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Introduction

Despite the rapid economic development China has experienced since the economic opening (See G, Key, P. [5]) in the 1970s, the benefits of this growth have been distributed unevenly across the country with the poorer spatial-geographically. While the Eastern coast is certainly the core of growth activities, continued polarized development at the country level leads to enormous regional and social demographic, favoring in China. The great majority of some 68 million Chinese living under the official poverty line in China in October, 2008 are in the western region. [6, 7]. Up to the beginning of the 21st Century, the Chinese government remains the development of the Western region a national priority. [8] The Table 3 shows some of the key reasons for the regional polarities are the quality and accessibility of education, particularly when it comes to basic education for children. [9] Improving basic education is an extremely important step towards the goal of developing countries for the simple reason that elementary school education not only produces a literate population capable of dealing with elements economic, but also creates a foundation for further education, growth and development [10].

An Overview of the Current State of Child Education in China

During several decades, the lack of educational equality resulting from regional disparities, poverty and genderbased worldwide remains an extensive and an important issue. The Table 3 shows that the economic inequality in China is a high, proportion of minority groups in the western region, the existence of patriarchal social systems which keep on shaping minorities educational choices and behaviors as well as family traditional social customs. These factors remain the development of education in Western China [11].

Factors Influencing Children’s Non-schooling

In order to examine the individual effect of each factor on children’s non-schooling rate, including gender (females), a series of multiple regression analyses were carried out. These tables contain that there is a strong association between the non-schooling rate and the productivity of 0.841 (0.001), 0.837 (0.001), 0.841 (0.001), 0.874 (0.001), 0.872 (0.001), 0.877 (0.001) for girls. R² for boys. The results indicate that girls have a stronger association with the non-schooling rate than the boys. There is a significant difference between the non-schooling rate of boys and girls at the 0.05 level, the association between the non-schooling rate and the productivity of 0.841 (0.001), 0.837 (0.001), 0.841 (0.001), 0.874 (0.001), 0.872 (0.001), 0.877 (0.001) for girls. R² for boys. The results indicate that girls have a stronger association with the non-schooling rate than the boys. There is a significant difference between the non-schooling rate of boys and girls at the 0.05 level.

Influence of Female Illiteracy

The results indicate that the female illiteracy rate is the most significant variable in determining the non-schooling rate, with an R² of 0.841 (0.001) for girls and 0.877 (0.001) for boys. This suggests that reducing female illiteracy could be an effective strategy to reduce the non-schooling rate among both boys and girls. In particular, the results indicate that reducing the female illiteracy rate could lead to a significant reduction in the non-schooling rate among girls, with an R² of 0.877 (0.001) compared to 0.841 (0.001) for boys. Therefore, reducing female illiteracy should be a priority in efforts to decrease the non-schooling rate in China.

Factors Influencing Children’s Non-schooling

Table 2: Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty index</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.410</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female illiteracy</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.770</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor population</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.370</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.740</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to lower secondary school</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.720</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis

Model 1: R² = 0.841 (0.001)

Model 2: R² = 0.877 (0.001)

Model 3: R² = 0.874 (0.001)

Model 4: R² = 0.872 (0.001)

Model 5: R² = 0.871 (0.001)
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