shift and four-shift schools? We find the bracket means for one-shift, two-shift, three-shift, and four-shift schools to be as follows (see Tables 6 and 7 for all three states and combined):

Number of Shifts	One-room schools				More-than-one-room schools			
	ES	P	RGS	C	ES	P	RGS	C
1	2.95	2.60	3.23	3.02	3.84	3.11	3.68	3.60
2	3.22	3.55	3.37	3.39	3.65	4.52	3.72	3.81
3		3.20	3.25	3.22	3.57	4.23	3.70	3.82
4		3.50	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.75	3.75	4.07

We would be hard pressed to find a consistent pattern in the above table. Indeed, contrary to our expectations bracket means seem to be higher in schools with a larger number of shifts (and hence a smaller amount of time available for instruction).

Thus in more-than-one-room schools in Pernambuco one-shift schools had a bracket mean of 3.11 (41+ % promotion) while four-shift schools had a bracket mean of 4.75 (90+ % promotion).

A plausible explanation seems to be based upon a certain general policy in Brazilian primary education: parents are allowed to enroll their children in the school of their choice regardless of

location within the educational jurisdiction. (The idea of a neighborhood school seems nonexistent in Brazil). Therefore, parents enroll their children in the "good" schools -- a phenomenon which forces such schools to multiply their shifts.

Is there a difference in promotion rates between one-room and more-than-one-room schools? We find the bracket means for one-room and more-than-one-room schools to be as follows (see Table 3 for all three states and combined):

Schools with:	ES	P	RGS	C
One-room	2.99	2.69	3.26	3.09
More-than-one-room	3.72	4.01	3.71	3.75

From this table we can see a consistent pattern: in all instances the bracket mean is higher for more-than-one-room schools than for one-room schools. For example, in the case of Rio Grande do Sul the bracket mean is 3.26 (41+ % promotion) for one-room schools and 3.71 (50+ % promotion) for more-than-one-room schools.

Is there a difference in promotion rates among schools having different percentages of qualified teachers? We find the bracket means for schools with different percentages of qualified teachers to be as follows (see Tables 10 and 11 for all states and combined):

% of teachers qualified	One-room schools				More-than-one-room schools			
	ES	P	RGS	C	ES	P	RGS	C
81-100	2.78	2.78	3.22	3.00	3.20	3.37	3.47	3.44
61-80			3.00	3.00	3.57	3.77	3.80	3.77
41-60			3.90	*4.00	3.58	4.00	3.86	3.83
21-40			2.80	*2.71	3.71	4.57	3.95	3.96
0-20	3.39	3.39	3.70	3.60	4.02	4.35	3.86	3.98

* Unexplained discrepancy (combined data should be 3.90 and 2.80 respectively).

From this table we see a more or less consistent pattern: the bracket means seem to be higher in schools with lower percentages of qualified teachers. Thus in the combined data for one-room schools schools having 81-100% of their teachers qualified have a bracket mean of 3.00 (41% promotion) while schools having 0-20% of their teachers qualified have a bracket mean of 3.60 (50+ % promotion). This result is contrary to expectation. Two explanations seem plausible. First, there was some discussion with the data processor regarding the format of the tables. Specifically, there was a question as to whether the "% of teachers qualified" column should run from 81-100 down to 0-20 or the other way around. If this were inadvertently reversed this would account for the negative correlation. However, if no such misunderstanding occurred, then such results might be explained in terms of standards. It has been our observation that qualified teachers have higher standards than unqualified teachers -- the unqualified teachers tending to let pupils "get by" with poorer quality work.

Incidental Findings

Number of shifts per school. Various reports came to us on the number of shifts per school. We were led to believe that almost all schools were on double and many on triple or quadruple shifts. The following table reports our findings in this regard (see Tables 1 and 2 for all three states and combined):

Responsible authority	One-room schools				More-than-one-room schools			
	ES	P	RGS	C	ES	P	RGS	C
State	1.03	1.31	1.31	1.24	1.95	2.27	1.88	1.91
County	1.00	1.07	1.19	1.14	1.00	1.68	1.83	1.77
Private	1.25	1.27	1.26	1.27	1.15	2.10	1.85	1.88

It can be seen from the above table that multiple shift schools are the exception rather than the rule. Only in the case of more-than-one-room state and private schools in Pernambuco was there a mean number of shifts in excess of two. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the number of children attending multiple-shift schools is insignificant. Such schools generally enroll a disproportionately large number of pupils.

Percent of pupils promoted. We had accepted as an operating assumption that the Brazilian teacher tends to promote about 50% of her pupils. Our data reveals that this figure is true in the aggregate but conceals the range as the following table shows (see Table 3 for all three states and combined):

State	% of pupils promoted (one-room schools)					% of pupils promoted (more-than-one-room in school)				
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100
ES	56	31	74	73	64	8	3	24	35	27
P	318	61	72	93	191	18	4	11	55	76
RGS	208	258	537	595	292	16	45	239	400	135
C	612	350	683	761	547	42	52	274	490	238

In the case of one-room schools it can be seen that the number of schools having a promotion rate of 0-20% is about the same as the number having a promotion rate of 81-100%. For example, in Pernambuco 318 schools had a percentage of promotion of 0-20 while 191 had a percentage of 81-100. In the case of more-than-one-room schools in all instances the number of schools with a promotion rate of 81-100 exceeds the number of schools with a promotion rate of 0-20, but again the range is apparent.

Conclusions

It must be said, in all fairness, that our findings are reported within rather wide tolerances. However, we always used what were, in our opinion, appropriate reporting procedures given the nature of the data available and the objectives of the study. This study, since it was of less current 1965 data, was meant to serve as a pilot to a more detailed study which we were planning of 1967 data. Since the study was based on a sample and not on a total population, the

reader may wonder why the statistical significance of the findings was not more thoroughly considered. The answer is that such analysis would have greatly complicated the data processing and consequently raised the cost (of what was to be a pilot study) beyond tolerable limits. At any rate such analysis was planned for the more detailed study of the 1967 data. It was felt, also, that more detailed statistical treatment would be unlikely to change, to any significant degree, the general conclusion to be drawn.

It must be kept in mind, also, that we did not have control over the actual field collection of data in this particular study. Thus we did not have the degree of confidence in the data which would justify detailed statistical analysis. In later studies we do have a greater measure of control. It must also be kept in mind that in this study we were not able to obtain the specific items of information needed to test the various facets of our general hypothesis. Specifically, the Federal Form SEP-01/1965 did not make reference to individual pupils but only to schools (pupils in aggregate). Also, we had not, in this form, any direct measure of either of our two main variables: dropout and repetition.

Nevertheless, we were able, indirectly, to clarify the problem by showing the relation of various school characteristics to promotion rates. If it had done nothing else this study demonstrated the utility of the general hypothesis as a frame of reference and the usefulness of certain tabular formats as analytical tools. Also,

it came out in the process of this study that several useful pools of data are being continuously collected and stored by a highly dedicated staff in the Statistical Service of Education and Culture, that the procedures for collecting such data can be assisted and improved, and that competent data processing firms are available in Brazil for processing such data.

Perhaps the most valuable achievement of this study was, in effect, a byproduct of our efforts. We discovered that the Statistical Service of Education and Culture was collecting data annually. However, the facilities of the SEEC were such that the results of one year's data collection could not be processed until about three years. Accordingly, we suggested a tri-annual collection. Also, we found that much relevant data was not being collected. We therefore made suggestions through Zenaide Schultz for the development of a new expanded form. As it turned out the SEEC did adopt a new expanded form to be circulated tri-annually (Form EP-04/1967).

Lastly, it should be said that the findings reported here are in no way to be construed as representing all that can be concluded from the tables appended. Readers of this report are urged to study the tables for themselves and draw additional, or contrary, conclusions. Most importantly, other investigators are urged to replicate this study or studies of a similar type; for our purpose in doing this study was not only to get certain information on a one-time basis but also to demonstrate that, by certain procedures, data already being collected could be used to provide information on a continuing basis.

APPENDIX

Table 1

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	257	8			265	1.03
County	58				58	1.00
Private	3	1			4	1.25
					327	1.02

Table 2

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	27	39	21	1	88	1.95
County	1				1	1.00
Private	5	1			6	1.15
					95	1.89

Table 3

Schools with:	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
One room	56	31	74	73	64	328	2.99
More than one room	8	3	24	35	27	97	3.72
						425	3.16

Table 4

One-room schools

Location	Teacher qualification		Number of teachers in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
Urban	14	18	32	43
Rural	99	202	301	32
			333	33

Table 5

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	3	6	5	11	28	54	4.01
Rural						43	3.00
						97	3.56

Table 6

One-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	54	30	72	72	61	319	2.95
2	2	1	2	1	3	9	3.22
3							
4							
						328	2.99

Table 7

More-than-one-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	5	2	4	4	18	33	3.84
2	2	1	11	21	5	40	3.65
3	1		9	8	3	21	3.57
4				1		1	4.00
						95	3.70

Table 8

One-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	5	1	5	9	9	29	3.55
Rural	81	30	69	64	55	299	2.93
						328	2.99

Table 9

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	2		11	23	18	54	4.01
Rural	6	3	13	12	9	43	3.34
						97	3.72

Table 10

One-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
81-100	50	26	58	44	28	216	2.78
61-80							
41-60							
21-40							
0-20	26	5	16	29	36	112	3.39
						328	2.99

Table 11

More-than-one-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
81-100	4	1	6	5	4	20	3.20
61-80	1		2	2	2	7	3.57
41-60	1	1	2	6	2	12	3.58
21-40			7	4	3	14	3.71
0-20	2	1	7	18	16	44	4.02
						97	3.72

Table 12

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Teacher qualification		Number of schools in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
State	105	164	269	39
County	5	53	58	8
Private	2	3	5	40
			332	33

Table 13

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	7	3	24	34	22	90	3.67
County	1					1	1.00
				1	5	6	4.83
						97	3.72

Table 14

One-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	53	24	64	65	59	265	3.20
County	32	7	10	6	3	58	1.96
Private				2	2	4	4.50
						327	3.00

Table 15

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	7	3	24	34	22	90	3.67
County	1					1	1.00
				1	5	6	4.83
						97	3.72

Table 1

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	78	20	5	1	104	1.31
County	500	23	6	1	530	1.07
Private	77	20	4		101	1.27
					735	1.13

Table 2

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	9	32	23	2	66	2.27
County	35	19	12	1	67	1.68
Private	6	16	7	1	30	2.10
					163	2.00

Table 3

Schools with:	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
One-room	318	61	72	93	191	735	2.69
More-than one-room	18	4	11	55	76	164	4.01
						899	2.93

Table 4

One-room schools

Location	Teacher qualification		Number of teachers in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
Urban	135	149	284	47
Rural	65	475	540	12
			824	24

Table 5

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
Urban	19	7	5	7	88	126	4.09
Rural	32	2			4	38	1.47
						164	3.48

Table 6

One-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	301	53	65	70	158	655	2.60
2	13	7	4	10	29	63	3.55
3	4	1	2	4	4	15	3.20
4			1	1		2	3.50
						735	2.69

Table 7

More-than-one-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
1	15	4	4	16	12	51	3.11
2	2		2	20	43	67	4.52
3	1		5	18	18	42	4.23
4				1	3	4	4.75
						164	4.01

Table 8

One-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	59	14	17	41	78	209	3.31
Rural	259	47	55	52	113	526	2.45
						735	2.69

Table 9

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	7		8	44	67	126	4.30
Rural	11	4	3	11	9	38	3.07
						164	4.01

Table 10

One-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
81-100	60	26	58	44	28	216	2.78
61-80							
41-60							
21-40							
0-80	26	5	16	29	36	112	3.39
						328	2.99

Table 11

More-than-one-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
81-100	11	4	5	17	14	51	3.37
61-80	2		1	1	5	9	3.77
41-60	1			1	3	5	4.00
21-40				3	4	7	4.57
0-20	4		5	33	50	92	4.35
						164	4.01

Table 12

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Teacher qualification		Number of schools in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
State	130	11	141	92
County	27	533	560	4
Private	43	80	123	34
			824	24

Table 13

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	3		5	27	31	66	4.25
County	11	4	4	18	30	67	3.77
Private	4		2	9	15	30	4.03
						163	4.01

Table 14

One-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	26	3	10	19	44	104	3.45
County	256	53	59	59	103	530	2.43
Private	34	5	3	15	44	101	3.29
						735	2.69

Table 15

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	3		5	27	31	66	4.25
County	11	4	4	18	30	67	3.77
Private	4		2	9	15	30	4.03
						163	4.01

Table 1

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	539	222	7	1	769	1.31
County	832	186	5		1,023	1.19
Private	63	23			86	1.26
					1,878	1.24

Table 2

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	173	350	81	6	610	1.88
County	33	50	13	2	98	1.83
Private	21	88	5		114	1.85
					822	1.86

Table 3

Schools with:	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
One room	208	258	537	595	292	1,890	3.26
More than one room	16	45	239	400	135	835	3.71
						2,725	3.40

Table 4

One-room schools

Location	Teacher qualification		Number of teachers in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
Urban	15	60	75	20
Rural	229	1,951	2,180	10
			2,255	10

Table 5

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	82	38	36	41	186	383	3.55
Rural	249	23	50	20	104	452	2.36
						835	2.90

Table 6

One-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	173	200	404	431	226	1,434	3.23
2	33	56	122	156	64	431	3.37
3	1	1	4	6		12	3.25
4			1			1	3.00
						1,878	3.26

Table 7

More-than-one-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
1	6	15	68	94	44	227	3.68
2	9	27	137	230	85	488	3.72
3		3	27	65	4	99	3.70
4			2	6		8	3.75
						822	3.71

Table 8

One-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	8	5	14	18	9	54	3.27
Rural	199	253	523	577	283	1,835	3.26
						1,889	3.26

Table 9

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
Urban	4	10	92	204	73	383	3.86
Rural	12	35	147	196	62	452	3.57
						835	3.71

Table 10

One-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
81-100	196	246	495	522	250	1,709	3.22
61-80	1	1	1	1	1	5	3.00
41-60			4	4	3	11	3.90
21-40	1	1	1	2		5	2.80
0-20	10	10	36	66	38	160	3.70
						1,890	3.26

Table 11

More-than-one-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
81-100	13	33	106	143	36	331	3.47
61-80		3	17	30	11	61	3.80
41-60		3	25	39	19	86	3.86
21-40		1	19	29	18	67	3.95
0-20	3	5	72	159	51	290	3.86
						835	3.71

Table 12

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Teacher qualification		Number of schools in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
State	166	822	988	15
County	52	1,111	1,173	5
Private	10	79	95	15
			2,256	10

Table 13

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	13	27	194	311	73	618	3.65
County	1	16	35	40	8	100	3.38
Private	2	2	9	49	54	116	4.30
						834	3.71

Table 14

One-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	54	94	238	267	118	771	3.39
County	145	156	282	301	148	1,032	3.14
Private	9	8	17	27	26	87	3.60
						1,890	3.26

Table 15

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	13	27	194	311	73	618	3.65
County	1	16	35	40	8	100	3.86
Private	2	2	9	49	54	116	4.30
						834	3.71

Table 1

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	874	250	12	2	1,138	1.24
County	1,390	209	11	1	1,611	1.14
Private	143	44	4		191	1.27
					2,940	1.19

Table 2

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	Number of shifts				Number of schools in this group	Number of shifts (mean for group)
	1	2	3	4		
State	209	421	125	9	764	1.91
County	69	69	25	3	166	1.77
Private	32	105	12	1	150	1.88
					1,080	1.88

Table 3

Schools with:	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
One room	612	350	683	761	547	2,953	3.09
More than one room	42	52	274	490	238	1,096	3.75
						4,049	3.27

Table 4

One-room schools

Location	Teacher qualification		Number of teachers in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
Urban	154	227	391	41
Rural	393	2,628	3,021	13
			3,412	15

Table 5

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	104	51	47	59	302	563	3.71
Rural	298	26	56	29	124	533	2.35
						1,096	3.05

Table 6

One-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	558	283	541	581	445	2,408	3.02
2	48	64	128	167	96	503	3.39
3	5	2	6	10	4	27	3.22
4			2	1		3	3.33
						2,941	3.09

Table 7

More-than-one-room schools

Number of shifts	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
1	26	21	76	114	74	311	3.60
2	13	28	150	271	133	595	3.81
3	2	3	41	91	25	162	3.82
4			2	8	3	13	4.07
						1,081	3.75

Table 8

One-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	72	20	36	68	96	292	3.32
Rural	539	330	647	693	451	2,660	3.07
						2.952	3.09

Table 9

More-than-one-room schools

Location	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
Urban	13	10	111	271	158	563	3.97
Rural	29	42	163	219	80	533	3.52
						1,096	3.75

Table 10

One-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
81-100	541	330	614	626	403	2,514	3.00
61-80	1	1	1	1	1	5	3.00
41-60			4	6	4	14	4.00
21-40	1	2	2	2		7	2.71
0-20	59	17	62	126	139	413	3.60
						2,953	3.09

Table 11

More-than-one-room schools

% of teachers qualified	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
81-100	28	38	117	165	54	402	3.44
61-80	3	3	20	33	18	77	3.77
41-60	2	4	27	46	24	103	3.83
21-40		1	26	36	25	88	3.96
0-20	9	6	84	210	117	426	3.98
						1,096	3.75

Table 12

One-room schools

Responsible authority	Teacher qualification		Number of schools in this group	% of teachers qualified (mean of group)
	Qualified	Unqualified		
State	401	997	1,398	28
County	94	1,697	1,791	5
Private	51	162	223	27
			3,412	16

Table 13

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of teachers qualified					Number of schools in this group	Qualification bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	23	30	223	372	126	774	3.70
County	13	20	39	58	38	168	3.52
Private	6	2	11	59	74	152	4.26
						1,094	3.75

Table 14

One-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	1. 0-20	2. 21-40	3. 41-60	4. 61-80	5. 81-100		
State	135	121	312	351	221	1,140	3.35
County	433	216	351	366	254	1,620	2.87
Private	43	13	20	44	72	192	3.46
						2,952	3.09

Table 15

More-than-one-room schools

Responsible authority	% of pupils promoted					Number of schools in this group	Promotion bracket (mean of group)
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100		
State	23	30	223	372	126	774	3.70
County	13	20	39	58	38	168	3.52
Private	6	2	11	59	74	152	4.25
						1,094	3.75