

インドの初等教員養成：1980年代までの拡張と停滞への一考察

赤井ひさ子
東海大学福岡短期大学

(受付：2006年9月20日)

(受理：2006年12月13日)

Teacher Education in India until 1980s: An Examination of Stagnation and Expansion

BY

Hisako Akai

Abstract

Ancient India was not a sub-continent of illiteracy although there were geographical differences in the spread of literacy. The rich tradition of acquiring basic education was common even among the masses. The 'modern school system' introduced by the British in 1854 saw an increase in the number of pupils enrolled in it, but the problem of serious drop-outs and shortage of teachers remained unsolved till the end of its rule in 1947. Consequently, 'modern school education' has slowly become irrelevant to the needs of people. Independent India increased the number of teachers not only by establishing new teacher training institutions but also by providing various types of short-term teacher training programs and appointing less trained personnel as school teachers. Despite the rapid expansion of school education there was a continued shortage of teachers which resulted in the persistence of high drop-out rates in schools and low quality of education. India's fabled cultural diversity has made it difficult for the Central Government to establish a consensus in teacher training/education. As such, nearly four decades passed until India announced a uniform system of teacher education for all parts of the country.

Key words: Teacher education in India, National Policy on Education 1968, National Policy on Education 1986, National Council for Teacher Education

1. Introduction

The independence of India in 1947 and the promulgation of her Constitution in 1950 gave its free people a great degree of hope that universalization of elementary education (UEE) could be achieved before long, as the Constitution professed that India would

endeavor to provide free and compulsory elementary education within 10 years from its commencement. Although India saw considerable expansion of elementary school education after 1947, the economic situation at the beginning of the First Five Year Plan (1951-55) was far from favorable to any marked stepping up of investment and many projects started in the post-war period faced financial difficulties. Furthermore, “there was little coordination, *inter se*, between developmental programme[s] of the Centre and of the States, and the administrative machinery in some of the newly constituted States was inadequate even for its normal tasks.” [Government of India, 1957: 1-2] Development in school education, needless to say, required more teachers working in schools, and it was considered that training new teachers needed appropriate competence, which in turn meant instruction over a period of time. Reviewing Indian education from this perspective reveals serious difficulties embedded in the school system in India.

This paper examines how India strove for the improvement of teacher education until its National Policy on Education 1986 (NPE86) announced in 1986, nearly four decades after her achievement of self-rule, and which was the second nationally declared policy on education after 1947. Followed by a review of school education and teacher training in the period before and after independence, this paper explores India’s national level strategy on teacher education and the obstacles that hinder further improvement. The focus of this paper is on policies in the context of primary and elementary teacher education and not policies as such, or how they have influenced other sectors of the Indian economy and policy. The fundamental rationale for my focus is that school teachers are pivots in the education process as has been repeatedly stated in reports compiled both by the British raj (rule) and the Central Government of India after independence. The primary sources for my analysis are reports/documents published by the raj, the Central and State governments, and studies by scholars concerned about the state of education in India.

2. Primary education and teacher education in India by NPE68 (1968)

There was “geographical variation in the spread of literacy and schooling facilities” [Kumar, K.: 71] in ancient India, but India was not a sub-continent of illiteracy. The characteristics of Indian indigenous primary school education are summarized as follows: (1) Primary schools provided boys in local communities with basic education (reading, writing and basic arithmetic) through vernaculars. (2) These schools were not organically connected with schools for higher learning where teaching media were

Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. (3) India's ancient schools, not only primary but also tertiary schools, had an effective method of teaching, which was later introduced to Europe as 'the monitorial system.' (4) Those indigenous primary schools were often supported by local communities, and (5) they had a flexible set up which responded to local needs. (6) Although there were no primary schools particularly organized for girls, while those from well-off families were tutored at home, traditional primary schools were open not only to boys from high-caste families but also those from the masses. (7) Quite a few children received basic education through domestic instruction, not from school education, because there was a tradition of passing on knowledge, such as, writing skills, keeping accounts, and so on from father to son. The actual status of primary education in 19th century can be found in survey reports compiled by the British in different provinces. For example, William Adam (1796-1881) who came to India first as a missionary became a vernacular scholar and wrote reports on indigenous primary education. These were submitted to Lord William Bentinck (1774-1839), the first Governor General of India (1833-35). Adam reported in 1835 that in some areas in Bengal "there would be a village school for every 400 persons." [Basu, A.: 6]

After the acquisition in 1765 of the 'diwani' (revenue administration) in Bengal, the British slowly became aware of Indian culture and began to interact with Indian communities. The Charter Act of the India Company, renewed in 1833, stated that the Indian Empire should hire native Indians as civil servants. However, this process didn't mean the diffusion of European education to Indian masses. Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859), President of the General Committee of Public Instruction, submitted his now infamous "Minute on Education" about the future education policy of India in 1835 which the Committee members failed to unanimously approve. His minute, approved by Lord Bentinck, insisted on the diffusion of European knowledge through English media and argued that the raj needed a class of people who could be interpreters between its rule and the large population of Indian masses, using the notorious phrase "a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect." [Macaulay, 1835: 7] Macaulay was biased against dialects spoken by natives. However, he was aware of the social change among Indians, that is, some Indians, for example, the rising Indian middle class, who were keen to learn English so that they could be engaged in new businesses and occupations that required the knowledge of English. The manner in which this was expressed in the Macaulay's Minute, generally known as 'Filtration Theory,' dominated the raj's educational policy for the next two decades. On the other hand, Indian intellectuals,

who had acquired both Indian tradition and European knowledge through long term interaction with British people, for example, Raja Rammohun Roy (1772-1883), initiated a new type of education and learning which included both Indian and Western knowledge.

The British Parliament gradually became aware that the growing Indian population which received new education could be a source of social transformation and by the time the Charter Act was due for renewal in 1853 it finally changed its 'Filtration Theory'. This was largely due to a document known as Wood's—Sir Charles Wood, President of Board of Control from 1853 to 1855, sent a Despatch to the Governor General of India in Council— Despatch of 1854. This Despatch called for the creation of a complete system of school education from primary school to university applicable throughout India, and stated that education was "one of our most sacred duties." [Government of India 1870: 1] At the same time, it noted the diversity of India and suggested that there ought to be appropriate modification "in order to adapt them to different parts of India." [Government of India 1870: 11] Although the Despatch admitted the usage of local languages in primary and secondary classes as teaching media, it put a higher priority on English language and Western knowledge. A few years after from the announcement of the new school system, the Sepoy mutiny (known by Indians as the First War for Independence) took place in 1857, and the East India Company was abolished in 1858. Henceforth, India came under the control of the British Crown. Due to a series of political changes, the diffusion of elementary education for the masses was excluded from the administrative priorities of the raj. Table 1 shows the expansion of 'modern primary school' in India by the beginning of the 20th century. It is obvious that the pace of expansion became slower, and this implies there must have been problems in the newly introduced school system. Table 2 shows serious drop-outs in primary school education before the independence period.

As the National Policy on education 1968 (NPE68), which was the first educational policy in India after independence, stated, "of all the factors which determine the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the teacher is undoubtedly the most important." [MHRD, 1968: 2-3] In ancient India, "teaching [had] been a recognized and revered profession since the dawn of history," [Mukerji, S.N.: 3] and primary school teachers were from "all classes including the depressed classes." [Ghosh, S.C.: 9]

Table 1: Expansion of Primary School Education (1870-1901)

Year	Number of primary school	Pupils enrolled in
1870-71	16,273	607,000
1881-82	82,916	2,060,000
1891-92	97,109	2,837,607
1901-02	98,538	3,268,729

[Sources: Government of India, 1883 (p.86) and Government of India, 1904 (pp.15-16)]

Table 2: School-going Children in 1936-37

Year 1936-37	Number of school-going children
	5-14 age population: Approximately 60,000,000 Pupils on the registers: 11,985,986 (19.9% of all)
Pupils in class I*	5,188,601
Pupils in class II	2,355,418
Pupils in class III	1,722,292
Pupils in class IV	1,214,504
Pupils in class V	703,628
In class VI and above	801,543

* Children generally enrolled in primary school at the age of 5 or 6.

[Source: CABE, 1944: 6]

For example, according to a survey conducted by the raj in the beginning of 19th century, 47% of primary teachers in the district of Dharwar in Bombay (Now Mumbai) Province was from the Brahmin category to whom the teaching profession was generally attributed. There was no ‘teacher certificate’ and/or license for offering basic education to local children. A primary teacher made his living by receiving a small amount of school fees from parents of their pupils, and he received presents on festival days like Diwali and Dusserah from village inhabitants. Since something practical and closely related to the daily lives of local people, i.e., the basic knowledge of 3R’s, was expected to be taught in indigenous primary schools, primary teachers were, mostly, not highly educated. British officers who inspected traditional primary schools sometimes reported that “the masters [were] ignorant” [Parulekar, R.V. 1951: xxvii] and often argued that such schools were detrimental; although, as Adam observed, indigenous schools were not inferior to that of village schools in Europe in those days. Yet, what has to be underscored is that “although most of the teachers [were] not well-qualified for higher instruction, [they] were qualified enough to impart the very modest fare of

schooling for which the pupils came to their schools,” [Parulekar, R.V. 1951: xxviii] i.e., primary teachers were closer to the community.

Considering the above situation, a logical question is: How did the raj train primary teachers for the new school system? The first ‘modern normal school’ in India before Wood’s Despatch (1854), was in Serampore, a pre-colonial town on the right bank of the Hoogli River in the Hooghly district of India’s Bengal state, established through the joint efforts of Danish and English missionaries in 1793. The first normal school under government management was established in Madras (now Chennai) in 1826.

According to the suggestion in Wood’s Despatch, 14 normal schools were established, but the number of teachers trained was far from adequate. It must be also noted that pedagogical and educational studies and subjects were slowly brought under the curricula for primary school teacher education in India along with their development. A report compiled by the raj in 1882, well-known by its author’s name as Hunter Commission Report—Sir William Wilson Hunter (1840-1900) was a member of the Indian Civil Service, a great statistician and compiler, an imperial historian, and a man of letters with a wide range of interests—argued that “the success of an indigenous school [had] often been mainly due to the fact that the master was a member of the village community.” [Government of India, 1883: 132] However, out of 66,552 primary school teachers in all of India, only 18.39% were ‘certificated’ in the year 1881-82. The Indian Educational Policy 1904 showed that the salary paid to primary teachers was insufficient to induce anyone to undergo a course of training. Regarding the content of the training, the policy stated that pupil teachers who “received a vernacular education [were] maintained by stipends and [received] further general education, combined with instruction in the methods of teaching, and practice in teaching under supervision.” [Government of India, 1904: 44] It also stated that the length of the training courses differed from province to province, and suggested that the course ought to be not less than two years. The Hartog Committee Report report in 1928, known by the name of its author—Sir Philip Joseph Hartog (1864-1947) was the Chairman of the Committee on Indian Education in 1928-29—commented dreadfully that: “The teachers [were] isolated and the difficulties of administration, supervision and inspection [were] much greater: and it [was] more difficult to secure regular and prolonged attendance of children.” [Government of India, 1929: 37]

Table 3 shows the expansion of institutions for primary school teachers in India before independence. There had been certainly an increase in number of successful teacher

trainees, but the Sargent Report—named after its author Sir John Philip Sargent (1888-1972) a British statesman and educator, who served as principal advisor to the government of India from 1938 to 1948—of 1944 stated that, actually, 612 institutions of the total 640 institutions (1940-41) “admitted class IV pass and Middle pass candidates for training as teachers of primary and lower secondary classes.” [Government of India, 1944: 48] All these documented comments by civil servants of the raj imply that teacher education in India had not been satisfactory ever since the implementation of ‘modern school education’ in 1854. The remark by J.P. Naik (1907-1981), a former Educational Advisor to the Government of India, that “the British never accepted responsibility for educating the masses,” [Naik, J.P. 1966: 16] is widely acknowledged by Indian educators. Moreover, it is not illogical to argue that, although the raj implemented a ‘modern school education’ instead of the indigenous primary education and altered the curricula and personnel structure of school system, it didn’t intend to make the primary teacher as “a profession in the modern sense.” [Kumar, K.: 189]

Table 3: Institutions for Primary School Teachers before Independence

Year	Number of Institutions For Primary Teachers	Number of Students Enrolled in
1856	10*	N.A.
1882	106	3,886
1913	550	11,000
1940-41	640	19,392 (Completed)

* Training institutions by missionaries are not included in this number.

[Sources: Mukerji, S.N., (p.8), Government of India, 1883 (p.134) and Government of India, 1913 (p.38), Government of India, 1944 (p.48)]

After independence, education was made a State subject according to ‘List II – State List’ of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution announced in 1950. As my paper has examined, the Hunter Commission Report (1883) observed that indigenous primary education was successful because the teacher was a member of the village community. However, the Hartog Committee Report (1928) noted, 45 years later, that the primary school teacher was isolated, and administration for schooling didn’t function well. The Sargent Report of 1944 criticized the training offered by teacher training institutions stating that they “fail[ed] to keep up with modern ideas in education and there [was] insufficient co-ordination between theory and practice.” [Government of India, 1944: 48] Thus, independent India had to struggle to establish UEE, after the raj had neglected

the improvement of teacher education. After independence, during the year 1948-49, most of the State Governments accepted the 'Basic Education', which was originally advocated by Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), as compulsory education. Hence, each State Government had to train two different types of primary school teachers, i.e., teachers for ordinary primary schools and teachers for Basic schools. The duration of training courses and the minimum qualification for admission for training institution varied from state to state. Table 4 shows the increase of primary teacher training institutions and their students from the year 1947-48 to 1964-65.

Table 4: Teacher Training Institutions and their Students (1947-1964)

Year	Primary Teacher Training Institutions	Students Enrolled in Training Institutions
1947-48	529*	38,895****
1948-49	597*	51,505****
1949-1950	720**	67,046
1950-51	782**	70,063
1955-56	Non-Basic Training 930 Basic Training 520	Non-Basic Training 90,914 Basic Training 55,091
1960-61	Non-Basic Training 1,138 Basic Training 843	Non-Basic Training 112,682 Basic Training 104,493
1964-65	Non-Basic Training 630*** Basic Training 448	Non-Basic Training 56,960 Basic Training 55,480*****

[Sources: "Education in India" by MHRD for each academic year]

* Both numbers exclude training courses attached to the secondary schools.

** Both numbers include Basic Training Schools.

*** Because of the statistical change, the number decreased from 1,137 (1963-64).

**** Includes Students enrolled in Basic Training Institutions.

***** Because of the statistical change, the number decreased from 113,522 (1963-64).

Table 5 shows the increase of total number of primary school teachers and pupils

enrolled in primary education (classes I to V or classes I to IV) from 1955-56 to 1964-65. Table 6 shows pupils who have completed primary school education before and after independence. These two tables reveal that the expansion of school education and serious drop-out were entwined for nearly two decades after independence. During the Second Five Year Plan (1956-60) period, compulsory education was adopted in many administrative blocks, and “the enrolment in classes I to V rose by nearly 40 percent.” [MHRD, 1964: 39] Consequently, state governments had to increase the number of teachers by adopting various measures in addition to the establishment of new training institutions. For example: United Provinces organized 25 Mobile Training Squads in order to train a large number of teachers needed for the new schools opened by the Government. Ministry of Education also adopted some special schemes, for example, (1) teacher training courses of 8 to 10 weeks’ duration, and (2) a program to relieve the educated unemployed, and under this program, “80,000 teachers and 2,000 social workers had been appointed.” [MHRD, 1961: 2] Following the introduction of Basic Education, the curricula for teacher education had to be changed and state governments also worked on this. For example, Bombay Province introduced the Basic Training syllabus in all primary teacher training institutions. However, “most of the Provinces could not introduce correlation of school subjects with the basic craft to the extent that the Basic System required.” [MHRD, 1952: 73] In addition, the output of qualified teachers from training institutions “failed to keep pace with the huge requirements created by the rapid growth of schools under various new schemes. The employment of a large number of untrained teachers [was] bound to reflect on the standard of teaching.” [MHRD, 1952: 132]

The Central Government itself recognized, even before the First Five Year, that “shortage of personnel and resources could not, however, be removed except on the basis of a long term programme.” [MHRD, 1954: 1] Another difficulty that couldn’t be concealed any more during the Second Five Year Plan period was the big internal disparity in the distribution of trained teachers. “Education in India 1948-49” reported that while Madras and Delhi had more than 90% of trained primary teachers, the percentage was below 10% in Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The percentage of trained teachers for all India level went up to 70.5% by the year 1965-66. However, according to the “Education in India 1965-66,” the disparity was still serious; 99.6% in Delhi and 20.0% in Nagaland.

Table 5: Primary School Teachers and Pupils Enrolled in (1955-1964)

Year	Primary School Teachers	Pupils Enrolled in Primary Schools
1955-56	Non-Basic Schools 675,801	Non-Basic Schools 22,919,734
	Junior-Basic Schools 113,347	Junior-Basic Schools 3,730,459
1960-61	Non-Basic Schools 741,515	Non-Basic Schools 33,631,391
	Junior-Basic Schools 175,606	Junior-Basic Schools 6,501,134
1964-65	Non-Basic Schools 811,377*	Non-Basic Schools 35,789,371
	Junior-Basic Schools 235,270	Junior-Basic Schools 10,669,580

[Sources: MHRD, 1958, 1964, 1969]

* This number includes both trained (622,166) and untrained (288,271).

Table 6: Primary School Students Completed Schooling

Year	Primary School Students Completed Primary Education (%)
1948-49	38.4%
1964-65	39.2%

[Sources: MHRD, 1952:53, 1969:55]

It is a serious contradiction to note that while the Central Government stated that the shortage of school teachers could be removed through a long-term plan, at the same time both Central and State Governments had *only* launched various short-term training for primary teachers and adopted less-trained teachers even though it was necessary to increase the number of primary teachers. Although no 'long term plan' was announced, as a result of diverse measures taken after independence, the percentage of trained teachers in all India increased from 61% (1955-56) to 70.5% at the end of the Third Five Year Plan Period (1965-66). Nevertheless, as Table 6 showed, the drop-out rate from primary schools had remained about 60% since independence. Consequently, the commission known as the Kothari Commission (1964-66)—Dr. D.S. Kothari (1906-1993) a distinguished physicist and astro-physicist,

was chairman of University Grants Commission—was appointed by the Central Government in order to seek new directions in education for national development. The Report of the Commission submitted in 1966 suggested a twelve year schooling structure, and at the same time, the need for decentralization of educational planning down to the district level.

This report spent one whole chapter (Chapter III) on ‘Teacher Status.’ The chapter, not only suggested improvement of teacher’s salary, but also argued for betterment in conditions of work such as minimum facilities in schools, provision of academic freedom of teachers both for better education and for professional growth of teacher. Instead of frequent transfers, the chapter insisted that “teachers should, as far as possible, be localized.” [Government of India, 1966: 50] The report admitted in the Chapter IV (Teacher Education) that the suggestions made in some seminars had not been implemented so far. It further argued that removing the isolation of teacher education, namely, isolation from university life and from neighborhood schools, and concern for teacher training institutions by institutions themselves, was indispensable for “significant improvement in teacher education.” [Government of India, 1966: 68] Some of the important recommendations made by the Kothari Commission report were as follows: (1) Admission qualification for primary teacher training institutions had to be raised to the higher secondary stage, i.e., the completion of 12 years’ schooling. (2) The duration of the training course had to be a minimum of two years. (3) There had to be direct relevance between the theoretical portion of the study and the practical work. (4) In-service education for teachers in every five years of service should be coordinated. (5) Each training institution should guide neighborhood schools and teacher training institution should be “closer to the community.” [Government of India, 1966: 12] Furthermore, the report foresaw that India “[might] take another 20-25 years to ensure that every primary teacher [had] at least ten years of general education.” [Government of India, 1966: 79]

The Central Government resolved the National Policy on Education 1968 (NPE68) based on the recommendations made by the Kothari Commission Report. It was not unreasonable to expect some concrete plans to be announced regarding primary/elementary teacher education since the report spent two chapters on “Teacher Status” and “Teacher Education” issues. As my paper has already argued, the NPE68 admitted that the teacher was the most important factor in the quality of education and for national development. However, instead of articulating a clear plan for how to

train and prepare school teachers, NPE68 stated: “It is on his personal qualities and character, his educational qualifications and professional competence that the success of all educational endeavour must ultimately depend.” [Government of India, 1968: 3] It mentioned the need for improving teachers’ emoluments and added that “teacher education, particularly in-service education, [ought to] receive due emphasis.” [Government of India, 1968: 3] It is obvious that NPE68 couldn’t announce any ‘long-term plan’ for pre-service teacher education as was suggested by the Kothari Commission Report although the policy is well-known for its suggestions, such as, the Three-Language Formula, Work-Experience, the 10+2+3 Schooling Structure and increasing the investment in education to a level of expenditure of 6% of the national income, which would be crucial for Indian education in the future. NPE68 expected that primary/elementary education could make improved endeavors within its structure, in other words, efforts of teachers, administrators, and students would play a key role in creating a national system of education through their dedicated efforts. J.P. Naik argued that this could be appropriate in case of pedagogic reforms within. However, “it does not apply to radical reforms whose impact goes beyond the education system and which have to be accompanied by corresponding social reforms.” [Naik, J.P, 1997: 241] Will teachers be ‘localized’ and ‘closer to the community’ without any long-term plan and a broad-based program for social change and better schooling? NPE68 stated in its last part that the Central Government would undertake programs, and assist State Governments when coordinated action for educational development was called for. The next part of my paper examines how India made efforts for better teacher education until her second educational policy after independence, the National Policy on Education announced in 1986 (NPE86).

3. Teacher education in India from the NPE68 to the NPE86

After independence, India did take some measures to extend primary teacher education. Some States established more teacher training institutions and many employed more teachers even though they were less-trained. However, on the other hand, there was a rapid expansion of enrollment in primary schools. Table 7 shows the distribution of teacher training institutions in the year when the NPE68 was announced. Further examination reveals diversity in teacher education in India, which might be one of the reasons why the NPE68 couldn’t unveil a concrete plan for teacher education. For example, the Union Territory Delhi (now the State of Delhi) had one Basic Teacher Training College, but no other institutions for primary teacher training. The State of Gujarat had 10 Non-Basic Teacher Training schools and 65 Basic Teacher Training

schools, but no college level institutions for teacher education.

Table 7: Teacher Training Institutions in India (1968-69)

Number of Institutions (All India)		States & UTs having Teacher Training Institutions*
Non-Basic College	278	8
Basic Training College	835	18
Non-Basic Training School	94	9
Basic Training School	107	6

[Source: MHRD, 1974: 58, 59, 62, 63]

* There were 28 States and Union Territories in India in 1968-69.

The shortage of school teachers couldn't be improved easily and India continued the previous strategy to increase the number of teachers during the next two Five Year Plan periods. The Fourth Five Year Plan suggested both increasing the output of teacher training institutions and "a large scale of correspondence and short-term courses." [Government of India, 1966: 318] State level efforts showed some progress in teacher training and conditions of teachers in service; for example, a White Paper on Policy on Educational Reconstruction in Maharashtra State reported introduction of a "revision of syllabus at teacher training level by introducing subjects of work experience and community living" [MHRD, 1975: 9-10]. During the Fifth Plan period, the Constitution was amended in 1976, and education became a Concurrent Subject between State Governments and the Central Government. This led to the expectation that a meaningful partnership would be established between the Central and States in managing education. The percentage of trained primary/junior basic school teachers increased to 85.1% by the year 1976-77. Table 8 shows the number of institutions for education in the same year.

As Table 8 shows, institutions for education at below degree level, which were in charge of training primary/elementary school teachers, increased to 1,038 (1976-77) from 201 in the year 1968-69. Yet, in the year 1976-77, out of 31 States and Union Territories (UTs), there were 8 State/UTs that had no below degree level institutions for education, and 7 States/UTs that had no above degree level institutions for education. When the Janata (People's) Government grasped power in 1977, it tried to revise the national policy on education and drafted a new one. It stated its concern for local community participation and co-ordination with schools and community, and the decentralization of

economic planning. The teaching community was expected to be more aware of their role in social reconstruction. Regarding teacher education, the draft stated that “the curriculum of teacher education at the elementary and secondary stage [would] be suitably changed in order to enable the teachers to play their proper role in reforming education.” [MHRD, 1979: 21] However, the Government lost power shortly and the draft was not made public, and hence NPE68 remained as a basic framework for education in India.

Table 8: Institutions for Education (1976-77)

<u>Degree & Above Institutions</u>		<u>Enrolment</u>
Boys	286	31,924
Girls	44	25,267
Total	330	57,191
<u>Below Degree Institutions</u>		<u>Enrolment</u>
Boys	758	63,053
Girls	280	37,706
Total	1,038	100,759

[Source: MHRD, 1981 (Volume I): 56, 71]

There were some suggestions in the Kothari Commission Report (1966) that required strong administrative initiative, for example, raising admission qualification for primary and elementary teacher training institutions to the higher secondary stage, and setting the duration of the training course for primary/elementary teachers at a minimum of two years. There were other suggestions in the report for which careful and attentive preparation was inevitable, for example, establishing a direct relevance between the theoretical portion of the study and its practical aspects, i.e., improving quality of the course and syllabus. There was one other suggestion that required cooperation not only from the teachers’ community but also from the local community, that is to say, setting up teacher training/education in a decentralized manner. The latter could be done, logically, through administrative regulation; however, it needed community participation to be successful. Taking what this paper has reviewed so far into account, none of these suggestions could be implemented within a short period or time.

Although its pace for reorganizing teacher education was rather slow, in the 1970s the Central Government took some positive steps to train school teachers. The National

Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), which in 1993 became a statutory body by an Act of Parliament, was established in 1973 and started efforts to realize planned and coordinated development of a teacher education system at an all-India level. NCTE granted accreditation to teacher training institutions and examined their quality. An NCTE approach paper in 1976 stated that teacher education had to meet with the needs of States and the local communities. What was the diversity in teacher education in the 1970s? According to the Second National Survey of Teacher Education at Elementary Level (1971-72), the minimum qualification for admission to primary/elementary teacher training institutions varied from Class VIII pass to higher secondary (XII) pass. Hence, there had to be flexibility in preparing teacher training curriculum at the Central level. Followed by seminars and workshops jointly held with a University Grants Commission (UGC) Panel, State Boards of Teacher Education and other experts in Education, a National Conference on Teacher Education was held at New Delhi in 1977. Consequently, Teacher Education Curriculum – A Framework 1978 was published in 1978 by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), which was an apex resource organization set up to assist and advise the Central and State Governments on school education.

The Framework admitted that although nomenclatures for teacher education had changed in the past, the “system in practice [had], by and large, remained unchanged,” [NCERT, 1978: 1] and provided student-teachers with very little awareness of the role of education in society. It further argued that because of India’s diversity, a flexible curriculum had to be developed. When this Framework was compiled, admission to the primary teacher training courses was not yet unified. Therefore, the Framework suggested 5 types of primary teacher training programs having the following basic structure: (1) Pedagogical Theory (20% of the course), (2) Working with the Community (20% of the course), and (3) Content-cum Methodology and practice teaching including related practical work (60% of the course). The Pedagogical theory in the Framework included teacher and education in the emerging Indian society, child psychology, and special courses according to needs and facilities available. Working with the community comprised of work situations related to teacher education, environmental studies, work experience and health/physical education and recreational activities. Content-cum methodology and practice teaching consisted of a core training program package, language, mathematics, environmental studies I (Science), environmental studies II (Social Study), work experience and art, health and physical education and recreational activities, and related practical work. The Framework stated that “the

teacher [was] supposed to look after the total development of the personality of the child” [NCERT, 1978: 13], while the earlier curriculum didn’t concern itself with what was important to stimulate the socio-emotional and moral development of the child.

The number of teachers actually increased by 1980-81 as is shown in the Table 9, but appointing women teachers, specified as one necessary factor for UEE by the Education Commission Report 1966 was not quite successful. Qualitative improvement had been repeatedly stated in annual government publications, but “at the administrative level, expansion continued to be the first priority; and even conceptually, programmes of qualitative improvement were ranked lower.” [Naik, J.P., 1997: 202] Table 10, shows high drop-out rates both at Class V and Class VIII, indicates that qualitative problems in school education had not yet effectively improved since independence until the end of the 1970s. Even more than a decade after the Kothari Commission Report and NPE68, the reported drop-out rate was more than 60% at the fifth standard. From this it could be logically inferred that school education was not yet successful. On the other hand, Table 11 shows rapid growth of tertiary education in India after independence. How come the number of students in higher education expanded three times more, in the same period, when nearly 60% of primary school pupils left schools without completing their 4 or 5 years of primary education? As a result of this distorted expansion of higher education, by the beginning of 1980s, India’s economic and technical development had already got to a stage that required a serious effort to ensure “the fruits of change reach[ed] all sections,” [Aggrawal, J.C.: 345] and education was supposed to a necessary measure to realize this goal.

Table 9: Teachers by Type of Schools from 1970 to 1980 ('000)

Year	Lower Primary		Upper Primary	
1970-71	Male	835	Male	463
	Female	225	Female	175
	Total	1,060	Total	638
1975-76	Male	955	Male	554
	Female	283	Female	224
	Total	1,248	Total	638
1980-81	Male	1,021	Male	598
	Female	342	Female	253
	Total	1,363	Total	851

[Source: NCERT, 2003: 143]

Table 10: Drop-out Percentage in Classes V and VIII (1946-1978)

Year	Class V Drop-out	Class VIII Drop-out
1946-47	68.2%	87.5%
1950-51	72.7%	87.0%
1965-66	70.1%	84.6%
1970-71	67.0%	77.9%
1975-76	62.8%	77.6%
1978-79	60.4%	76.7%

[Source: Government of India, 1985: 18]

Table 11: Expansion of School Education (Primary vs. Tertiary)

Year	Pupils in Primary Schools	Students in Tertiary Education
1948-49	12,854,498	272,258
1964-65	35,789,301	1,743,251
Rate of Expansion	2.78 times	6.40 times

[Source: MHRD, 1952: 49 / MHRD, 1969: 193]

Accordingly, teacher related problems that had been revealed even during the raj and especially from early 1960s, turned out to be problems that couldn't be ignored anymore. As such, by the beginning of 1980s, the Central Government organized a National Commission on Teachers (I) in 1983. The commission presented its report, The Teacher and Society in 1985 after intensive review on teachers' issues. The report observed that the average teacher's perception of his role and responsibility was concerned with his own immediate tasks, and insisted that "it [was] important the administration of the foundation be suitably decentralized to respond promptly and more effectively to the welfare needs of teachers." [Government of India, 1985: 33] The report argued that "teachers' status [was] a complex sociological concept," [Government of India, 1985: 25] and suggested that Central and the State Governments must renew the pay scale of school teachers. It further argued that a two year training course after 12 years' schooling was appropriate for primary/elementary teacher training.

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi (1984-89) pledged that a new educational policy would be prepared, and for this purpose, an appraisal of Indian education system was undertaken by the Ministry of Education. Accordingly, the Central Government published a document as a preparation for a new policy on education. This document,

Challenge of Education – a policy perspective (1985), stated that an analysis of the period after independence period revealed that desired improvements had not materialized because of the lack of resources and called for measures to restructure education. Concerning teacher education, it stated that much of teacher education was irrelevant to contemporary requirements. It is indeed quite surprising to read the following passage in the report published nearly four decades after independence: “So much [was] expected of the teacher; yet teaching [had become] the last choice in the job market.” [Government of India, 1985: 55] The Central Government announced its second educational policy after independence in 1986 (NPE86), together with the detailed Programme of Action 1986 (POA86) for a smooth implementation of the policy. NPE86 stated that the common school system of the 10+2+3 structure that had been suggested by NPE68 was accepted by most of States. For further improvement and introducing a ‘radical reconstruction’ of the education system, NPE86 insisted on a common core in the curricular and that the Minimum Level of Learning (MLL) ought to be prescribed. This policy is known for its schemes, for example, providing a minimum teaching facility for all the schools in India (Operation Blackboard), and further expansion of Non-Formal Education and adult education. The policy clearly stated that one of the top priorities for the implementation of the schemes and other plans articulated in it was the decentralization of management in education. NPE86 is, when evaluated from a positive standpoint, a corpus of past suggestions, and when considered from a negative view point, a miscellany of unsolved past problems. A new dimension of this policy was that it was accompanied by a 204 pages of document, the POA86 which aimed at providing “an indication of the nature of actions which [would] be needed in order to implement the directions of the Policy.” [Government of India, 1986 (A): ii]

How did NPE86 state that teacher education had been one of the most serious un-solved problems on the Indian educational scene? It insisted that the status of the teacher reflected the socio-cultural ethos of a society. The POA86 argued that teacher education was a continuous process and its pre-service and in-service components were inseparable. It further stated that “as the first step, the system of teacher education [would] be overhauled.” [Government of India, 1986 (A): 26] Consequently, the establishment of the District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET), as a Central scheme, was announced. The DIET system was planned to have the “capability to organize pre-service and in-service courses for elementary school teachers and for the personnel working in non-formal and adult education.” [Government of India, 1986(B):

26] It further emphasized “decentralization and the creation of a spirit of autonomy for educational institutions” [Government of India, 1986 (B): 26] as one of the important factors of the management of education. By the time when NPE86 was compiled, Indian education system had already become too vast to be supported only by national and State level agencies. Therefore, as was stated in the Guideline “a third – district level – tier to the support system” [MHRD, 1989: 3] was deemed necessary, and the DIET system was expected to work as one of the “network arrangements” [Government of India, 1989(B): 26] in the Indian education. The previous policy (NPE68) emphasized that a teacher’s personal competence was the most important factor for education, but UEE couldn’t be achieved as planned within the time NPE86 was announced. On the contrary, NPE86 stressed structural changes in the teacher education framework, although teachers were still supposed to play an important role in education. Did the envisaged improvement in primary/elementary teacher education, especially after independence, work out smoothly and promptly after the announcement of NPE86?

4. Conclusion – For future expansion with qualitative improvement

The implementation of the DIET system began in 1987, and a total number of 216 DIETs in the country had already been established by 1989. Although the Guideline suggested seven departments at each DIET including a department for two years’ pre-service teacher training course after 12 years of schooling, when circumstances in a district so required, a DIET was able to start with some of the seven departments. Statistics show that education in India made some progress: The Fifth All India Education Survey by NCERT (1986) found that, by the year 1986-86, the gross enrolment ratio (GER) had moved up to total 93.3% for primary grades I to V, even though there was still gender disparity, 106.4% for boys and 79.8% for girls. GER in upper primary classes (VI to VIII) was still not high enough, but reached total 48.5% in the same year (60.6% for boys and 48.5% for girls). Even in rural areas, “51.16% of the rural habitations [were] served by primary schools/sections within the habitation, 83.82% up to 1km, and 94.65% up to 2 kms.” [NCERT, 1993: 67] In the year 1986-87, 86.45% of primary teachers were trained teachers.

Nevertheless, the problem of drop-outs from the school system continued to be serious; out of 14.08 million boys and 9.84 million girls admitted in Grade I in the year 1984-85, “56.75 per cent boys and 52.03 percent girls dropped out from the education system before reaching Grade V” by the year 1988-89.” [Mehta, Arun. 1995: 146] The National

Front Government that came to power in 1989 carried out a review of NPE86 and published the report, Towards an Enlightened and Humane Society in 1990. This report found that “out of 101 DIETs sanctioned during the year 1987-77 and 114 sanctioned during 1988-89, only 70 and 20 respectively [had] become operational/semi-operational.” [Government of India, 1990: 314] Furthermore, when NCTE reviewed the admission procedure for institutions for teacher education in 1988, there were still some states which accepted Class X pass students to primary teacher training institutions, and the duration of the training varied one to two years, although NPE86 suggested a 2 years’ course after 12 years’ of schooling. NCTE stated that “most of the States [were] in the process of switching over” [NCTE, 1989: 2] to the system suggested in 1978, even 10 years after the first teacher education curriculum was published by NCERT.

The surprising growth of total population, the rapid expansion of school education, remaining high drop-out rates, the huge number of out-of-school children who have been ‘out of the school system,’ and slow progress of the improvement of teacher training were problems interwoven with Indian education, and these were hurdles that India had to tackle in the 1990s. Another big tide that influenced India during the last decade of the 20th century, which this paper didn’t cover, was the ‘Education for All (EFA) Declaration’ announced by the World Conference on Education for All held in 1990 at Jomtien, Thailand. The member countries and international agencies were asked to be responsible for taking “effective steps for achieving EFA by the year 2000.” [NIEPA, 2000: 7] Schools, institutions, and communities in India couldn’t be foreign to this trend. The next question that needs to be asked is: How was teacher education, which was in the process of ‘switching over’ at the end of the 1980s, re-arranged in the complicated circumstances and how effectively did the newly arranged system work towards the twin goals of UEE and EFA?

References

- Aggrawal, J.C. Land marks in the History of Modern Indian Education. Delhi: Vikas, 1993.
- Basu, Anathnath (Ed.). Reports on the State of Education in Bengal 1835 & 1838 by William Adam. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1941.
- Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE). “Post-War Educational Development in India.” Delhi: Bureau of Education India, 1944. (Sargent Report)

- Ghosh, Suresh C. The History of Education in Modern India 1757-1998. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2000.
- Government of India. "Selections from the Records of the Government of India - A Collection of Despatches from the Home Government on the Subject of Education in India 1854 to 1868." Home Department. No. 76. Calcutta: Office of Superintendent Government Printing, 1870. (Woods' Despatch)
- . "Report of the Indian Education Commission, dated 3 February 1882." Calcutta: Indian Education Commission, Government of India, 1883. (Hunter Commission Report)
- . "Indian Educational Policy 1904." Calcutta: Superintendent, Government Printing, 1904.
- . "Indian Educational Policy 1913." Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1913.
- . "Interim Report of the Indian Statutory Commission – Review of Growth of Education in British India by the Auxiliary Committee Appointed by the Commission." Indian Statutory Commission. London: University of London Institute of Education, 1929. (Hartog Committee Report).
- . "Review of the First Five Year Plan." New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1957.
- . Planning Commission. "Fourth Five Year Plan – A Draft Outline." New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1966.
- . National Commission on Teachers – I, 1983-85. "The Teacher and Society – Report On National Commission on Teachers – I." New Delhi: National Commission on Teachers – I, 1983-85.
- . "Towards and Enlightened and Humane Society." New Delhi: Committee for Review of National Policy on Education (1986), 1990.
- Kumar, Krishna. Political Agenda of Education. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Minute on Indian Education 1835."
<http://www.english.ucsb.edu/faculty/rraley/research/english/macaulay.html>
- Mehta, Arun C. Education for All: Myth and Reality. Delhi: Kanishka, 1995.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) "Education in India 1947-48," New Delhi: Government of India, 1951.
- . "Education in India 1948-49." New Delhi: Government of India, 1952.
- . "Education in India 1949-50, Vol.1 – Report." New Delhi: Government of India, 1954.
- . "Education in India 1950-51, Vol.1 – Report." New Delhi: Government of India, 1955.

- . “Education in India 1954-55, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1957.
- . “Education in India 1955-56, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1958.
- . “Education in India 1957-58, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1961.
- . “Education in India 1960-61, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1964.
- . “Education and National Development: “Report of the Education Commission 1964-66,” New Delhi, 1966. (Kothari Commission report)
- . “National Policy on Education 1968.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1968.
- . “Education in India 1964-65, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1969.
- . “Education in India 1968-69, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1974.
- . “Education in India 1969-70, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1975.
- . “Draft National Policy on Education 1979.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1979.
- . “Education in India 1976-77, Vol.1 – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1981.
- . “Challenge of Education – A Policy Perspective.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1985.
- . “Programme of Action 1986.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1986(A).
- . “National Policy on Education 1986.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1986(B).
- . “District Institutes of Education and Training – Guidelines.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1989.
- Mukerji, S.N. (Ed.) Education of Teachers in India. Vol. I. Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1968.
- Naik, J.P. Elementary Education in India – The Unfinished Business. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1966.
- . The Education Commission and After. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing, 1997.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). “Compendium of Educational Statistics (School Education),” New Delhi: NCERT, 2003.
- . Usha Nayar (Ed.) “Universal Primary Education of Rural Girls in India,” New Delhi: NCERT, 1993.

- . “Teacher Education Curriculum – A Framework,” New Delhi: NCTE, 1978.
- National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). “Admission Procedure for Teacher Education Institutions.” New Delhi: NCTE, 1989.
- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). “Year 2000 Assessment, Education for All – India,” New Delhi: NEAPA and Government of India, 2000.
- Parulekar, R.V. (Ed.). Survey of Indigenous Education in the Province of Bombay (1820-1830) Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1951.

日本語標題および日本語要旨

インドの初等教員養成：1980年代までの拡張と停滞への一考察

英国植民地政府がインドで 1854 年に導入した近代的学校教育は、19 世紀後半に初等教育就学者の増加をみた後、内在する質的問題と教員不足とから順調な発展をみせぬまま独立 (1947 年) を迎えた。独立後の連邦政府は、初等教育の質的改善の必要を認識しながらも初等教員を短期間で養成するなどの方策をもって初等教育就学者の急増に対処した。本稿はこれらの独立後に持ち越された問題点を指摘し、さらに 1970 年代から独立後二度目の「国家教育政策決議 (1986 年)」に至るまでに、連邦政府が国家の発展を期して、インドの持つ多様性を活かしながら地方分権化を実現した初等教員養成の全国の実施へ向けて行った改革を検討した。また、今後進めなければならない 1990 年代以降の教育政策の成否の実証的研究の課題にも触れた考察である。