

独立後のインドの初等教育及び初等教員養成

赤井 ひさ子  
東海大学福岡短期大学

(受付：2007年9月27日)  
(受理：2008年2月4日)

**Elementary Education and Elementary Teacher Education  
in India after Independence**

By

Hisako Akai

## 独立後のインドの初等教育と初等教員養成

赤井 ひさ子

東海大学福岡短期大学

(受付：2007年9月27日)

(受理：2008年2月4日)

### **Elementary Education and Elementary Teacher Education in India after Independence**

By

Hisako Akai

#### Abstract

The increase in number of certified, primary/elementary teachers after independence had not been achieved by rigorous, long-term plans for teacher education, but through various short-term training programmes organized on an ad-hoc basis by State Governments in response to the rapid expansion of school education. National Policy on Education 1986 (NPE86) envisaged that the system of teacher education would be overhauled and stated that the District Institute of Education and Training (DIET) be established as one pillar of decentralized planning to achieve Universalization of Elementary Education (UEE). The 1990s saw a lot of projects for UEE like District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) which also involved district-based teacher preparation. Primary/elementary teacher education in India is now facing a new phase that requires not only quantitative expansion, but also qualitative re-arrangement so that teachers can be catalysts for achieving UEE.

**Key words:** Universalization of elementary education in India (UEE), Teacher education, District Institute of Education and Training (DIET), National Policy on Education 1986

#### 1. Introduction

India has “achieved multifaceted socio-economic progress” [Government of India, 2006: 1] after its independence in 1947, for example, it is “now self-sufficient in agricultural production” [Government of India, 2006: 1] and is the sixth nation to have ventured into outer space. At the same time, although the results of Census 2001 revealed that there had been an increase in literacy, yet “the literacy rate in the country is 64.84 per cent, 75.26 for males and 53.67 for females.”

[Government of India, 2006: 9] National Policy on Education 1968, (NPE68), the first nationally declared educational policy after independence, stated that “of all the factors which determine the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the teacher [was] undoubtedly the most important.” [MHRD, 1968: 3] National Policy on Education 1986 (NPE86), the second national level educational policy, announced that “District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET) [would] be established with 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” [MHRD, 1986: 26]

This paper, using documents compiled by governments and publications by scholars/researchers concerned with Indian education, studies elementary education and elementary teacher education in India after independence, considers contemporary issues and the need for examining the efficacy of teacher education. This paper focuses on policies in the context of primary and elementary teacher education, though not on them per se, or how they have influenced other sectors of the Indian economy. The fundamental rationale for this paper is that school teachers are a key asset in the learning process in the school system. This has been reiterated in reports prepared by the Government of India.

## 2. Education in India after independence

Among all the factors that have contributed to the progress after independence, education is one indispensable indicator. In India, the objectives of education were redefined after independence “so as to provide the people with an adequate system of education that would suit the aspirations and needs of the country.” [MHRD, 1952: 1] Before independence, “over 85 per cent of her population [was] still illiterate”. [Government of India, 1944: 6] Since independence, however, India has showed steady progress in literacy and number of schools as is shown in Table 1. The latest Census 2001 defined “a person aged seven and above, who can both read and write with understanding in any language” [Government of India, 2006: 8] as literate. The progress showed in Table 1 deserves fair appreciation. Nevertheless, India has not yet achieved UEE as stated in Article 45 of the Indian Constitution promulgated in 1950, that is, the State shall endeavor to provide all the children with free and compulsory elementary education within 10 years. In the Constitution, “education was made a State subject according to entry 11 of List II – State List of the Seventh Schedule.” [Biswas, A & Aggrawal J.C., 1972: 1] In addition to the announcement in the Constitution, India set up a National Planning Commission that reported to the Prime Minister of India on the formulation of national model of planning in 1950, and the implementation of the First Five Year Plan (1951-1955), that regarded education as one of the important components of the field of social services. The agencies responsible for the administration and control of primary education are State Governments, Local bodies, and private bodies that may be aided or unaided. The actual and direct responsibility rests, in most States, with the local bodies, i.e., district boards in the rural areas and municipal cooperation in towns and cities.

Providing people with compulsory school education “has been a part and parcel of the whole civilized world,” [Dash, M. 2000:6] however, projects for national development that started “in the post-war period were faced with financial difficulties.” [Government of India, 1957: 1] Nevertheless, school education showed progress. In the year 1948-49, enrolment in primary and secondary schools “increased by 13.8 and 10.7 per cent respectively, the corresponding figures for the previous year being 10.2 and 11.8 percent respectively.” [MHRD, 1952: 19] Even so, at an all-India level wastage at primary stage in the same year was 61.6 per cent, and “the greatest wastage occurred between classes I and II.” [MHRD, 1952: 52-53] Furthermore, the breakdown of this national level wastage rate revealed that there was a big disparity, for example, 64.7% of wastage at primary stage in Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) and 32.3% of wastage at primary stage in Delhi. One of the administrative difficulties that India had to tackle after independence was that “it [had] not been possible to adopt a uniform system of Primary Education, with the result that the structure of the Primary stage [differed] to some extent from Province to Province” [MHRD, 1952: 43] under the raj.

Table 1: Literacy rate and number of schools in India (1951-2001)

Census Year	Literacy rate (%)			Number of schools	
	Persons	Males	Females	Primary	Upper Primary
1951	18.33	27.16	8.86	215,036	14,576
1961	28.31	40.40	15.34	351,530	55,915
1971	34.45	45.95	21.97	417,473	93,665
1981	43.57	56.37	29.75	503,762	122,377
1991	52.21	64.13	39.29	566,744	155,926
2001	64.84	75.26	56.67	641,695*	198,004**

Sources: Government of India 2007: 15. NIEPA, 2000a: 6. MHRD, 2001: 21

\* This number is the number of primary schools in 1999-2000.

\*\* This number is the number of upper primary schools in 1999-2000.

Notes:

1. Literacy rate for 1951, 1961, and 1971 as per the Census relate to population aged five years and above. The rates for the 1981, 1991, and 2001 Censuses relate to the population aged seven years and above.
2. The 1981 literacy rates exclude Assam where the 1981 Census could not be conducted.
3. The 1991 literacy rates exclude Jammu and Kashmir where the 1991 Census could not be conducted due to disturbed conditions.

The annual publication on education (1959-60) stated that “introduction of universal education for girls of the age-group 6-11, like that for boys” [MHRD, 1962: 266] had to be one of the targets in the Third Five Year Plan (1961-65), that is to say, gender disparity was recognized as an important issue. In addition, the Central Government’s report on education (1964-65) stated that “the spread

of education among the weaker sections of society is an essential pre-requisite to the all-round development, --- particularly of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes.” [MHRD, 1969: 450] In order “to advise the Central Government on the national pattern of education and on the general principles and policies for the development of education at all stages and in all aspects,” [MHRD, 1966: Foreword] the Government of India appointed an Education Commission (1964-66) in 1964. The following Table 2 quoted from the Report of the Education Commission 1964-66 (1966), indicates that the very large total enrolments in class I happened “partly because of the large stagnation in this class and partly because about one-third to one-half of the total wastage at the primary stage occur[ed] at the end of this class only.” [MHRD, 1966: 154] The first National Policy on Education 1968 after independence (NPE68) based on the recommendation of the Education Commission (1964-66) was announced in 1968. After the adoption of NPE68, there had been a significant expansion in educational facilities, and “more than 90% of the country’s rural habitations [had] schooling facilities within a radius of one kilometer” [Government of India, 1986: 2] by the middle of the 1980s. Table 3 and Table 4 show educational composition of both rural and urban labor force from the 1970s to the beginning of the 1990s. As stated in the notes below the tables, the data for 1972-73, 1977-78, 1983 and after were based on different population estimates, however, it could be observed that gender disparity regarding primary level education had slowly become smaller both in rural and urban areas, although it still seriously wide. The Census of India, conducted once in 10 years, provides some definitions of each item for the survey. For example, in the Census for 2001, an urban area is a zone that has a minimum population of 5,000 and a population density of at least 400 persons er sq. km. The definition in subsequent Census changes, for example, and urban area is a minimum population of 4,000 in the Census for 1991. This is in keeping with demographic changes. In 1976, “through a Constitutional amendment, education became the joint responsibility of the Central and state governments.” [Government of India, 1987: 67] This amendment made it possible for the Central Government to take a greater role in providing education. From the Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85), education, which had been one of the components of social service, “has been considered to be pivotal in the social and economic development of the country through development of human resources.” [Government of India, 1987: 68]

Table 2: Enrolment in Classes I to VIII (1946-47 to 1965-66)

Year	Class-wise Enrolment (in 000's)							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
1946-47	3,570 (100.0)	2,525 (70.7)	1,821 (51.0)	1,404 (39.3)	1,137 (31.8)	648 (18.1)	523 (14.6)	448 (12.5)
1950-51	6,948 (100.0)	4,332 (62.3)	3,353 (48.3)	2,623 (37.8)	1,898 (27.3)	1,246 (17.9)	1,023 (14.7)	851 (12.2)
1955-56	9,958 (100.0)	5,523 (55.5)	4,067 (40.8)	3,216 (32.3)	2,403 (24.1)	1,698 (17.1)	1,436 (14.4)	1,160 (11.6)

1960-61	13,391 (100.0)	7,513 (56.1)	5,886 (44.0)	4,593 (34.3)	3,611 (27.0)	2,727 (20.4)	2,220 (16.6)	1,758 (13.1)
1965-66	18,843 (100.0)	10,973 (58.2)	8,875 (47.1)	6,924 (36.7)	5,522 (29.3)	4,453 (23.6)	3,680 (19.5)	2,900 (15.4)

Source: MHRD, 1966: 155

Note: Figures within brackets indicate the percentage of enrolment in each class to the enrolment in class I of the same year.

By the middle of the 1980s, problems such as gender disparity, urban and rural disparity had become quite obvious impediments in advancing education, and providing all children with equal opportunity for education that had been recognized as essential requirement for national development. Consequently, National Policy on Education 1986, (NPE86) emphasized that the national system of education gave “equal opportunity to all not only in access, but also in the conditions for success,” [MHRD, 1986: 4] and “decentralization” [MHRD, 1986: 26] of the management of education. To this end, a Programme of Action 1986 (POA86) for the smooth implementation of the second policy, was announced in 1986. Regardless of some of the above efforts, “69 per cent of females and 43 percent of males aged six and above in rural areas had never enrolled in any educational institution as against 36 and 17 per cent in urban areas” [Mehta, A.C., 1995: 42] in the year 1986-87. Concerning qualitative aspects, “of those discontinued education (all levels), about 26.08 per cent left the education because of that they were not interested in it and 17.37 and 18.05 percent due to failures and economic reasons” [Mehta, A.C., 1995: 42] in the same year. In order to catch up with changing circumstances in society, National Policy on Education 1986 with Modifications Undertaken in 1992 (NPE92) and Programme of Action 1992 (POA92) was tabled in Parliament in 1992. POA92 “resolve[d] to ensure free and compulsory education of satisfactory quality to all children up to 14 years of age” [Government of India, 1994: 87] before the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Table 3: Educational Composition of Rural Labor Force (1972-1993)

Educational Level	<u>1972-73</u>		<u>1977-78</u>		<u>1983</u>		<u>1987-88</u>		<u>1993-94</u>	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Illiterate	61.1	91.6	55.5	88.1	52.1	86.2	48.3	82.3	43.2	78.0
Literate but up to primary	29.0	7.1	30.8	9.1	29.2	10.2	29.6	12.0	28.2	14.2
Middle	6.3	0.8	8.5	1.6	10.8	2.1	11.6	3.2	13.9	4.4
Secondary	3.1	0.4	4.7	1.0	6.4	1.2	8.4	2.0	11.3	2.8
Graduate &										

above	0.5 0.1	1.0 0.2	1.5 0.3	2.1 0.4	2.8 0.6
Total (%)	100.0 100.0	100.0 100.0	100.0 100.0	100.0 100.0	100.0 100.0

Source: NCERT, 2003: 21

Note: Data for 1972-73 and 1977-78 included the population aged five years and above while data for 1983 and after included the population aged 15 years and above. Total may not add to hundred because of missing values and rounding of figures.

Table 4: Educational Composition of Urban Labor Force (1972-1993)

Educational Level	<u>1972-73</u>		<u>1977-78</u>		<u>1983</u>		<u>1987-88</u>		<u>1993-94</u>	
	Male	Female								
Illiterate	24.8	67.4	22.1	58.2	21.7	56.5	19.6	51.8	17.8	45.9
Literate but up to primary	37.2	16.5	33.6	17.9	30.1	17.5	30.5	19.0	25.3	19.0
Middle	15.0	4.0	17.2	6.7	18.1	6.3	16.4	7.3	17.6	8.9
Secondary	16.6	8.0	18.4	10.8	19.9	11.6	21.8	12.3	24.7	14.0
Graduate & above	6.4	4.1	8.7	6.4	10.1	8.0	11.7	9.6	14.5	12.2
Total (%)	100.0 100.0									

Source: NCERT, 2003: 22

Note: Data for 1972-73 and 1977-78 included the population aged five years and above while data for 1983 and after included the population aged 15 years and above. Total may not add to hundred because of missing values and rounding of figures.

Besides efforts made by Indian Central and State Governments, international organizations, like United Nations Educational Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), paid attention to primary/elementary education in newly developed countries from the 1960s. A world forum, the Jomtien Conference in Thailand declared 'Education For All' (EFA) in 1990, focused on setting up precise deadlines and a detailed strategy for EFA. Consequently, Government of India accepted external aid for educational development, and external assistance on a massive scale flowed into India in the 1990s. "The country saw the emergence of a large multi-state programme for EFA under the banner of the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)" [Govinda, R, 2002: 2] as a centrally sponsored scheme, and there were some other programmes such as United Nations Development Programme that took the form of Additional Central Assistance to the states

governments. Those externally funded projects carried out a good volume of research “that [had] established the intrinsic and instrumental importance of literacy and elementary education in achieving a number of other social and developmental goals,” [Mehrotra, S., et al, 2005: 166] and chose elementary education as the main focus of their activities. By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, India, at the national level, had achieved almost universal enrolment as indicated by the gross enrolment ratios at primary level (Classes I to V). Dropout rates had been declined between 1991 and 1999, especially, “between 1991 and 1995 the dropout rate for girls declined from about 48 percent to 38 per cent at primary stage.” [Govinda, R., 2002: 4] After NPE86, National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) released the In-service Teacher Education Package (Vol. 1) for primary school teachers in 1988, so that each state could refer to the improvement of in-service teacher education through under state level institutions, such as, District Institute of Education and Training (DIET). The establishment of the DIET was announced by NPE86. A DIET in the district also conducts pre-service teacher education following the new teacher education curricula suggested by National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE). These efforts together with DPEP and other externally funded educational initiatives are supposed to have contributed to the decline of dropouts in primary school education in the 1990s. However, when “examined against participation of age-specific population, there [was] still a sizeable gap in the net enrolment ratios.” [Govinda, R., 2002: 3] Further, regarding the quality of elementary education, the Baseline Assessment Surveys (BAS) and Mid-term Assessment Surveys (MAS) conducted by the National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in 1994 and 1997 in some of the project districts of the DPEP showed the results that were “not very encouraging, especially those at the end of three or four years of primary schooling.” [Mehrotra, S., et al., 2005: 84]

Table 5 shows national level gross enrollment ratio for the years 1991 and 1997, which shows a slight improvement in girls’ enrolment at primary level.

Table 5: Gross Enrollment Ratio – National (1991 and 1997)

Year	I-V Primary (6-11 years)			V-VIII Upper Primary (11-14 years)		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1991	98.12	75.89	87.28	79.82	54.62	67.87
1997	98.50	81.50	90.30	66.50	49.50	58.50

Source: NIEPA, 2000: 35

Note: These figures don’t entirely match with the figures in the ‘Selected Educational Statistics’ published by Government of India since the base population size used are different.

One of the reasons for the decline (see Table 5) at the upper primary level was that children were not enrolled precisely at the official age specified by the State, and this age varied from one State to another. Also, “this could be lack of school readiness and the fact that the number of the first generation learners [was] very large in educationally backward State.” [NIEPA, 2000: 35] Year 2000

Assessment: Education for ALL – India published by National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) further offered the following information on inter-state disparity as follows [NIEPA, 2000: 37]: The State having the highest gross enrollment ratio in the year 1997-98 was Gujarat (119.9% for boys and 114.5% for girls, and total 117.6%), and the State having the lowest gross enrollment ratio in the same year was Uttar Pradesh (74.1% for boys and 49.0% for girls, and total 49.0%). Gross enrollment ratio for classes I to V is calculated by the numerical formula of Total Enrolment in Grades I to V divided by Population of age 6 to 11 years. The State having the highest net enrollment ratio in 1997 was Assam (102.5% for boys and 94.2% for girls, and total 98.4%) and the state having the lowest net enrollment ratio was Uttar Pradesh (56.0% for boys and 36.4% for girls, and total 46.8%). In India, the population growth during the last few decades [had] been high, and comparison with the total population in the school-going age showed that “several million children [were] still outside the fold of ‘primary schooling’ at the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century.” [NIEPA, 2000: 34] The provision of access to school is not enough for achieving UEE, and children in school must complete the full cycle of good quality of primary education. POA92, which suggested decentralizing planning and management of education, further explained that “decentralization impli[ed] democratic participation by elected representatives of the people in decision-making at the district, sub-district and Panchayat levels.” [MHRD, 1992b: 112] Hence, it is logical to assume that effective decentralization having preferable partnership between Central and States, and appropriate planning that covers a certain period of time are essential factors in order to realize UEE. “Absence of a long-term plan in education is perhaps one of the main source of ills of the system.” [Tilak, Jandhyala B.J., 2003: 48]

### 3. Elementary teacher education in India after independence

Teachers are those who convey knowledge. Even though the advancement of technology drastically changed our lives, “the fundamental requirement of any comprehensive development in the educational system is the provision of an adequate establishment of teachers and of the necessary institutions for training them.” [MHRD, 1944: 47] Moreover, NPE68 advocated further significance of school teachers tutoring at Indian schools. It asserted that the success of all educational efforts ultimately depended on teachers’ “personal qualities and character, his educational qualifications and professional competence.” [MHRD: 2-3] The percentage of children in primary classes to those of school going age in 1950-51 was 41.2%. [Government of India, 1955:45] It was, hence, quite natural to assume that India would need more schools, and more school teachers having appropriate competence. During the year 1948-49, most of the State Governments accepted ‘Basic Education’ which was originally suggested by Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948). Hence, each State Government had to train two different types of primary school teachers, i.e., teachers for ordinary primary schools and teachers who work with Basic Schools conducting Basic Education which had been established after the suggestion of M.K. Gandhi. The duration of training courses and the minimum qualification for admission for training institution varied from state to state. In the year 1950-51, there were 782 teacher training institutions

including institutions for Basic School teachers, and 70,063 students were enrolled. [Government of India, 1955: 146] Since the rate at which teachers were trained was too slow to meet their full demand, State Governments adopted various strategies to increase the number of school teachers necessary, for example, “Mobile Training Squads were organized to visit village schools and give an intensive practical training to young teachers in the environment in which they were living and working.” [MHRD, 1952: 144] In addition to this, State Governments had to employ a large number of untrained teachers after independence, which “reflect[ed] on the standard of teaching.” [MHRD, 1952, 132] At the same time, the Central Government admitted that “shortage of personnel and resources could not, however, be removed except on the basis of a long term programme.” [MHRD, 1955: 1]

Table 6 shows the expansion of primary teacher education and primary school education during the first three Five Year Plan periods. From the year 1964-65 a new definition was adopted for classifying an education institution. All institutions at which the minimum admission qualification was less than matriculation was defined as school.

Table 6: Primary Teacher Education until the Third Five Year Plan Period

Year	Teacher training Institutions	Teacher trainees	Primary School Teachers	Pupils Enrolled in Primary Schools
1955-56	Non-Basic 930	Non-Basic 90,914	Non-Basic 675,801	Non-Basic 24,511,331
	Basic Training 520	Basic 55,091	Junior-Basic 113,347	Junior-Basic 3,730,459
1960-61	Non-Basic 1,138	Non-Basic 122,682	Non-Basic 741,515	Non-Basic 33,631,391
	Basic Training 843	Basic 104,493	Junior-Basic 175,606	Junior-Basic 6,501,134
1964-65	<u>School Level</u> Non-Basic 630*	Non-Basic 56,960	Non-Basic 811,337***	Non-Basic 35,789,371
	Basic Training 448	Basic 55,480*	Junior-Basic 235,270	Junior-Basic 10,669,580

Source: MHRD, 1958, 1964, and 1969

\* Due to the statistical change, the number decreased from 1,137 (1963-64).

\*\* Because of the statistical change, the number decreased from 133,522 (1963-64).

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

All the teachers teaching at primary stage in the year were 1,164,573.

If the increase of ‘trained and certified’ teachers was accompanied by the increase of successful completion of primary/elementary school education, the measures taken so far could be successful. However, percentage of primary school pupils that completed primary education was 38.4% (1948-49) and 39.2% (1864-65) respectively. It is regrettable that after independence, whenever additional school teachers were needed, the main response was organizing some short-term training programmes so that teachers could be promptly ‘certified.’ The Education Commission Report (1964-66), which aimed at advising educational development at all stages, devoted one whole chapter (Chapter III) to ‘Teacher Status,’ made specific recommendations in how to improve teacher education: (1) Admission qualification for primary and elementary teacher training institutions had to be raised to the higher secondary stage. (2) The quality of the existing programmes of teacher education ought to be improved so that it could catch up with the realities of schools and society. (3) The duration of the training course for primary stage had to be a minimum of two years so that the needed courses in subject-matter could be amply provided. (4) There had to be direct relevance between the theoretical portion of the study and the practical work including practice-teaching in the training course curricula so that teacher trainees could understand the objectives and implications of the school syllabi. Further, an important suggestion made by the Report was the relationship between teacher training institution and local community. It argued that (5) each training institution should be required to guide neighborhood schools and should be “closer to the community” [Government of India, 1966: 12], and that (6) it would be advisable to transfer the control over teacher training programme from the Central to “the States and to locate this control in the State Institutes of Education, whenever and wherever they are ready.” [Government of India, 1966: 69]

The NPE68 was based on the recommendation of the Education Commission Report 1966. However, it didn’t profess any particular plan for pre-service teacher education, which had been repeatedly stated as an urgent need for the UEE. With the expansion of elementary education after independence, elementary teacher education also entered a period of large scale expansion. Consequently, teachers with even inadequate academic preparation had to be recruited” [S.N. Mukerji 1968: 44] and therefore, problems in teacher education had become more complicated. Probably, one of the reasons why NPE68 couldn’t articulate clear plans for teacher education was the wide variety and disparity in the conditions of school education and teacher education in the country. The number of teachers had increased by 1980-81 as shown in Table 7, but appointing women teachers suggested by the Education Commission 1964-66 as one of the crucial factors for UEE was not yet successful enough.

Table 7: Teachers by Type of Schools from 1970 to 1980 (‘000)

Year	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: Compendium of Educational Statistics, NCERT: 143

Circumstances in education couldn't be improved easily, and India kept adopting former strategies to increase the number of teachers during the next two Five Year Plan periods. The Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-73) suggested not only increasing the output of teacher training institutions, but also "on a large scale of correspondence and short-term courses" in order to produce more school-teachers. [Government of India, 1974: 318] and the Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79) emphasized "strengthening of educational institutions for teachers." [Government of India, 1974-79: 76] The drop-out percentage at class V that was 68.2% in the year 1946-47, decreased to 60.4% in the year 1978-79, and the drop-out percentage at class VIII that was 87.5% in 1946-47 decreased to 76.7% in the year 1978-79. [Government of India, 1985: 18] However, these high drop-out ratios after two decades of independence imply that serious qualitative problems in school education had yet to be resolved and there was plenty of scope for improvement.

In the beginning of 1980s, India's economic and technical development had already got to a stage that required a serious effort to ensure that "the fruits of change reach[ed] at all sections," [Biswas A & Aggraval, J.C., 1983: 345] and education was supposed to be a necessary measure to realize this goal. By the middle of the 1980s, "many studies have shown that in the field of education, investments in elementary education yield the highest rate of return and have a significant impact on productivity and the general well being of the masses." [MHRD, 1985: 5] However, a document prepared by MHRD, aimed at providing the basis for a nation-wide debate that would facilitate the formulation of new educational policy, Challenge of Education (1985) stated that "so much [was] expected of the teacher; yet teaching [had] become the last choice in the job market." [MHRD, 1985: 55] A historical review is required to understand the depth of this telling comment. The Education Commission (1964-66) observed that the British rule didn't want to reduce the salaries of government servants, but at the same time, "they were anxious to keep salary costs down to a level which the economy could afford. Hence, the salaries of teachers in local authority schools were deliberately fixed at a point lower than that for government teachers and those for teachers in private schools were fixed at a still lower point." [MHRD, 1966: 49] Consequently, it lowered the average wage for teachers in general, because teachers in government service were a very small minority. This was one of the reasons why the teaching profession couldn't attract many young candidates and it had been further affected the quality of teaching.

NPE86 stated that one of the top priorities was the decentralization of management in education. It insisted that the status of the teacher reflected the socio-cultural ethos of a society. POA86 argued that teacher education was a continuous process. It further stated that “as the first step, the system of teacher education [would] be overhauled,” [MHRD, 1986b: 26] and consequently, the establishment of the District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET), as a central scheme, was announced in NPE86. 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.” at district level. [MHRD, 1986a: 26] The previous NPE68 emphasized teacher’s personal competence as an important factor in education, but UEE couldn’t be achieved by the time when the NPE86 was announced. On the contrary, NPE86 stressed the structural change of educational framework, although teachers were still presumed to have an important role in education. The implementation of the DIET system began in 1987, and “till October 1989, Central assistance had been sanctioned under the Scheme for setting up a total of 216 DIETs” [MHRD, 1989: 4, Guideline] in India. A review report of NPE86 published in 1990 by the Central Government found that “out of 101 DIETs sanctioned during the year 1987-88 and 114 sanctioned during 1988-89, only 70 and 20 [had] respectively become operational/semi-operational.” [Government of India, 1990: 314] However, the revised Programme of Action 1992 announced in 1992 (POA92) stated that among the sanctioned DIETs, 162 were already conducting training programmes. The establishment of DIETs, that is, “systematic planning and implementation of programmes for education and training of school teachers for the elementary stage of education system,” [NIEPA, 2001: 4] progressed slowly during the 1990s, and by the year 1990-2000, total 556 DIETs had established in India. The Year 2000 Assessment: Education for All compiled by NIEPA reported that there were total 1,161 elementary teacher education institutions including DIETs. There were a total 581 DIETs in India in the year 2005.

The following two tables (Table 8, Table 9), based on the Sixth All India Educational Survey (1993), show the number of teachers in 1993. The number of teachers increased by about 260,000 at primary level and by about 270,000 at the upper primary level compared to 1980-81. However, low percentages of SC/ST teachers and female-teachers, especially in rural areas in the tables and the earlier cited data on the continuing high drop-out ratio from school education may explain the need of a system, such as, the DIET system covering the whole India. According to the 1991 Census, the percentages of SC and ST population at all-India level were 16.48% and 8.08% respectively. Generally speaking, there were more SC/ST teachers in Government/ Local body schools, and more female teachers worked in Private aided schools/Private unaided schools both in rural and urban areas. After POA92, it was intended that in order to improve education by launching the Operation Blackboard (OB) scheme from 1987, “at least 50% of the teachers appointed [would] be women,” [MHRD, 1992: 40]. This was done so that it would impact positively on girls’ education and increase the percentage of female teachers.

**Table 8: Number of Primary school (Classes I – V) teachers (1993)**

Area	Full time teachers Total number (All communities)	Percentage of teachers		
		SC	ST	Female
Rural	12,75,218	12.49	9.01	23.50
Urban	3,48,161	7.06	2.65	61.29
Total	16,23,379	11.32	7.65	31.61

Source: NCERT, 1998: 12

**Table 9: Number of Upper-primary school (Classes VI to VIII) teachers (1993)**

Area	Full time teachers Total number (All communities)	Percentage of teachers		
		SC	ST	Female
Rural	790,271	9.88	7.84	25.40
Urban	339,472	6.82	3.18	60.60
Total	11,29,747	8.96	6.44	35.97

Source: NCERT, 1998: 13

Data regarding teachers in India repeatedly mentioned low academic qualification of primary teachers. After the establishment of DIETs, most States raised eligibility for admission to primary and elementary teacher education institutions to the completion of 12 years of schooling and therefore, school teachers' academic qualification in India is expected to be improved in the future. Table 10 shows academic qualification of primary school regular teachers. Nearly one-fourth of primary teachers in rural areas and one-fifth of primary teachers in urban areas had academic qualification up to secondary level in 2005. Primary teachers having academic qualification up to higher secondary were higher in rural (58.51%) than in urban areas (28.72%), but primary teachers having academic qualification up to Graduate are higher in urban (47.46%) than rural areas (38.22%). As far as regular primary teachers were concerned, the percentage of teachers having academic qualification up to higher secondary was supposed to increase because of the establishment of the DIET system. However, in a few States, a significant number of teachers had academic qualifications below secondary level, for example, Mizoram (31.20% males and 38.62% females) and Tripura (33.56% males and 30.83% females).

**Table 10: Academic Qualification of Primary School Regular Teachers (2005)**

Qualification	Percentage		
	All areas	Rural areas	Urban areas

	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Below									
Secondary	4.27	5.24	4.64	4.35	5.65	4.78	3.38	4.22	3.96
Secondary	25.56	25.33	25.47	26.08	26.44	26.20	20.05	22.65	21.83
Hr.Secondary	27.58	25.40	26.77	27.88	26.80	27.53	24.32	22.29	22.93
Up to Hr.									
Secondary	57.41	56.06	56.88	58.31	58.89	58.51	47.75	49.16	48.72
Graduate &									
Post Grad.	38.90	41.09	39.76	38.12	38.43	38.22	47.26	47.56	47.46
Others*	3.69	2.85	3.37	3.57	2.68	3.28	4.99	3.27	3.82

Source: NIEPA, 2006: 177

\* Others include M.Phil/Ph.D., other qualification and no response.

Table 11 shows professional qualification of primary school regular teacher as of 2005. Among regular school teachers, nearly “36.76 per cent male and 32.80 per cent female teachers (all categories) in urban areas are B.Ed or equivalent compared to 27.70 per cent male and 22.54 per cent female teachers in rural areas” [NIEPA, 2006: 179] in 2005. However, as is shown in the Table 11, primary school regular teachers having B.Ed or equivalent qualifications are 23.68 percent male and 23.95 per cent female teachers in urban areas, and 18.98 per cent male and 16.85 per cent female teachers in rural areas. Further, the relatively higher percentage of no response “indicates that a fairly good number of regular teachers do not have any professional qualification,” [NIEPA, 2006:179] and how to provide necessary and appropriate in-service training to the teachers working with school without any professional training to cultivate their professional competency is another serious issue in Indian school education.

Table 11: Professional Qualifications of Primary School Regular Teachers (2005)

Qualifi- cations	All areas (%)			Rural areas (%)			Urban areas (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
J.B.T or equivalent	35.20	29.35	32.94	35.99	32.50	34.84	26.90	21.71	25.35
S.B.T or equivalent	22.60	32.18	26.31	22.50	32.27	25.71	23.50	31.93	29.27
B.Ed or equivalent	19.38	18.91	19.20	18.98	16.85	18.28	23.68	23.95	23.86
M.Ed or equivalent	1.10	1.33	1.19	1.07	1.21	1.12	1.49	1.61	1.57
No response	21.70	18.23	20.36	21.46	17.17	20.05	24.43	20.81	21.95

Source: NIEPA, 2006a: 178

The Sixth All-India Educational Survey (1993) reported that there were a total of 31,943 (24,945 in rural areas and 6,998 in urban areas) voluntary/contractual/other teachers working at primary schools, and that a total of 18,641 (10,545 in rural areas and 8,096 in urban areas) in the same category of teachers working at upper primary schools at an all-India level. Concerning part-time teachers, the same survey reported that there were a total of 6,970 (3,961 in rural and 3,009 in urban) part-time teachers at primary schools and that there were 7,817 part-time teachers (3,287 rural and 4,530 in urban) at upper primary schools at the all-India level. [NCERT, 1998: 130, 135] The number of these teachers increased during the 1990s because of diverse reasons, for example, non-availability of qualified persons, varying regulations regarding primary/elementary teacher education institutions in each State, and State Governments' concern on curtailing expenditure on teachers' salaries. Such teachers are called by various titles, for example, para-teachers, and they are paid "consolidated salaries which vary between one-tenth and one-fifth the salary of a regular elementary school-teacher, across different regions of India." [Govinda, R, 2002: 197] Para-teachers perform several functions, i.e., keeping the school open when a regular teacher goes on leave, assisting slow learners, and so on. By the year 2004, all the States, except Punjab, had appointed para-teachers, and the total number amounted to 259,099 in the same year. Para-teachers work not only with primary/elementary schools, but also with secondary and higher secondary schools in recent years, and "it has been observed that in as many as 70,820 schools (6.82 per cent of total schools), only para-teachers were working in 2005, against 43,655 schools (4.69 per cent) in 2004." [Mehta, A.C., 2006a: 181] About 65% of a total of 379,000 para-teachers worked with primary schools, the majority of para-teachers (92%) were appointed in rural areas, and 64% of them were male teachers. Regarding the qualifications of para-teachers, about 51.49% male and 49.09% female para-teachers were graduates and above. "May be para-teachers are better qualified than regular teachers, but majority of them do not possess any professional qualification." [NIEPA, 2006: 187] Even if we admit that para-teachers were a transitional necessity for UEE, one of the underpinning issues of a less-paid school teacher is that "the educational bureaucracy has found it convenient to work with para-teachers. --- The state does not need to spend on welfare benefits and give pension under the para-teachers system." [Govinda, R. 2002: 197] Many researchers and scholars have already questioned the para-teacher system on the ground that it could be detrimental to the quality of school education in the long run. Even para-teachers who possess Bachelor's and/or further degrees are "unanimous in emphasizing the vital role of pre-service and in-service training for effectively doing their work in the schools." [Govinda, R. & Josephine, Y. 2005: 29] The increasing the number of para-teachers further complicates the situation of primary/elementary teacher education in contemporary India. Table 12 summarizes distribution of para-teachers in 2005.

Table 12: Distribution of Para-teachers by Category (2005)

	Number of para-teachers
--	-------------------------

School category	Male	Female	Total
Primary only	163,025	82,793	245,818
Primary with Upper-primary	43,214	30,512	73,728
Others *	35,687	23,833	59,520
All schools (2003)	135,826	74,269	213,699
All schools (2005)	241,926	136,740	379,385

Source: NIEPA., 2006: 182

\*Others includes primary with Upper primary & Secondary/

Hr. Secondary, Upper primary only, Upper primary with Secondary/

Hr. Secondary, and No response.

As this paper has reviewed, NPE86 stated that the status of the teacher reflected the socio-cultural ethos of a society, and teaching was the last choice in the job market in the middle of 1980s according to the Challenge of Education (1985). One of the reasons for this could be a teacher's relatively low emoluments. "In many part of the country, teachers receive lower salaries than upper division clerks, revenue inspectors, trained nurses, and pharmacists." [Govinda, R., 2002: 195] A uniform national pay scale for elementary teachers suggested by the Education Commission (1964-66) was not possible to implement because of differentials in supply of qualified and trained teachers in each State. When teachers in one state who are properly trained and certified are paid lower than teachers in neighboring states with similar qualifications, it could affect a teachers' motivation. However, academic and professional qualification of primary elementary teachers has been gradually improved after NPE86. The PROBE Report (1999) revealed that countless parents voiced their view about education saying: "if only teachers would teach properly." [PROBE, 1999: 54] It is well-known, especially in rural and remote areas, that some teachers don't appear at their work-places regularly, and anecdotes about motivated and devoted teachers are, generally speaking, labeled as exceptional. At the same time, difficulties faced by teachers are also repeatedly reported, such as, problems faced by female teachers in finding safe accommodations in rural areas and parental apathy towards school education. In case of single-teacher schools, 'non-teaching duties mean that the school has to be closed.' [PROBE, 1999: 61] From the end of the 1980s to the 1990s when India received an unprecedented amount of financial aid, it was loudly asserted that one of the main difficulties for achieving UEE was teacher absenteeism. Some of the projects started during this period, for example, the *Shiksha Karmi* Project (SKP) in Rajasthan, especially focused on this dimension and trained "a full-time teacher belonging to the same village in which he or she teachers and substitutes the formally qualified teacher in government primary schools." [Govinda, R., 2002: 353] The SKP system had an intensive residential training course for multi-grade and multi-level teaching, and an induction training of 41 days. However, the minimum qualifications for a *shiksha karmi* had to be relaxed in order to select appropriate persons belonging to the same village where he or she taught.

Although some projects in the 1990s certainly stimulated school education in some remote and/or backward areas, programmes like SKP “involve[d] a potential risk of institutionalized dualism in the schooling system.” [PROVE, 1999: 99] Blaming either teachers or parents is not a productive argument. The social distance between teachers and children is wide especially in government schools that mainly cater for the weaker section of the society. In fact, teacher absenteeism has two inter related roots, firstly many teachers work in a de-motivating circumstances, for example, lack of school infrastructure, and second, “there is a deep lack of accountability in the schooling system.” [PROBE, 1999: 54]

Educationists argue that a motivated teacher is able to communicate with children and such a teacher is concerned about children’s good performance and cognition. They insist that the present school education must help develop the child’s total personality, and that the new type of motivated teacher use a child-centered approach of teaching. They further maintain that this new task requires substantial autonomy for teachers and that “autonomy for teachers would imply greater professional self-reliance, demand for higher status, and local control.” [Kumar, K., 2004: 39] On the contrary, the term ‘motivated teacher’ is interpreted differently by teachers, administrators, and parents. A study conducted in one district of northern India revealed that most teachers “believed that daily attendance and complying with orders and requests for information were reasonable indicators of motivation. Administrators at the district level described a motivated teacher as one who was regular, did what she or he was told and was, by and large, compliant. --- Parents had a different view. For them discipline in the school and regular teaching served as clinchers.” [Ramachandran, V., *EPW*, May 21, 2005: 2141] The Teacher and Society compiled in 1985 by National commission on Teachers – I (1983-85) reported that the average teacher’s perception of his responsibility was to do his immediate tasks. This situation has continued for two decades even though the DIET system for elementary teacher training now covers most of the States.

Studies on teachers have been conducted from the mid-1960s by NCERT researchers. A survey in the 1967 regarding socio-economic conditions and value patterns of elementary and secondary school teachers in eight states revealed that they “had to overcome a great deal of cultural and social prejudices in order to become teachers and still their economic condition was not satisfactory.” [Goyal, J.C. & Chopra, R.K., 1990:4] Considering serious problems in primary/elementary education in India, it is regrettable to read that “a large number of studies [had] been conducted on the attitude of secondary school teachers towards their profession. However, a few attempts [had] been made on primary school teachers.” [Goyal, J.C. & Chopra, R.K., 1990: 5] A survey conducted in Sholapur city in 1982 about primary school teachers’ living and working conditions found that nearly 92% of families in the sample were below the poverty line. This survey revealed that teachers who wanted widen their education talents by enrolling in programs for further studies found that it “was not [an] encouraging [prospect] as the conditions of service in schools did not offer them sufficient incentives for additional attainments.” [Goyal, J.C. & Chopra, R.K. 1990:2] A

study on elementary school teacher's profile conducted by NCERT in 1989 chose two educationally backward states and two advanced states from each region (east, west, north and south) for sampling. This study found that more than 50% of the teachers answered that they had chosen a teaching job because they were interested in the job and that they thought it was best and prestigious. However, nearly 36% answered that they became teachers because no further education was possible for them. Furthermore, 31.14% of teachers in backward states and 9.01% of advanced states responded that no other profession was available. This indicated that "many teachers [had] not selected the profession out of choice but due to some compelling circumstances." [Goyal, J.C. & Chopra, R.K. 1990: 40] This study also found that the teachers working in advanced states had higher job satisfaction than their counterparts in backward states.

#### 4. Conclusion – further research needs for achieving UEE

The enrollment in primary school (Classes I to V) in India had reached nearly 100% at the end of the 1990s, and universal enrollment at elementary level (Classes VI to VIII) is the target expected to be achieved in the near future. Qualitative improvement and education for weaker sections in the society and backward areas are important issues requiring urgent and effective strategies. The dimension of teacher education has, however, become more complex after the 1990s. Regarding regular teachers and their academic and professional qualifications, these have improved since independence. The launching of a Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Teacher Education in NPE86 is "a major national initiative towards the quality improvement of human resources for the development of primary education" [NIEPA, 2000b: 7] and the DIET system is the main supply institution for the initial training of elementary teachers in most States. However, when many States began to appoint para-teachers, "money was saved not only on salaries but on training requirements as well, as the scheme of para-teachers envisaged an extremely brief, necessarily token training." [Kumar, K., 2004: 65] As a result of dual hiring policies, there are problems not only with regard to qualifications of teachers but also how to provide various types of teachers with carefully prepared pre-service and in-service teacher education so that all the teachers in the country can contribute to achieving UEE and qualitative improvement of school education. Teachers' social status has also become more complicated because of having both regular teachers and para-teachers. Also, teacher related issues differ from State to State, district to district according to the conditions in school education. Further research has to be based on the awareness of these new circumstances and realistic plans formulated to contribute to the improvement in education in each district and each State. At the same time, teachers need to be organized so that they too can provide practical answers to problems in teacher education, as they have experienced them.

#### References

Aggrawal, J.C. Landmarks in the History of Modern Indian education. Delhi: Vikas, 1993.

- Biswas, A & Aggraval, J.C. Education in India, New Delhi: Arya Book Depot, 1972.
- Dash, M., Education in India – Problems and Perspectives. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2000.
- Government of India. “Post-War Educational Development in India.” New Delhi: Central Advisory Board of Education, 1944.
- . “Review of the First Five Year Plan.” New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1957.
- . “Fourth Five Year Plan – A Draft Outline.” New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1966.
- . “Fifth Five Year Plan.” New Delhi: Planning Commission, 1974.
- . 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.
- . “India 1986 – A reference annual.” New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. 1987.
- . “India 1993 – A reference annual.” New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. 1994.
- . “India 2005 – A reference annual.” New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. 2006.
- . “India 2006 – A reference annual.” New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. 2007.
- Govinda, R.. (Ed.) India Basic Education Report. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Govinda, R. and Y. Josephine. Para Teacher: As Review, New Delhi: NIEPA, 2005.
- Goyal, J.C., & Chopra, R.K.. The elementary school teacher – a profile. New Delhi: NCERT, 1990.
- Kumar, K. What is worth teaching?, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2004.
- Mehta, Arun C. Education for All: Myth and Reality. Delhi: Kanishka Publishers, 1995.
- Mehrotra, S., et al.. Universalizing Elementary Education in India –Uncaging the ‘Tiger’ Economy. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- 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.I – Report.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1954.
- . “Education in India 1950-51, Vol.1 – Report, New Delhi: Government of India, 1955.
- . “Education in India 1955-56, Vol.I – Report, New Delhi: Government of India, 1958.
- . “Education in India 1959-60, Vol.I – Report, New Delhi: Government of India, 1963.
- . “Education in India 1960-61, Vol.I – Report, New Delhi: Government of India, 1964.
- . “Education in India 1964-65, Vol.1 – Report, New Delhi: Government of India, 1969.

- . “Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission 1964-66,” New Delhi, 1966.
- . “National Policy on Education 1968.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1968.
- . “Challenge of Education – A Policy Perspective.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1985.
- . “National Policy on Education 1986.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1986a.
- . “Programme of Action 1986.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1986b.
- . “Programme of Action 1992.” New Delhi: Government of India, 1992.
- . “Working Group Report on Elementary and Adult Education, Tenth Five Year Plan 2002 – 2007.” New Delhi: Government of India, 2001.
- Mukerji, S.N. Education of Teachers in India , Vol. I, Delhi: S. Chand & Co, 1968.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). “Sixth all India education survey (1993), Volume III, Teachers in schools.” New Delhi, 1998.
- . “Compendium of Educational Statistics (School Education), New Delhi:, 2003.
- National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA).  
Year 2000 Assessment Education for All: India, New Delhi: 2000.
- . “District Institutes of Education and Training – A National Evaluation (Draft Report).” New Delhi, 2001.
- . Elementary Education in India – Analytical Report 200405. New Delhi, 2006.
- Ramachandran, V., ‘Why School Teachers Are De-motivated and Disheartened,’ *EPW* May, 2005: 2141.
- Tilak, Jandhyala B.G. (Ed). Financing Education in India. New Delhi: NIEPA, 2003.

#### 日本語表題および日本語要旨

#### 独立後のインドの教育と初等教員養成に関する一考察

独立(1947年)後のインドでは、教育普及や識字率の向上のために多くの学校が増設され、就学率も大きく増加した。だが、この教育発展を支える役割を担う教員の増員は、急速な教育発展に追いつかなかった。特に初等教員の増員は、長期的展望としっかりした計画に基づいて行われたというよりも、教員の短期養成や教員資格を持たぬ者の教員への任用などによってまかなわれることが多かった。その結果、そして教育施設や教材などの問題と相俟って、初等教育を修了する生徒の割合は1960年代半ばになっても独立直後とさほど変わることがなかった。そこで、1986年の「国家教育政策決議」によって全国的な初等教員養成機関設立を開始し、1990年代には多くの国内外の教育プロジェクトを導入し、20世紀末までに、就学率は大きく向上した。21世紀に入った現在、インドの初等教員養成は量的拡張のみではなく質的充実・変革を図っており、独立以来の目標とされた初等教育普遍化により貢献することが期待されている。