B CC BY-NC

N S Bohra, S B Joshi India



Establishing the Relationship Between Learner Profile and Retention of Learning: A Case of Adult Literacy Program in India

DOI: 10.15804/tner.2019.55.1.16

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between learner profile and retention of learning in adult education programs in India. To achieve the objective, learner profile was divided into three measuring factors as social, economic and learning factors. A survey method was used to collect the required data. A testing method was executed to examine the retention level of learners. Factors responsible for the retention of learner profile were further analyzed with the use of a statistical technique (ANOVA). Results of the study show that the economic factors of learner profile have an impactful relationship with the retention level but customized contents of relevant study material with sustainable infrastructural facilities of learning centers can maximize the retention level of learners of such programs.

Keywords: retention of learning, adult literacy

Introduction

India recognised education as a fundamental right with the enactment of the Right to Education Act in 2010. It took almost 63 years, post-independence, to establish education as a fundamental right. Although there have been many efforts undertaken by central and state governments to provide education to all and to eradicate illiteracy from the country. Education is the foundation stone for the social and economic development of a nation. Education improves the quality of life in terms of an increase in life expectancy, an increase in healthy living, increased nutritional levels of women and children, increased capability to contribute towards social, cultural and economic development.

Adult education refers to the illiterate population between the ages of 15 and 35 years. Illiterate adults are the outcome of failure of elementary and compulsory education programs. The educationists who have conceptualized adult education believe that formal education has not been able to achieve its objectives. Elementary education refers to formal education, which is designed for children up to 15 years of age. Hence, adult education can be referred to as formal education for adults with different ways of teaching, The major focus on the execution of adult education started in 1950 with the objective of teaching (reading, writing and arithmetic) to the illiterate population in the desired age group. Adult education, due to the low literacy rate, is mainly confined to adult literacy only, although continuing education and skill development enhances the overall idea of adult education in India.

Different stages of education are identified as learning, retention, recall, recognition and application. Adult literacy also undergoes the same stages of education. There are various efforts made by the governments and allied functionaries to improve the adult literacy rate of the country. The learning environment and resources have been made available for the illiterate population over 15 years of age. The next stage in the education system is retention, which enables operationalisation of other stages like recall, recognition and application. Retention of learning in the adult literacy programme also ensures success of such programmes. Poor retention of learning in adult literacy programmes affects the adult literacy rate and results in decreasing all efforts of adult literacy programmes. It is of paramount importance to study the factors that influence higher retention rate among learners in adult literacy programmes, numerous factors responsible for retention among neo-literate in the learning campaign.

The purpose of the study was to identify the relationship between the demographic profile of a learner and retention of learning in adult literacy programmes. To achieve this objective, the following sub-objectives were designed:

- To identify the relationship between sociological factors (gender, age, marital status, previous educational status and highest education in family) and retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.
- **2.** To ascertain the relationship between economic factors (employment status, major family occupation and family income) and retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.

3. To assess the relationship between learning factors (regular attendance, availability of learning resources and self-motivation level) and retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.

Methodology

Research Design and Sample Design: Descriptive/diagnostic research design was adopted for the study with simple random sampling.

Sample Area and Sample Size: The study was conducted in Uttarakhand, an Indian state which was created in 2000. As a sample area, two districts were selected, i.e., Udham Singh Nagar (US Nagar) and Champavat. US Nagar was selected for the obvious reason of having the lowest literacy rate among the 13 districts in the state and Champavat has the highest disparity between the male and female literacy rates. Champawat and US Nagar comprise four blocks and seven blocks respectively. One block of each district was selected and five villages of each district were selected

| lock Barakot | Udham Singh | Nagar; Block Bajpur |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|
| Population | Villages | Population |
| 1257 | Bajpur | 5746 |
| 1122 | Barhani | 5662 |
| 969 | Bannakhera | 5660 |
| 777 | Chakarpur | 5464 |
| 772 | Maheshpura | 5328 |
| | 1257 1122 969 777 | PopulationVillages1257Bajpur1122Barhani969Bannakhera777Chakarpur |

Table 1. Population of sample villages

Source: www.censusindia.gov.in/handbookPartAChampawat/ and www.censusindia.gov.in/handbookPartAUdhamsinghnagar/

The survey was conducted with the use of a structured questionnaire given to 292 learners in order to collect data of learner profile. The required information was segmented into three measured factors as socioeconomic factors, economic factors and learning factors.

Testing Method was used to analyse the retention level of learners, a simple test of learning was administered to 292 learners, containing three sections, i.e., reading, writing and arithmetic. The same test was administered to the 292 learners twice with an interval of 30 days. The test contained 30 questions pertaining to the

recent lessons. The tests paper was prepared in collaboration with the volunteering teachers of the adult literacy programmes. The respondents were divided into three groups according to the percentage marks obtained, i.e., low scores comprising marks under 40%; average scores comprising marks between 40% and 60%; and high scores comprising marks over 60%.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

A. Survey Method

Profiles of 292 learners were collected through the survey method and its was observed in the socio-economic profile of the learner that there were more female participants (78%) than the male participants in the adult literacy program (cf., Table2). The survey revealed that married participants were more concerned about their literacy, the motivation level of school drop-outs was equal to that of the illiterate.

The survey showed that there were more unemployed people and agricultural labourers participating in the program An interesting finding of the survey was that a few learners the high income group (annual income more than Rs 10,000,000) also participated in the program. The learners attended the classes on the regular basis. The survey revealed a very interesting fact related to the motivation level of the learners, i.e., they were motivated enough to attend the program.

| Socio-Economic Factors | Options | Number of Respondents | % of Respondents |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Gender | Male | 64 | 22% |
| | Female | 228 | 78% |
| Age | >15-25 | 85 | 29% |
| | >25-35 | 88 | 30% |
| | >35-45 | 61 | 21% |
| | >45-55 | 35 | 12% |
| | >55 | 23 | 8% |
| Marital Status | Married | 237 | 81% |
| | Unmarried | 55 | 19% |

| | Table 2 | 2. Learner | Profile |
|--|---------|------------|---------|
|--|---------|------------|---------|

| Socio-Economic Factors | Options | Number of Respondents | % of Respondents |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Previous Educa- | Illiterate | 161 | 55% |
| tional Status | Drop-out | 131 | 45% |
| Highest education | Illiterate | 12 | 4% |
| in family | Up to 5th grade | 50 | 17% |
| | 6th – 8th grade | 55 | 19% |
| | 9th – 10th grade | 64 | 22% |
| | 11th – 12th grade | 70 | 24% |
| | > 12th grade | 41 | 14% |
| Economic Factors | Options | Number of Respondents | % of Respondents |
| Employment | Unemployed | 216 | 74% |
| Status | Employed | 76 | 26% |
| Major Family | Farming | 61 | 21% |
| Occupation | Agricultural Labor | 105 | 36% |
| | Non-Agricultural Labor | 50 | 17% |
| | Business | 76 | 26% |
| Family Annual | up to Rs 50,000 | 111 | 38% |
| Income | Rs. 50,000 – Rs 5,000,000 | 91 | 31% |
| | Rs. 5,000,000 – Rs. 10,000,000 | 58 | 20% |
| | >Rs. 10,000,000 | 32 | 11% |
| Learning Factors | Options | Number of Respondents | % of Respondents |
| Attendance | Attend classes daily during the week | 55 | 19% |
| | Attend 5 classes a week | 61 | 21% |
| | Attend 4 classes a week | 55 | 19% |
| | Attend 3 classes a week | 53 | 18% |
| | Attend 2 classes a week | 35 | 12% |
| | Attend 1 class a week | 32 | 11% |
| Willingness to | Yes | 164 | 56% |
| continue learning beyond basic literacy | No | 128 | 44% |

| Learning Factors | Options | Number of Respondents | % of Respondents |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Availability of Le- | Adequately Available | 96 | 33% |
| arning Resources | Marginally Available | 114 | 39% |
| | Least Available | 82 | 28% |
| Motivation Level | Highly Motivated | 105 | 36% |
| | Averagely Motivated | 152 | 52% |
| | Least Motivated | 35 | 12% |

B. Testing Method

To understand the retention level of the learners in the adult education program, two tests with the same questions, in the interval of 30 days, were administered. Test Score I represents the percentage marks obtained by the respondents for the test administered immediately after a lesson, whereas Test Score II represents percentage marks obtained by the respondents for the test administered 30 days after a lesson. The respondents' percentage marks were grouped in three categories, i.e., low, average and high, representing marks obtained 'under 40%', 'from 40% to 60%' and 'over 60%'. Table 3 presents the number and percentage of the respondents for each of the three factors bifurcated as per the percentage marks obtained category-wise.

The research revealed that 64% of the male respondents and 49% of female respondents scored high marks in the second test whereas only 6% of the female respondents and 47% of the male respondents were able to score high marks in the second test. This data reveal that the female respondents were not able to retain the learned lesson, which may be caused either by the unattractiveness of study material or other family assignments. The same sort of difference in test score I and test score II was observed in most of the measuring factors such as age group between 15 and 25 years, school drop-outs, employed, unemployed, agricultural or nonagricultural laborers, learners who attended the maximum number of classes or learners who attended the minimum number of classes and those who are highly motivated or those who are less motivated.

ANOVA was used to analyse data for each factor with the two test scores. The ANOVA computation of socio-economic factors with two test scores. The calculated value of F-ratio is greater than the table value for each of the factor at 95% confidence level, which signifies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Thus, it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between the sociological factors of retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.

| | | | - | lable 3. | | cores c | of learne | lest scores of learner retention | tion | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|----|-----|----------|--------------|---------|-----------|----------------------------------|------|-----|-----|---------------|----|------|-------|
| Socio- | | | | F | Test Score I | I | | | | | Te | Test Score II | II | | |
| economic | Options | Г | Low | Ave | Average | H | High | Total | Γc | Low | Ave | Average | Ηi | High | Total |
| Factors | | No | % | No. | % | No. | % | | N0. | % | No. | % | No | % | |
| Gender | Male | 4 | 6% | 19 | 30% | 41 | 64% | 64 | 12 | 19% | 22 | 34% | 30 | 47% | 64 |
| | Female | 42 | 18% | 75 | 33% | 111 | 49% | 228 | 121 | 53% | 94 | 41% | 13 | 6% | 228 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Age | >15-25 | 4 | 5% | 24 | 28% | 57 | 67% | 85 | 36 | 42% | 41 | 48% | ∞ | 6% | 85 |
| | >25-35 | 6 | 10% | 27 | 31% | 52 | 59% | 88 | 39 | 44% | 38 | 43% | 11 | 13% | 88 |
| | >35-45 | 6 | 15% | 16 | 26% | 36 | 59% | 61 | 27 | 44% | 13 | 21% | 21 | 34% | 61 |
| | >45-55 | 13 | 37% | 19 | 54% | ю | 6% | 35 | 18 | 51% | 16 | 46% | п | 3% | 35 |
| | >55 | 11 | 48% | × | 35% | 4 | 17% | 23 | 13 | 57% | × | 35% | 2 | 6% | 23 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Previous | Married | 32 | 14% | 81 | 34% | 124 | 52% | 237 | 112 | 47% | 98 | 41% | 27 | 11% | 237 |
| Education | Unmarried | 14 | 25% | 13 | 24% | 28 | 51% | 55 | 21 | 38% | 18 | 33% | 16 | 29% | 55 |
| 014143 | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| | Illiterate | 29 | 18% | 69 | 43% | 63 | 39% | 161 | 72 | 45% | 58 | 36% | 31 | 19% | 161 |
| | Drop-out | 17 | 13% | 25 | 19% | 89 | 68% | 131 | 61 | 47% | 58 | 44% | 12 | %6 | 131 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Highest | Illiterate | 33 | 25% | 5 | 42% | 4 | 33% | 12 | 6 | 75% | 2 | 17% | 1 | 8% | 12 |
| Education in Family | Up to 5th grade | 13 | 26% | 20 | 40% | 17 | 34% | 50 | 29 | 58% | 18 | 36% | 3 | 6% | 50 |
| 1 | 6th – 8th grade | 15 | 27% | 20 | 36% | 20 | 36% | 55 | 32 | 58% | 18 | 33% | 5 | 9%6 | 55 |
| | 9th – 10th grade | 7 | 11% | 18 | 28% | 39 | 61% | 64 | 33 | 52% | 21 | 33% | 10 | 16% | 64 |
| | 11th – 12th grade | 4 | 6% | 21 | 30% | 45 | 64% | 70 | 25 | 36% | 32 | 46% | 13 | 19% | 70 |
| | > 12th grade | 4 | 10% | 13 | 32% | 24 | 59% | 41 | 5 | 12% | 25 | 61% | 11 | 27% | 41 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 97 | 33% | 149 | 51% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |

Table 3. Test scores of learner retention

| HighTotalLowAver.No.%No.%No.38 50% 76 11 14% 44 38 50% 76 11 14% 44 114 53% 216 122 56% 72 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 50 27 54% 19 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 40% 48 53% 91 45 40 48 53% 91 45 40 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 550% 202 15 26% 27 21% 46% 12 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 550% 202 122 46% 116 250% 202 122 26% 27 222 69% 22 26% 27 222 50% 25% 21 22% 250% 212 22% 210% 27% 250% 212 22% 210% 27% |
|--|
| No. % No. % No. 38 50% 76 11 14% 44 114 53% 216 122 56% 72 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 47 48% 50 27 54% 19 47 48% 50 27 54% 19 47 48% 50 27 54% 19 48 50 20 27 54% 19 48 50 213 46% 116 48 53% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 15 26% 21 48 53% 15 26% 21 48 53% 213 46% 116 <t< td=""></t<> |
| 38 50% 76 11 14% 44 114 53% 216 122 56% 72 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 39 64% 61 28 46% 116 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 36 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45% 40 48 53% 91 45% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 38 66% 38 25% 11 26% 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 38 66% 38 25% |
| 114 53% 216 122 56% 72 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 39 64% 61 28 46% 24 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 42 55% 76 22 29% 36 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45% 40 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 38 66% 58 15 26% 21 455 69% 38 25% 11 |
| 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 39 64% 61 28 46% 24 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 152 52% 76 22 29% 40 152 52% 91 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 45 49% 38 25% 11 26% 55 59% 26% 27 26% 27 |
| 39 64% 61 28 46% 24 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 38 66% 32 8 25% 11 45 49% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 47 45% 105 56 53% 38 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 24 48% 50 27 54% 19 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 42 55% 76 22 29% 35 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 152 52% 292 133 46% 116 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 44 40% 111 65 59% 40 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 |
| 48 53% 91 45 49% 38 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 157 50% 700 122 40% 11 |
| 38 66% 58 15 26% 27 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 157 53% 303 133 45% 116 |
| 22 69% 32 8 25% 11 157 57% 707 132 45% 115 |
| 1E7 E70/ JOJ 122 AE0/ 11E |
| 0%07 011 0%07 CC1 767 0%7C 7C1 0%7C |

[202]

| . , | | | | Tes | Testing Method Score I | thod Sco | ore I | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|-----|-----|------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|---------|----|-------|-------|
| Learning Factors | Options | | Low | Ave | Average | H | High | Total | L | Low | Ave | Average | Hi | Hight | Total |
| | | No | % | N0. | % | No. | % | | No. | % | No. | % | No | % | |
| Attend- ance | Attend classes daily during the week | 4 | 7% | 12 | 22% | 39 | 71% | 55 | 17 | 31% | 25 | 45% | 13 | 24% | 55 |
| | Attend 5 classes | 7 | 11% | 14 | 23% | 40 | 66% | 61 | 16 | 26% | 36 | 59% | 6 | 15% | 61 |
| | Attend 4 classes | 7 | 13% | 17 | 31% | 30 | 56% | 54 | 26 | 48% | 20 | 37% | 8 | 15% | 54 |
| | Attend 3 classes | 10 | 19% | 19 | 36% | 24 | 45% | 53 | 29 | 55% | 18 | 34% | 6 | 11% | 53 |
| | Attend 2 classes | 6 | 25% | 15 | 42% | 12 | 33% | 36 | 23 | 64% | 6 | 25% | 4 | 11% | 36 |
| | Attend 1 class | 6 | 27% | 17 | 52% | 7 | 21% | 33 | 22 | 67% | × | 24% | ю | 6% | 33 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Willing- | Yes | 21 | 13% | 45 | 27% | 98 | 60% | 164 | 50 | 30% | 83 | 51% | 31 | 19% | 164 |
| ness to | No | 25 | 20% | 49 | 38% | 54 | 42% | 128 | 83 | 65% | 33 | 26% | 12 | %6 | 128 |
| learning beyond basic literacy | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Availa- | Adequately Available | 10 | 10% | 18 | 19% | 68 | 71% | 96 | 22 | 23% | 54 | 56% | 20 | 21% | 96 |
| bility of learning | Marginally Available | 24 | 21% | 28 | 25% | 62 | 54% | 114 | 52 | 46% | 43 | 38% | 19 | 17% | 114 |
| resources | Least Available | 12 | 15% | 48 | 59% | 22 | 27% | 82 | 59 | 72% | 19 | 23% | 4 | 5% | 82 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| Motiva- | Highly Motivated | 13 | 12% | 13 | 12% | 79 | 75% | 105 | 33 | 31% | 46 | 44% | 26 | 25% | 105 |
| tion Level | Averagely Motivated | 21 | 14% | 63 | 41% | 68 | 45% | 152 | 79 | 52% | 58 | 38% | 15 | 10% | 152 |
| | Least Motivated | 12 | 34% | 18 | 51% | 5 | 14% | 35 | 21 | 60% | 12 | 34% | 2 | 6% | 35 |
| | Total | 46 | 16% | 94 | 32% | 152 | 52% | 292 | 133 | 46% | 116 | 40% | 43 | 15% | 292 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[203]

| | Social | Factors | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F-Ratio (Calcu- lated) | F-Ratio (Table Value) | Sig. |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------------|-------------------|-----|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| | Test | Between Groups | 95.916 | 1 | 95.916 | 437.326 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| | Score I | Within Groups | 63.604 | 290 | 0.219 | - | | |
| Gender | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Gen | Test | Between Groups | 39.225 | 1 | 39.225 | 104.327 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| | Score | Within Groups | 109.035 | 290 | 0.376 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 118.185 | 4 | 29.546 | 205.143 | 2.3719 | 0 |
| | Score I | Within Groups | 41.336 | 287 | 0.144 | - | | |
| Age | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Aę | Test | Between Groups | 118.172 | 4 | 29.543 | 281.794 | 2.3719 | 0 |
| | Score | Within Groups | 30.089 | 287 | 0.105 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 27.495 | 1 | 27.495 | 60.395 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| tus | Score I | Within Groups | 132.025 | 290 | 0.455 | - | | |
| Stat | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Marital Status | Test | Between Groups | 80.516 | 1 | 80.516 | 55 516 344.669 3.8415 | 0 | |
| Ma | Score | Within Groups | 67.745 | 290 | 0.234 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| q | Test | Between Groups | 96.403 | 1 | 96.403 | 442.928 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| catio | Score I | Within Groups | 63.118 | 290 | 0.218 | - | | |
| Previous Education | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| ous] | Test | Between Groups | 96.244 | 1 | 96.244 | 536.583 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| revio | Score | Within Groups | 52.016 | 290 | 0.179 | - | | |
| Р | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| 'n | Test | Between Groups | 133.906 | 5 | 26.781 | 299.029 | 2.2141 | 0 |
| ∕ Edı | Score I | Within Groups | 25.614 | 286 | 0.09 | - | | |
| (limi) | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Highest Family Edu- cation | Test | Between Groups | 134.317 | 5 | 26.863 | 551.032 | 2.2141 | 0 |
| ighe | Score | Within Groups | 13.943 | 286 | 0.049 | - | | |
| Η | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |

Table 4. ANOVA analysis

| | | | Economic | Factor | s | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|------------------------|------------------|---|
| IS | Test | Between Groups | 96.326 | 1 | 96.326 | 442.036 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| Statu | Score I | Within Groups | 63.195 | 290 | 0.218 | - | | |
| ent (| | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Employment Status | Test | Between Groups | 49.168 | 1 | 49.168 | 143.892 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| mpla | Score | Within Groups | 99.093 | 290 | 0.342 | - | | |
| щ | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 128.647 | 3 | 42.882 | 400.025 | 2.6049 | 0 |
| ily n | Score I | Within Groups | 30.873 | 288 | 0.107 | - | | |
| Fam atio | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| Major Family Occupation | Test | Between Groups | 106.961 | 3 | 35.654 | 248.628 | 2.6049 | 0 |
| Ma | Score | Within Groups | 41.3 | 288 | 0.143 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 112.928 | 3 | 37.643 | 232.679 | 2.6049 | 0 |
| Family Annual Income | Score I | Within Groups | 46.592 | 288 | 0.162 | - | | |
| | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | - | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 122.689 | 3 | 40.896 | 460.598 | 2.6049 | 0 |
| | Score | Within Groups | 25.571 | 288 | 0.089 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| | | | Learning | Factor | s | | | |
| Attendance | Test | Between Groups | 138.79 | 5 | 27.758 | 382.942 | 2.2141 | 0 |
| | Score I | Within Groups | 20.731 | 286 | 0.072 | _ | | |
| | | Total | 159.521 | 291 | | _ | | |
| | Test | Between Groups | 129.779 | 5 | 25.956 | 401.664 | 2.2141 | 0 |
| | Score | Within Groups | 18.481 | 286 | 0.065 | - | | |
| | II | Total | 148.26 | 291 | | - | | |
| - pu | Test | Potwaan Crouns | 00.406 | | | | | |
| to con- g beyond racy | 1631 | Between Groups | 99.426 | 1 | 92.313 | 149.351 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| | Score I | Within Groups | 68.295 | 1 290 | 92.313 0.196 | _ 149.351 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| ss to co ng beyt teracy | | | | | | _ 149.351 _ | 3.8415 | 0 |
| igness to co arning beyc sic literacy | | Within Groups | 68.295 | 290 | | - 149.351 - 391.287 | 3.8415 | 0 |
| illingness to col le learning beyc basic literacy | Score I Test Score | Within Groups Total | 68.295 167.721 | 290 291 | 0.196 | - | | |
| Willingness to con- tinue learning beyond basic literacy | Score I Test | Within Groups Total Between Groups | 68.295 167.721 49.168 | 290 291 1 | 0.196 | - | | |
| - | Score I Test Score | Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups | 68.295 167.721 49.168 99.093 | 290 291 1 290 | 0.196 | - | | |
| - | Score I Test Score II | Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 68.295 167.721 49.168 99.093 148.26 | 290 291 1 290 291 | 0.196 59.168 0.142 | | 3.8415 | 0 |
| - | Score I Test Score II Test | Within GroupsTotalBetween GroupsWithin GroupsTotalBetween Groups | 68.295 167.721 49.168 99.093 148.26 108.545 | 290 291 1 290 291 2 | 0.196 59.168 0.142 54.272 | | 3.8415 | 0 |
| - | Score I Test Score II Test | Within GroupsTotalBetween GroupsWithin GroupsTotalBetween GroupsWithin Groups | 68.295 167.721 49.168 99.093 148.26 108.545 50.976 | 290 291 1 290 291 2 2 289 | 0.196 59.168 0.142 54.272 | | 3.8415 | 0 |
| of Re- | Score I Test Score II Test Score I | Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 68.295 167.721 49.168 99.093 148.26 108.545 50.976 159.521 | 290 291 1 290 291 2 289 289 291 | 0.196 59.168 0.142 54.272 0.176 | | 3.8415 2.9957 | 0 |

[205]

The ANOVA computation of economic factors with two test scores. The calculated value of F-ratio is greater than the table value for each of the factors at 95% confidence level, which means that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Thus, it is concluded that there is significant relationship between the economic factors of retention of learning in adult literacy programmes. The ANOVA computation of economic factors with two test scores. The calculated value of F-ratio is greater than the table value for each of the factors at 95% confidence level, which means that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Thus, it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between the learning factors of retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.

Conclusion

It is evident from the findings that economic factors play a pivotal role in retention of learning in adult literacy programmes. The better the economic condition of the respondent and their family, the better the retention of learning. Similar reading is reflected through socio-economic factors like employment status. Thus, it may be suggested that adult literacy programme has to be designed in a manner that helps the respondents improve their economic condition. Moreover, retention is also affected by several other factors such as teachers, teaching resources, teaching process, application of learning, etc. Socio-economic factors are mostly unchangeable, whereas economic factors and learning factors can be improvised in a manner to improve retention of learning in adult literacy programmes.

The adult literacy programme need to address the more important question of the learners, "what's-in-it-for-me". This is prominently related to their economic status. Establishing the link between literacy and economic activity of the learners will keep them motivated and improve the retention level. Skill development lessons linked to literacy lessons may add plenty of value propositions for the learners. Once the economic benefit of learning and literacy is understood well by the learners, retention of learning in adult literacy programmes will occur naturally. In order to improve retention of learning in adult literacy programmes, adult learners learn by discussing, applying and sharing knowledge through group discussion. Learners need to be involved in formal group discussion forums under the supervision of teachers. This would enable the learners to discuss various lessons among themselves, which would help them to retain knowledge for a longer period of time. Learning by doing is another way of retaining the knowledge gained in the classroom, which has to be applied in practice to ensure that the knowledge is retained for a longer period of time. Finally, teaching others is the most powerful tool to retain knowledge gained in a lesson. Involving learners in teaching new students allows them to retain learning permanently. It also encourages them to learn and increases their confidence and motivation levels.

It is a well-known fact that continuing education ensures retention of learning for a longer period of time. It is recommended to devise advanced courses linking to the learner's economic activities, beyond the basic literacy programmes. The availability of advanced curriculum would motivate learners to pursue education beyond basic literacy. More and more learners taking up advanced courses will resolve the problem of retention of basic literacy.

References

- Salihu, L., & Aro, M. (2018). Children with learning difficulties in mathematics: Relating mathematics skills and reading comprehension. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(4), 1024–1038.
- Dukynaitė, R., & Dudaitė, J. (2017). Influence of school factors on students' sense of school belonging. *The New Education Review*, 47(1), 39–52.
- Fincher, M. (2010). Adult student retention: A practical approach to retention improvement through learning enhancement. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 58(1), 12–18.
- Ocak, G. (2010). The effect of learning stations on the level of academic success and retention of elementary school students. *The New Educational Review*, 21(2), 146–157.
- Comings, J.P. (1995). Literacy skill retention in adult students in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 15(1), 37–45.
- Quigley, B.A., & Uhland, R.L. (2000). Retaining adult learners in the first three critical weeks: A quasi-experimental model for use in ABE programs. *Adult Basic Education*, *10*(2), 55.
- Alhassan, A.M. (2012). Factors affecting adult learning and their persistence: A theoretical approach. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 150–168.
- Ritter, F.E., Baxter, G., Kim, J.W., & Srinivasmurthy, S. (2013). Learning and retention. *The Oxford handbook of cognitive engineering*, 125–142.
- Combs, A.K. (2015). The Factors Affecting the Retention of Adult Basic Education Teachers in Kentucky.
- Karuppaiyan, S. (1998). A study on retention of literacy among the neo literate of total literacy campaign in Pudukkottai District Tamilnadu.
- Spivey, T.M. (2016). Examining Barriers to Retention of Adult Learners in Rural Education Programs.