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## Preface

There is an absence of a responsive education system in India. School curricula are inapt to meet diverse learning needs of learners living in different contexts. Infrastructure facilities are woefully inadequate for joyful learning environment in schools. Millions of learners do not have an access to safe-drinking water. As a consequence, there is a high incidence of dropout rate in schools particularly at the primary level. There are hardly any appropriate programmes to address the needs of children who are excluded from the main stream schools (HIV + Children, Children of prostitutes, children of migrant workers, orphans etc.)

In spite of all the immense strides the rest of India takes, the poorest of the poor (BPL) live often in poor conditions and considerable hardship. They are poorly served especially in terms of education and health facilities. The biggest disappointments in India are education and health.

Teaching workforce in our schools is woefully inadequate. On an average there are 2.63 teachers against five classes in government run primary schools. Further 11.7 per cent primary schools are still single teacher schools. Multi-grade teaching is a ait accompli in most of the primary schools. The situation affects adversely the quality of education. Recruitment of Non-professionals as teachers is further exacerbating the quality of primary education. This is because more than 10 per cent of the total teaching workforce now comprises of para-teachers in the country. These highly under-paid and non professional teachers can hardly do justice to their profession. All these factors are impeding the endeavors geared to the attainment of the goal - Education For All.
The study conducted by Kremer et al (2004) revealed that one in four teachers was absent at a typical government run primary school. These researchers did not study the reasons for their absence. The present study undertaken by the All India Primary Teachers' Federation highlights specific reasons for teachers' absence from schools. It highlights that teachers' in-service education and training and their engagement in nonprofessional work outside the school contribute significantly towards teachers' absence in schools. The findings of the study are an eye opener for all concerned.

We are indebted to the Education International for financial support in conducting this study. We are also thankful to Mr. Wouter Van der Schaaf, Coordinator-EI, Mr. Aloysius Mathews, Chief Coordinator, Ms. Shashi Bala Singh, Coordinator, EI-APR, Mr. Sagar Nath Pyakuryal, Coordinator, EI-APR for providing academic support in planning and conducting the study. My thanks are also due to Dr. Ajit Singh, Director-PDP for his incessant endeavors for developing design, analyzing the data and producing the report of the study. Sh. Sanjeev Kumar also deserves my thanks for working diligently for word processing of the report of the study. I am also thankful to Shri S. Anbalagan, General Secretary-Tamilnadu Elementary School Teachers' Federation, Shri Kamala Kant Tripathy- General Secretary, All Utkal Primary Teachers' Federation and Shri Digvijay Singh Chauhan, Deputy General Secretary, Uttranchal Rajya Prathmik Shikshak Sangh and their associates for collecting the requisite data for the study.
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## Executive Summary

The present study titled teacher absence in primary schools was conducted in three states - Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu. The main objectives of the study were to determine teachers' absenteeism rate in government primary schools in the said states and also to find out specific reasons for their absence from schools. In each state, three districts were covered. Sundergarh, Khordha and Nayagarh were covered in the state of Orissa. Dehradun, Haridwar and Rudra Prayag were covered in Uttarakhand state and Ramanathapuram, Sivagangai and Virudhu Nagar in the state of Tamilnadu. In each district, two to four blocks were covered. In each block, 10 per cent of primary schools were covered.

Eleven hundred and forty teachers in 314 schools were covered in these districts. Investigators from the concerned state primary teacher association visited these schools. Only one visit was made to these schools.
The study reveals that in the state of Orissa, 23.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 5.5 per cent were not present in their school due to personal reasons. Personal reasons included illness, maternity leave and casual leave to discharge their family responsibilities and social obligations. The rest of the teachers were not present in their school either because of their participation in in-service training programmes (14.4\%) or their engagement in non-professional work (3.6\%) assigned to them by their authorities. In Uttarakhand state, 33.8 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 16 per cent were not present due to personal reasons. Further, 12.0 per cent were participating in in-service training programmes and 5.8 per cent were engaged in non-professional work. In Tamilnadu state, only 11.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 7.3 were not present in their school due to personal reasons and 4.2 per cent on account of their engagement in non-professional work. On the whole, in these three states, 21.0 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, 9.1 per cent were not present in their school due to personal reasons. Further, 9.2 per cent were undergoing in-service training and 2.7 per cent engaged in nonprofessional work.
The study reveals that teachers' participation in in-service training programmes and their engagement in non-professional work contribute significantly to their absence in school. This reduces their teaching hours in schools. To increase teaching hours in schools, the state government should reduce suitably the duration of teachers' in-service education and training. Further teachers should not subjected to non-professional assignments/ duties outside their school. These measures would reduce teachers' absenteeism rate from schools and would result in significant improvement in their teaching hours.

## The Context

### 1.0 Backdrop

In 2005, India, according to the new estimates by the World Bank, had 456 million people or about 42 per cent of the population living below the new international poverty line of \$ 1.25 per day. India is therefore, home to roughly one-third of all poor in the World. One of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that member countries of the United Nations pledged to attain by the year 2015 is to eradicate poverty and hunger. Education is the key to socio-economic development of any nation. Without education, it is not possible to eradicate poverty. Therefore, the achievement of the goal - Education For All is highly essential to eradicate poverty from the country.

Realizing the importance of education, the framers of the Indian Constitution incorporated in the Directive Principles of the State Policy that the State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children in the age group 6 to 14 years within ten years from the promulgation of the Constitution.

Since independence, the country has been making concerted efforts to achieve the goal-Education For All (EFA). The National Policy on Education (1986), International Conventions such as Jomtien Conference (1990), Dakar Convention (2000) have provided impetus to these endeavours. On $13^{\text {th }}$ December 2002, the country amended its Constitution and made Right to Education a Fundamental Right. Despite of all these endeavours, the long cherished goal Education For All is still elusive. The achievement of the goal - EFA seems to be distant dream. In the light of the present scenario in the country, it is not on track. Therefore, the achievement of the goal even by 2015 does not seem to be a reality.

The attainment of the goal - education for all by 2015 implies that all eligible children complete and graduate from the cycle of free and compulsory quality primary education. To achieve this, it would require entry of all children into school by 2008 or 2009 at the latest with no dropout and completion and graduation for all in the final year of primary schooling. Though the net enrolment ratio is increasing over the years and yet it is at present around 93 per cent. But the dropout rate is still alarmingly very high. It is around 30 per cent. The high dropout is therefore, a significant hindrance for achieving education for all by 2015.

For attaining Universal Primary Education (UPE), the primary education system needs to be efficient one. The essential ingredients of an efficient primary education system are - appropriate infrastructure facilities in schools, an adequate flow of qualified professional teachers (one teacher per class) with remuneration adequate to meet their needs and sustained professional development, and use of appropriate instructional approaches and strategies by teachers for transacting the curriculum.

### 1.1.0 Teaching Workforce in Primary Schools

In our country, primary schools are ill-equipped with teaching work-force. All primary schools managed by the Government have an average of 2.63 teachers per school against 5 classes (Mehta, 2007). 'Schools with less than 3 teachers are 60.3 per cent. Further 11.7 per cent schools are still single teacher schools (NUEPA, 2008). An adequate number of qualified professional teachers is the key for improving quality of education and for attaining UPE. Since there is inadequate teaching workforce in our primary schools, the quality of teaching is suffering. Though the pupil-teacher ratio in the country is $42: 1$, there are many states in which this ratio is very high. "For instance in the state of Bihar, the pupil teacher ratio is more than 60:1 in 68.5 per cent schools, followed by Uttar Pradesh in 35.8 per cent schools, 26.5 per cent schools in Jharkhand, and 24.7 per cent schools in West Bengal. Further pupil teacher ratio is more than 100:1 in 5.2 per cent schools in the country" (NUEPA, 2008).

### 1.2.0 Teacher Absenteeism

Inadequacy of teachers coupled with high rate of teacher absenteeism renders the learning conditions in schools from bad to worse. A recent study titled Teacher Absence in India: A Snapshot conducted by Kremer and Others (2004) in eight countries - Peru, Ecuador, Papua New Guinea, Bangladesh, Zambia, Indonesia, India and Uganda covered 20 Indian states representing 98 per cent of the population or roughly one billion people. The study focused on government run primary schools, but it also covered rural private schools and private aided schools located in villages. The study revealed that one in four teachers was absent at a typical government run primary school. India has the second-highest average absence rate among eight countries. The teacher absence rates in eight countries are presented in Table 1.1

## Table 1.1 Teacher Absence Rates in Different Countries

## Teacher Absence (\%)

Peru
Ecuador14
Papua New Guinea ..... 15
Bangladesh ..... 16
Zambia ..... 17
Indonesia ..... 19
India ..... 25
Uganda ..... 27

Within India, the absence rate ranged from 14.6 per cent in Maharashtra to 41.9 per cent in Jharkhand. Absence rates are generally higher in low income states. Teacher absence rates in different states are presented in Table 1.2 (Kremer and Others, 2004).

## Table 1.2 Teacher Absence Rates in Government run Schools in different States in India

| State | Absence (\%) | State | Absence (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Maharashtra | 14.6 | West Bengal | 24.7 |
| Gujarat | 17.0 | Andhra Pradesh | 25.3 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 17.6 | Chhattisgarh | 30.6 |
| Kerala | 21.2 | Uttaranchal | 32.8 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 21.2 | Assam | 33.8 |
| Tamil Nadu | 21.3 | Punjab | 34.4 |
| Haryana | 21.7 | Bihar | 37.8 |
| Karnataka | 21.7 | Jharkhand | 41.9 |
| Orissa | 23.4 |  |  |
| Rajasthan | 23.7 | Weighted Average | $\mathbf{2 4 . 8}$ |

### 1.3.0 Need for the Study

Teachers remain absent /are not able to attend school for a number of reasons. Teachers are deployed for certain non-professional duties such as participating in elections to local bodies, State Legislatures and Parliament, decennial population Census, disaster relief duties, polio drop campaigns, preparing voters' list, animal and bird surveys, below poverty line survey, ration card verification, generating awareness among people about leprosy, preparing project activities to be conducted by different panchayats, literacy campaign etc.

Further teachers have to go to their Education Department for getting their leave sanctioned, GPF Advance, seeking release of their dues, annual increment, transfer, to participate in meetings and departmental functions, etc. The situation in the education department is generally so bad that teachers feel that unless they go personally, their case would not move. Teachers are also required to undergo mandatory 20 days in-service education and training every year under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. It has been observed that teachers and students are also required
to receive high officials and VIPs. Teachers are also required to participate in various awareness programmes such as HIV/AIDS, Polio and welcome programmes. These reasons coupled with teachers' illness, and to discharge their family responsibilities and social obligations, etc. increase teacher absence rate. Further absence rates are higher during rainy seasons, extreme weather conditions, festivals, towards the end of the calendar year, agriculture season festival, etc. Absence rates are not the same the whole year.

The All India Primary Teachers' Federation shared the findings of the study conducted by Kremer and others with the members of the state affiliates, at the state, district and block level. The teachers opined that teachers' rate of absenteeism is high on account of factors referred to above. But it is not as high as reported in the said study throughout the year. They expressed that the findings of the study are tarnishing the image of teachers. They further expressed that inadequacy of infrastructure facilities such as toilets, electricity, safe drinking water, rooms for instruction and teaching work-force affect adversely teacher motivation and increase teacher absence rate. Kremer and others (2004) also found that absence rate was considerably lower in schools with better infrastructure - a potentially important element of working conditions.

In the light of the above situation, All India Primary Teachers' Federation (AIPTF) decided to undertake a study to determine rate of teacher absenteeism in government primary/elementary schools. The present study was undertaken with the objectives specified below:

### 1.4.0 Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to:

- determine teacher absenteeism rate in government run primary/ elementary schools; and
- find out specific reasons for their absence from schools


### 1.5.0 Design of the study

## Sample:

The survey method was used to collect the requisite data for the study. The study was conducted in three states only - Orissa, Uttrakhand and Tamilnadu. One state
was selected from each of the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions of the country. Further one state was selected from those states in which the rate of teachers' absenteeism is very high and two other from those states in which the rate of absenteeism is moderate. In each of these states, only three districts were selected on a random basis. In each district, two to four blocks were selected. In each block, 10 per cent of primary schools were selected randomly. Districts and blocks covered in these states are mentioned below:

## Orissa State

## District

1. Sundergarh
2. Khordha
3. Nayagarh

## Block

Bisra, Kuarmunda and Lathikata
Khordha, Begunia and Bolagarh
Nayagarh, Ranpur and Nuagaon

## Uttarakhand State

## District

1. Dehradun
2. Haridwar
3. Rudra Prayag
4. Ramanathapuram
5. Sivagangai
6. Virudhu Nagar

## District

- Virudhu Nagar


## Block

i) Vikas Nagar
ii) Kalsi
i) Bahadarabad
ii) Narson
i) Ukhimath
ii) Jhakhali

## Tamilnadu State

## Block

i) Ramanathapuram
ii) Thirupullani
iii) Nainarkovil
iv) Kadaladi
i) S. Pudur
ii) Thiruppathur
iii) Singampunari
iv) Kallal
i) Sattur
ii) Vembakkottai
iii) Thiruchuli
iv) Rajapalayam

## Tool

A questionnaire was developed to collect the requisite data for the study.

## Procedure of Collection of data

Investigators were appointed to collect the data from the states under study. Each state appointed two to three investigators and one supervisor for the purpose. These investigators were qualified professional teachers who are either retired or in service.

## Training of Investigators

Investigators appointed by the AIPTF were provided training at Shikshak Bhawan New Delhi for two days on $9^{\text {th }}$ and 10th May 2007. During training, these investigators were sent to two primary schools in Delhi with a view to providing them experiences to collect the requisite data with the help of the questionnaire developed for the purpose. Investigators perceived the visit to schools as meaningful experiences to collect the data.

## Collection of Data

Trained investigators visited the schools without any information to them. They ascertained from the head-teacher the position of teaching staff in her/his school and the number of teachers who were not present in the school on that day. Reasons for their absence/not being present in the school were also ascertained from the head-teacher. The school record in this regard was also consulted. These investigators made only one visit to each school. It took about three months to collect the requisite data from the schools.

## Delimitations

The following were the delimitations of the study
The study was conducted in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu only. In each state, only three districts were selected. In each district, two to four blocks were selected randomly. Only 10 per cent of schools in the selected blocks were covered.

Only one visit was made to the selected schools.
The study was conducted in Government run primary/elementary schools in the states mentioned above.

## Teacher Absenteeism

This chapter presents data regarding teachers' absenteeism rate from schools. As mentioned in Chapter-I, the present study was conducted in three states - Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu. In each of these states, three districts were covered. Names of these districts and the number of schools covered in these districts are mentioned in table 2.1.

## Table 2.1 States, Districts, Schools and Teachers Covered

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the State | Name of the District | No. of Schools Covered | No. of Teaches appointed in Districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Orissa | i) Sundergarh | 30 | 94 |
|  |  | ii) Khorda | 31 | 119 |
|  |  | iii) Nayagarh | 30 | 114 |
| 2 | Uttarakhand | i) Dehradun | 37 | 103 |
|  |  | ii) Haridwar | 39 | 149 |
|  |  | iii) Rudra Prayag | 29 | 56 |
| 3 | Tamilnadu | i) Ramanathapuram | 33 | 114 |
|  |  | ii) Sivagangai | 33 | 145 |
|  |  | iii) Virudu Nagar | 52 | 246 |
| Total |  |  | 314 | 1140 |



Figure 2.1 Number of Schools and Teachers covered


Figure 2.2 Number of Schools and Teachers covered in Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamlinadu

Investigators from the concerned state primary teachers association visited schools with a view to determining the number of teachers who were not present in the school on that day. The data in this regard are presented block-wise. The data related to teacher absenteeism in the selected blocks of the said districts in Orissa state are presented first.

## Orissa State

In Orissa state, three districts were covered. In each district, three blocks were covered. The data regarding teachers' absenteeism in the selected blocks from Sundergarh district are presented in Table 2.2. The table manifests the number and percentage of teachers who were absent/not present in their school.

Table- 2.2 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Sundergarh District

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SI. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Name of the Block | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in school |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in School |  |  | not present in school |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Kuarmunda | 07 | 03 | 10 | 18 | 07 | 25 | 16 | 07 | 23 | 2 | - | 2 | 11.1 | - | 8.0 |
| 2 | Lathikata | 10 | - | 10 | 44 | - | 44 | 38 | - | 38 | 6 | - | 6 | 13.6 | - | 13.6 |
| 3 | Bisra | 10 | - | 10 | 25 | - | 25 | 22 | - | 22 | 3 | - | 3 | 12.0 | - | 12.0 |
|  | Total | 27 | 03 | 30 | 87 | 07 | 94 | 76 | 07 | 83 | 11 | - | 11 | 12.6 | - | 11.7 |

It is evident from table 2.2 that only three schools in the urban area were covered in Kuarmunda block alone. Further all the seven teachers appointed in these schools were present in their
school. The percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in these three blocks ranges from 8 in Kuarmunda block to 13.6 in Lathikata block. Only 11.7 per cent teachers were not present in their school in these blocks.

The number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Khordha district is highlighted in Table 2.3

Table 2.3 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Khordha District

| S. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in schools |  |  | Not present in schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Khordha | 10 | - | 10 | 42 | - | 42 | 31 | - | 31 | 11 | - | 11 | 26.2 | - | 26.2 |
| 2 | Begunia | 10 | - | 10 | 27 | - | 27 | 22 | - | 22 | 05 | - | 05 | 18.5 | - | 18.5 |
| 3 | Bolagarh | 11 | - | 11 | 50 | - | 50 | 41 | - | 41 | 09 | - | 09 | 18.0 | - | 18.0 |
|  | Total | 31 | - | 31 | 119 |  | 119 | 94 | - | 94 | 25 | - | 25 | 21.0 | - | 21.0 |

Table 2.3 manifests that all the 31 schools covered under Khorda, Begunia and Bolagarh blocks were in the rural area. The table further manifests that rate of teachers' absenteeism is quite high i.e. 26.2 per cent in Khordha block. In other two blocks, teachers who were not present in their school are around 18 per cent. Teacher' absenteeism rate in the district is, however, 21.0 per cent. It is higher than that in Sundergarh district.

The data with regard to teachers who not were present in their school in Nayagarh, Rampur and Nuagaon blocks of Nayagarh district are presented in Table 2.4

Table 2.4 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Nayagarh District

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block |  |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. of schools covered |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in schools |  |  | not present in schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Nayagarh | 10 | - | 10 | 37 | - | 37 | 23 | - | 23 | 14 | - | 14 | 37.8 | - | 37.8 |
| 2 | Ranpur | 10 | - | 10 | 28 | - | 28 | 20 | - | 20 | 08 | - | 08 | 28.6 | - | 28.6 |
| 3 | Nuagaon | 10 | - | 10 | 49 | - | 49 | 30 | - | 30 | 19 | - | 19 | 38.8 | - | 38.8 |
|  | Total | 30 | - | 30 | 114 | - | 114 | 73 | - | 73 | 41 | - | 41 | 36.0 | - | 36.0 |

Table 2.4 reveals that percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in all the three blocks of Nayagarh district is very high. It ranges from 28.6 per cent in Ranpur block to 38.8 per cent in Nuagaon block. In the district of Nayagarh 36 per cent teachers were not present in their school.

Table 2.5 presents data regarding percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in all the three districts covered in this study. Data in this regard are also depicted through Figure 2.3

Table 2.5 District-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not present in Schools

| SI. No. | Name of the district | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in school |  |  | not present in school |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Sundergarh | 27 | 03 | 30 | 87 | 07 | 94 | 76 | 07 | 83 | 11 | - | 11 | 12.6 | - | 11.7 |
| 2 | Khordha | 31 | - | 31 | 119 | - | 119 | 94 | - | 94 | 25 | - | 25 | 21.0 | - | 21.0 |
| 3 | Nayagarh | 30 | - | 30 | 114 | - | 114 | 73 | - | 73 | 41 | - | 41 | 36.0 | - | 36.0 |
|  | Total | 88 | 03 | 91 | 320 | 07 | 327 | 243 | - | 250 | 77 | - | 77 | 24.1 | - | 23.5 |



Figure 2.3 Percentage of teachers not present in schools

Table 2.5 reveals that the percentage of teachers who were not present in their school is the highest i.e. 36 percent in the district of Nayagarh. It is the lowest i.e. 11.7 in Sundergarh district. The percentage of teachers who were not present in these districts on a average is 23.5. Kremer and associates (2004) also found that the rate of teacher absenteeism from their school in Orissa state was 23.4 per cent.

## Uttarakhand State

In the state of Uttarakhand, three districts - Dehradun, Haridwar and Rudra Prayag were covered. In each district, only two blocks were covered. Table 2.6 presents data regarding number and percentage of teachers who were not present in the school when investigator from the state primary teachers association visited the schools.

Table 2.6 Block-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not present in Schools in Dehradun District

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of Schools Covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in Schools |  |  | present in Schools |  |  | not present in Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Vikas Nagar | 17 | - | 17 | 59 | - | 59 | 35 | - | 35 | 24 | - | 24 | 40.7 | - | 40.7 |
| 2 | Kalsi | 20 | - | 20 | 44 | - | 44 | 29 | - | 29 | 15 | - | 15 | 34.1 | - | 34.1 |
|  | Total | 37 | - | 37 | 103 | - | 103 | 64 | - | 64 | 39 | - | 39 | 37.8 | - | 37.8 |

Table 2.6 reveals that the rate of teachers' absenteeism in these selected blocks is very high. It is 40.7 per cent in Vikas Nagar block and 34.1 per cent in Kalsi block. On an average, teachers' absenteeism rate is 37.8 per cent in these blocks.

The rate of teachers' absenteeism from schools in the district of Haridwar is presented in the table 2.7

Table 2.7 Block-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Haridwar District

| Sl. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of Schools Covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in Schools |  |  | present in Schools |  |  | not present in Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Bahadarabad | 24 | - | 24 | 103 | - | 103 | 60 | - | 60 | 43 | - | 43 | 41.7 | - | 41.7 |
| 2 | Narson | 15 | - | 15 | 46 | - | 46 | 35 | - | 35 | 11 | - | 11 | 23.9 | - | 23.9 |
|  | Total | 39 | - | 39 | 149 | - | 149 | 95 | - | 95 | 54 | - | 54 | 36.2 | - | 36.2 |

Table 2.7 reveals that 41.7 per cent teachers were not present in their school in Bahadarabad block. On the other hand 23.9 per cent teachers were not present in their school in Narson block. On an average 36.2 per cent were not present in their school in the said the blocks. This rate of teachers' absenteeism from their school in these blocks is quite high.

The number and percentage of teachers who were not present in schools in Ukhimath and Jakholi blocks of Rudra Prayag district is presented in table 2.2

Table 2.8 Block-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Rudra Prayag District

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of Schools Covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers jot present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in Schools |  |  | present in School |  |  | Not present in School |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Ukhimath | 18 | - | 18 | 34 | - | 34 | 28 | - | 28 | 6 | - | 6 | 17.8 | - | 17.8 |
| 2 | Jakholi | 11 | - | 11 | 22 | - | 22 | 17 | - | 17 | 5 | - | 5 | 22.7 | - | 22.7 |
|  | Total | 29 | - | 29 | 56 | - | 56 | 45 | - | 45 | 11 | - | 11 | 19.7 | - | 19.7 |

Table 2.8 manifests that on a average 19.7 per cent teachers were not present in their school in Ukhimath and Jakholi blocks. The rate of teachers' absenteeism in these blocks of Prayag districts is quite low when we compare the rate of absenteeism with blocks in Dehradun and Haridwar districts.

Table 2.9 presents data regarding teachers' absenteeism in all the three districts in Uttarakhand state. The data are also depicted through figure 2.4

## Table 2.9 District-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in their School

| SI. No. | Name of the District | No. of Schools Covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of present of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in Schools |  |  | present in Schools |  |  | Not present in Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Dehradun | 37 | - | 37 | 103 | - | 103 | 64 | - | 64 | 39 | - | 39 | 37.8 |  | 37.8 |
| 2 | Haridwar | 39 | - | 39 | 149 | - | 149 | 95 | - | 95 | 54 | - | 54 | 36.2 | - | 36.2 |
| 3 | Rudra Prayag | 29 | - | 29 | 56 | - | 56 | 45 | - | 45 | 11 | - | 11 | 19.7 | - | 19.7 |
|  | Total | 105 | - | 105 | 308 | - | 308 | 204 | - | 204 | 104 | - | 104 | 33.8 | - | 33.8 |



Figure No. 2.4 Percentage of teachers not present in their school

The table 2.9 reveals that teachers' absenteeism rate is quite high in Dehradun and Haridwar districts. It is quite low in Rudra Prayag district. On an average, the rate of teachers' absenteeism in Uttarakhand state is 33.8 per cent. Kremer and associates (2004) too found that teachers' absenteeism rate in Uttarkhand was 32.8 percent.

Tamilnadu State

In Tamilnadu state also, three districts - Ramanathapuram, Sivagangai and Virudu Nagar were covered. In each district, four blocks were covered. Table 2.10 specifies number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in selected blocks of Ramanathapuram district.

Table- 2.10 Block-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in their School in Ramanathapuram District

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in Schools |  |  | not present in schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 7 | - | 7 | 44 | - | 44 | 37 | - | 37 | 7 | - | 7 | 15.9 | - | 15.9 |
| 2 | Thirupullani | 9 | - | 9 | 29 | - | 29 | 24 | - | 24 | 5 | - | 5 | 17.2 | - | 17.2 |
| 3 | Nainarkovil | 7 | - | 7 | 18 | - | 18 | 14 | - | 14 | 4 | - | 4 | 22.3 | - | 22.3 |
| 4 | Kadaladi | 10 | - | 10 | 23 |  | 23 | 17 | - | 17 | 6 |  | 6 | 26.1 |  | 26.1 |
|  | Total | 33 | - | 33 | 114 | - | 114 | 92 | - | 92 | 22 | - | 22 | 19.3 | - | 19.3 |

Table 2.10 reveals that percentage of teachers who were not present in their school ranges from 15.9 to 26.1 in the selected blocks mentioned in the table. The highest rate of teachers' absenteeism i.e. 26.1 per cent is in Kadaladi block and the lowest i.e. 15.9 per cent in Ramanathapuram. Overall percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Ramanathapuram district is 19.3 per cent.

Table 2.11 presents data regarding teachers' absenteeism in four blocks of Sivagangai district - S. Pudur, Thiruppathur, Singampunari and Kallal.

Table 2.11 Block-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Sivagangai District

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in schools |  |  | Not present in schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | S. Pudur | 6 | - | 6 | 15 | - | 15 | 12 | - | 12 | 3 | - | 3 | 20 | - | 20 |
| 2 | Thiruppathur | 6 | 4 | 10 | 17 | 47 | 64 | 15 | 47 | 62 | 2 | - | 2 | 11.8 | - | 3.1 |
| 3 | Singampunari | 7 | - | 7 | 33 | - | 33 | 32 | - | 32 | 1 | - | 1 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 |
| 4 | Kallal | 10 | - | 10 | 33 | - | 33 | 28 |  | 28 | 5 | - | 5 | 15.2 |  | 15.2 |
|  | Total | 29 | 4 | 33 | 98 | 47 | 145 | 87 | 47 | 134 | 11 | - | 11 | 11.2 | - | 7.6 |

Table 2.11 reveals that teachers' absenteeism rate is the highest (20\%) in S. Pudur block and the lowest ( 3.0 per cent) in Singampunari block. It is interesting to highlight that in Thiruppathur block only four schools were in the urban area. All the 47 teachers appointed in these schools were present. Though the data in this regard is not adequate, but it does indicate that the rate of teachers' presence is better in urban schools than in rural schools. However, the rate of teachers' absenteeism in Sivagangai district is quite low (7.6 per cent)

In Virudhu Nagar district, four blocks - Sathur, Vembakkottai, Thiruchuli and Rajapalayam were covered. Table 2.12 present data regarding teachers' absenteeism rate from schools in these blocks of Virudhu Nagar District.

Table 2.12 Blocks wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Virudhu Nagar District.

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the Block | No. of schools covered |  |  | No. of teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | appointed in schools |  |  | present in schools |  |  | Not present in schools |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T | R | U | T |
| 1 | Sathur | 10 | 2 | 12 | 46 | 14 | 60 | 44 | 13 | 57 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 5.0 |
| 2 | Vembakkottai | 12 | - | 12 | 53 | - | 53 | 49 | - | 49 | 4 | - | 4 | 7.5 | - | 7.5 |
| 3 | Thiruchuli | 12 | - | 12 | 54 | - | 54 | 48 | - | 48 | 6 | - | 6 | 11.1 | - | 11.1 |
| 4 | Rajapalayam | 9 | 7 | 16 | 39 | 40 | 79 | 32 | 35 | 67 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 17.9 | 12.5 | 15.2 |
|  | Total | 43 | 9 | 52 | 192 | 54 | 246 | 173 | 48 | 221 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 9.9 | 11.1 | 10.1 |

Table 2.12 manifests that teachers' absenteeism rate is very low (10.1\%) in Virudhu nagar district. Teachers' absenteeism rate in blocks ranges from 5.0 to 15.2 per cent. The highest absenteeism rate (15.2\%) is in Rajapalayam block and the lowest (5.0\%) in Sathur block.

Table 2.13 highlights teachers' absenteeism rate in all the three districts covered in this study. The teachers' absenteeism rate is also depicted through figure 2.5.

Table 2.13 District-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Tamilnadu state

| SI. <br> No | Name of the District | No. of teachers |  |  | Not present in school | Percentage of teachers not present in schools |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. of schools covered | appointed in school | present in school |  |  |
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 33 | 114 | 92 | 22 | 19.3 |
| 2 | Sivagangai | 33 | 145 | 134 | 11 | 7.6 |
| 3 | Virudhunagar | 52 | 246 | 221 | 25 | 10.1 |
|  | Total | 118 | 505 | 447 | 58 | 11.5 |



Figure 2.5 Percentage of Teachers not present in Schools

Table 2.13 reveals that teachers' absenteeism rate is high (19.3\%) in Ramanathapuram district. The lowest teachers' absenteeism (7.6\%) is in Sivagangai district. Overall teachers' absenteeism in Tamilnadu state is 11.5 per cent. It is quite low in comparison to teachers' absenteeism rate in other states - Orissa and Uttarakhand.

Table 2.14 manifests teachers' absenteeism rate in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu. Teachers' absenteeism rate is also depicted through Figure 2.6

Table 2.14 State-wise Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools

| Sl. <br> No. | Name of <br> the State | No. of <br> Schools <br> Covered | No. of teachers <br> appointed <br> in Schools |  |  | present <br> in School |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not present |  |  |  |  |  |
| in schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$



Figure 2.6 Percentage of Teachers not present in Schools

Table 2.14 reveals that in all the three states, 314 schools and 1140 teachers were covered. The rate of teachers' absenteeism is the highest (33.8\%) in Uttarakhand and the lowest (11.5\%) in Tamilnadu. The rate of teachers' absenteeism is 23.5 per cent in Orissa. The overall average teachers' absenteeism in these states is 21 per cent.

The study conducted by Educational Consultants India too revealed that only 24 per cent in Andhra Pradesh, 15.4 per cent Madhya Pradesh and 11 per cent in Uttar Pradesh were not present in their school when unannounced visits were made to schools (Ed. CIL, 2008).

## Specific Reasons for Teachers' Absence from Schools

In chapter-II, teachers' absenteeism rate from schools has been presented. The data collected from schools reveal that 23.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school in the state of Orissa, 33.8 per cent in Uttarakhand state and 11.5 per cent in Tamilnadu state. Overall rate of teachers' absenteeism in these states is 21.0 per cent.

The study conducted by Kremer et al (2004) revealed that one in four teachers was absent at a typical government run primary school in India. It also highlights that India has the second-highest average absence rate among countries.

The study conducted by Kremer et al (2004) did not, however study where were those teachers who were absent from their school when the investigator(s) visited their school. The present study besides determining rate of teachers' absenteeism in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu, studied specific reasons for teachers not being present in their school. It attempted to determine the percentage of teachers who were not present in their school on account of personal reasons, academic reasons and because of their engagement in non-professional work assigned to them by their authorities.

Personal reasons included illness, maternity leave, domestic work such participation in marriage parties, religious functions, festivals etc. Academic reasons included participation in in-service education programmes for teachers such as seminars, orientation courses and workshops. Non-professional work included election duty, preparation of voters' list, undertaking survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, identification of dropouts from primary schools, campaign against diseases such as polio etc.

Specific reasons for teachers' absence from their schools are presented in the following paragraphs. Data in this regard are presented first in respect of Orissa state.

## Orissa state

The data collected from schools are presented district wise. Table 3.1 presents data regarding number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school due to personal reasons, academic reasons, and because of their engagement in non-professional work assigned to them by the education department.

Table 3.1 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Sundergarh District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | Total no. of teachers in Sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sundergarh | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical /Maternity leave | 94 | 4 | 4.25 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops etc. |  | 4 | 4.25 |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of Voters' list <br> III. Survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, drop outs from schools <br> IV. Campaign against illiteracy, diseases-Polio etc. |  | 3 | 3.20 |
|  | Total | 94 | 11 | 11.70 |

Table 3.1 reveals that out of 11.70 per cent teachers who were not present in their school, only 4.25 per cent were not there in their school due to personal reasons. The rest i.e. 7.45 per cent were not there either due to academic reasons ( $4.25 \%$ ) or were engaged in nonprofessional work (3.20\%) assigned to them by the authorities of the education department.

Table 3.2 manifests number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school due to various reasons - personal, academic and non-professional work in Khordha district.

Table 3.2 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Khordha District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Khordha | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical /Maternity Leave | 119 | 4 | 3.36 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops etc. |  | 16 | 13.44 |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of Voters' list <br> III. Survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, drop outs from schools <br> IV. Campaign against illiteracy, diseases-Polio, etc. |  | 5 | 4.20 |
|  | Total | 119 | 25 | 21.0 |

Table 3.2 reveals that out of 119 teachers, only 4 ( 3.36 per cent) teachers were not present in their school due to personal reasons. Further 16 ( 13.44 per cent) were not there due to academic reasons and 5 (4.20 per cent) on account of their engagement in non-professional work.

Table 3.3 presents data regarding number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school due of various reasons in Nayagarh district.

Table 3.3 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Nayagarh District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nayagarh | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical/maternity Leave etc | 114 | 10 | 8.8 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars and workshops |  | 27 | 23.7 |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation Voters' list <br> III. Survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, drop outs from schools <br> IV. Campaign against illiteracy diseases-polio etc. |  | 4 | 3.5 |
|  | Total | 114 | 41 | 36.0 |

In this district, 36.0 per cent teachers were not present in their school. It is interesting to highlight that out of 36 per cent, only 8.8 per cent were not present in their school due to personal reasons. The rest were not there in their school either due to academic reasons (23.7\%) or their engagement in non-professional work (3.5\%).

Table 3.4 presents data regarding teachers' absence from schools due to personal and academic reasons and their engagement in non-professional work in all the three districts Sundergarh, Khordha and Nayagarh. The data are also depicted through figures 3.1 and 3.2.

Table 3.4 Number and Percentage of teachers not Present in Schools in different districts in the State of Orissa due to Various Reasons

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the District | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reason |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Personal | Academic | Nonprofessional work |  |
| 1 | Sundergarh | 94 | 11 | 4.25 (4) | 4.25 (4) | 3.20 (3) | 11.7 |
| 2 | Khordha | 119 | 25 | 3.36 (4) | 13.44 (16) | 4.20(5) | 21.0 |
| 3 | Nayagarh | 114 | 41 | 8.8(10) | 23.7(27) | 3.5(4) | 36.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 327 | 77 | 5.5(18) | 14.4 (47) | 3.6(12) | 23.5 |

* Figures in bracket indicate the number of teachers


Figure 3.1 Percenage ofteachers not present in schools due to various reasons


Figure 3.2 Percentage of Teachers not present in School due to

Table 3.4 reveals that teachers' absenteeism rate on an average in these districts is 23.5 per cent. Out of 23.5 teachers who were not present in their school, only 5.5 per cent were not there due to their personal reasons, 14.4 per cent due to academic reasons and 3.6 per cent were engaged in non-professional work.

## Uttarakhand State

Table 3.5 specifies number and percentage of teachers in selected blocks of Dehradun district who were not present in their school.

Table 3.5 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Dehradun District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | No. of teachers in Sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dehradun | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical/Maternity Leave etc | 103 | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} 18.4 \\ 2.9 \end{array}\right\} 21.3$ |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops |  | 1 | 1.0 |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I.Election Duty II.Preparation of Voters' list III.Survey for counting out of school children <br> IV.Campaign against illiteracy diseases-Polio etc. |  | 14 2 | $\left.\begin{array}{c} 13.6 \\ 1.9 \end{array}\right\} 15.5$ |
|  | Total | 103 | 39 | 37.8 |

In Dehradun district, a high percentage (37.8\%) of teachers were not present in their school. Out of 37.8 per cent, a high percentage of teachers (21.3\%) were not present due to
their personal reasons. Out of these, 2.9 per cent teachers (3 teachers) were not present in their school due to their illness. Further, 15.5 per cent teachers were not there in their school due to their engagement in non-professional work. Of these, 13.6 per cent were engaged in preparation of voters' list and 1.9 per cent for survey of counting children in the age-group 6 to 14 .

The number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Haridwar district is mentioned in Table 3.6

Table 3.6 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Haridwar District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Haridwar | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical/Maternity Leave <br> etc. | 149 | 16 2 | $\left.\begin{array}{l} 10.70 \\ 01.35 \end{array}\right\} 12.05$ |
|  | Academic <br> I. Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops <br> II. Attachment to other schools |  | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} 18.1 \\ 4.7 \end{array}\right\} 22.80$ |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of Voters' list <br> III. Survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, drop out children <br> IV. Campaign against illiteracy Diseases-Polio etc. |  | 2 | 1.35 |
|  | Total | 149 | 54 | 36.2 |

Table 3.6 reveals that out of 36.2 per cent teachers who were not present in their school, only 12.05 per cent were not there due to personal reasons. Of these, 1.35 per cent were on
leave due to illness/maternity leave. Further 18.1 per cent teachers were participating in training programmes and 4.7 per cent were attached to other schools. Besides 1.35 per cent were engaged in non-professional work - preparation of voters' list.

The number and percentage of children who were not present in their school in Rudra Prayag district is presented in Table 3.7

Table 3.7 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in their School in Rudra Prayag District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | Total No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rudra <br> Prayag | Personal Reasons? <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical/Maternity Leave etc | 56 | $\left.\begin{array}{l} 8 \\ 1 \end{array}\right\} 9$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} 14.3 \\ \underline{01.8} \end{array}\right\} 16.1$ |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops, CRC meetings |  | 2 | 3.6 |
|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of voters' list <br> III. Survey for different purposes such as people below poverty line, drop outs from schools <br> IV. Campaign against illiteracy diseases-Polio etc. | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 56 | 11 | 19.7 |

Table 3.7 manifests that out 19.7 per cent teachers who were not present in their schools, 16.1 per cent were not there on account of personal reasons. Further 1.8 per cent were not there in the school due to their illness or maternity leave. Besides 3.6 per cent teachers were not in the school as they were attending meeting in Cluster Resources Centres (CRCs).

Table 3.8 depicts picture regarding teachers' absenteeism rate in all the three districts in the state of Uttarakhand. Data in this regard are also depicted through figures 3.3 and 3.4

Table 3.8 Number and Percentage of teachers not Present in Schools in different districts of State of Uttarakhand

| S. No. | Name of the District | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reasons |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Personal | Academic | Nonprofessional work |  |
| 1 | Dehradun | 103 | 39 | 21.3 (22) | 1.0 (1) | 15.5 (16) | 37.8 |
| 2 | Haridwar | 149 | 54 | 12.05 (18) | 22.80 (34) | 1.35 (2) | 36.2 |
| 3 | Rudra Prayag | 56 | 11 | 16.1 (9) | 3.6 (2) | - | 19.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 308 | 104 | 16.0 (49) | 12.0 (37) | 5.8 (18) | 33.8 |

Figures in brackets indicate number of teachers
Table 3.8 reveals that out of 33.8 per cent teachers who were not present in their school in the state of Uttarakhand, only 16.0 per cent were not there due to personal reasons. Twelve per cent were participating in training programmes and 5.8 per cent were engaged in nonprofessional work.


Figgure 3.3 Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons


Flgure 3.4 Percentage of Teachers not present In Schools due to Personal Reasons

## Tamilnadu State

In Tamilnadu state, the study was conducted in three districts- Ramanathapuram, Sivagangai and Virudhu Nagar. Table 3.9 manifests the number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school due to personal, and academic reasons, and because of their engagement in non-professional work.

Table 3.9 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Ramanathapuaram District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the District | Reason for not being present in school | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramanathapuram | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical <br> IV. Maternity leave | 114 | 2 $(1.8 \%)$ <br> 5 $(4.4 \%)$ <br> 3 $(2.6 \%)$ | 8.8 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training programmes, seminars, workshops,( in yoga, peace education, computer training) |  | 12 | 10.5 |


|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of Voters' list <br> III. Survey for different <br> purposes such as people <br> below poverty line, drop <br> out children | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IV. <br> Campaign against <br> illiteracy, diseases-Polio <br> etc. | Total | 114 | 22 | 19.3 |

Table 3.9 reveals that out of 114 teachers, 22 (19.3 percent) were not present in their school. Of these, 12 (10.5\%) teachers were not present in their school because they were participating in training programmes in yoga, peace education and computer education. The remaining 10 ( $8.8 \%$ ) teachers were not there due to personal reasons. Of these, 3 (2.6\%) teachers were on maternity leave, 5 (4.4\%) on medical leave and remaining 2 (1.8\%) on causal leave to attend to their personal work. It is interesting to highlight that none of the teachers from selected schools in the district was engaged in non-professional work.

Table 3.10 presents data regarding number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Sivagangai district due to various reasons.

Table 3.10 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in Sivagangai District due to Various Reasons

| Name of the <br> District | Reason for not being present <br> in school | No. of <br> teachers in <br> sampled <br> schools | No. of teachers <br> not present in <br> schools due to <br> various reasons | Percentage of <br> teachers not <br> present in <br> schools due to <br> various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sivagangai | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical / Maternity Leave | 145 | 9 | 6.2 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training <br> programmes, seminars, <br> workshops | - | 2 | 1.4 |


|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Voters List <br> III. Survey for different <br> purposes such as people <br> below poverty line, drop <br> out of students <br> Campaign against <br> illiteracy, diseases-Polio <br> etc. |  | - | - |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 145 | 11 | $\mathbf{7 . 6}$ |

Table 3.10 manifests that out of 145 teachers in the sampled schools in Sivagangai district, 11 (7.6\%) teachers were not present in their school. Of these, 9 (6.2\%) were on leave due to some personal reasons and the remaining 2 (1.4\%) were participating in in-service training programmes being organized by government agencies. It is interesting to observe that none of the teachers was engaged in non-professional work.

Table 3.11 highlights the number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Virudhu Nagar district.

Table 3.11 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in their School in Virudhu Nagar district due to various reasons

| Name of the <br> District | Reason for not being present <br> in school | No. of <br> teachers in <br> sampled <br> schools | No. of teachers <br> not present in <br> schools due to <br> various reasons | Percentage of <br> teachers not <br> present in <br> schools due to <br> various <br> reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Virudhu <br> Nagar | Personal <br> I. Earned leave <br> II. Casual Leave <br> III. Medical /Maternity Leave | 246 | 18 | 7.3 |
|  | Academic <br> Participation in training <br> programmes, seminars, <br> workshops | - | 7 | 2.8 |


|  | Non-professional Work <br> I. Election Duty <br> II. Preparation of Voters list <br> III. Survey for different <br> purposes such as people <br> below poverty line, drop <br> out children <br> Campaign against <br> illiteracy, diseases-Polio <br> etc. | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 246 | 25 | 10.1 |

Table 3.11 reveals that of 246 teachers, 25 (10.1\%) were not present in their school. Of these, 18 (7.3\%) were not there due to personal reasons and the remaining 7 ( $2.8 \%$ ) due to their participation in-service training programmes.

Table 3.12 presents data regarding number and percentage of teachers who were not in their school due to personal and academic reasons in all the three districts of Tamilnadu state. Data in this regard are also depicted through figures 3.5 and 3.6.

Table 3.12 Number and Percentage of Teachers not Present in Schools in different Districts due to Various Reasons

| S. No. | Name of the District | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. and Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reasons |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Personal | Academic | Nonprofessional Work |  |
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 114 | 8.8 (10) | 10.5 (12) | - | 19.3 |
| 2 | Sivagangai | 145 | 6.2 (9) | 1.4 (2) | - | 7.6 |
| 3 | Virudhu Nagar | 246 | 7.3 (18) | 2.8 (7) | - | 10.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 505 | 7.3 (37) | 4.2 (21) | - | 11.5 |

Figures in brackets indicate number of teachers.


Figure 3.5 Percentage of teachers not presentin schools due to various reasons


Figure 3.6 Percentage of Teachers not present in schools due to Personal Reasons

Table 3.12 reveals that out of 505 teachers in sampled schools in the districts of Ramanathapuram, Sivagangai and Virdhunagar, only 11.5\% teachers were not present in their school. Of these, $7.3 \%$ were not there due to personal reasons and the remaining $4.2 \%$ due to their participation in-service training programmes. It is interesting to highlight that none of the teachers was engaged in non-professional work.

Table 3.13 presents number and percentage of teachers who were not present in their school due to personal and academic reasons and because of their engagement in non-
professional work in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu. Data have also been depicted through figures 3.7 and 3.8.

Table 3.13 Number and Percentage of teachers not Present in Schools in different States due to Various Reasons

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sl. } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Name of the state | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of <br> not present in schools | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reasons |  |  | Percentage of teachers not percent in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Personal | Academic | Nonprofessio nal Work |  |
| 1 | Orissa | 327 | 77 | 5.5 (18) | 14.4 (47) | 3.6 (12) | 23.5 |
| 2 | Uttarakhand | 308 | 104 | 16.0 (49) | 12.0 (37) | 5.8(18) | 33.8 |
| 3 | Tamilnadu | 505 | 58 | 7.3 (37) | 4.2 (21) | - | 11.5 |
| 4 | All the three states | 1140 | 239 | 9.1 (104) | 9.2 (105) | 2.7 (30) | 21.0 |

Figures in bracket indicate number of teachers


Figure 3.7 Teacher Absence inStates


Table 3.13 reveals that out of 1140 teachers in sampled schools in the states mentioned above, $21 \%$ teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 9.1 per cent were not in their school due to personal reasons. Personal reasons included leave due to illness/maternity leave, domestic work, etc. Further 9.2 per cent teachers were not there due to their participation in in-service training programmes. The rest 2.7 per cent were engaged in non-professional work assigned to them by their authorities.


## Main findings

The following are the main findings emanating from the study:
(0) In Sundergarh district of Orissa, 11.7 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Twenty one per cent teachers were not present in their school in Khordha district and 36 per cent in Nayagarh district. On an average, 23.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school in these three districts.
© In Uttarakhand state, 37.8 per cent teachers were not present in their school in Dehradun district. The percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Haridwar and Rudra Prayag districts was 36.2 and 19.7 respectively. On an average, 33.8 per cent teachers were not present in these three districts.
(0) In Tamilnadu state, 19.3 per cent teachers were not present in their school in Ramanathapuram district. The percentage of teachers who were not present in their school in Sivaganagai and Virudhu Nagar districts was 7.6 and 10.1 respectively. On an average, teachers' rate of absenteeism in these districts was 11.5 per cent.
© In Orissa state, 23.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 5.5 per cent were not present in their school due to their personal reasons. Further 14.4 per cent were participating in training programmes being organized by the state government and 3.6 per cent engaged in non-professional work assigned to them by the state authorities.
© In Uttarakhand state, 33.8 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 16 per cent were not there on account of personal reasons. Twelve cent
were participating in training programmes and 5.8 per cent engaged in nonprofessional work assigned to them by the state authorities.
© In Tamil Nadu state, 11.5 per cent teachers were not present in their school. Of these, only 7.3 per cent were not there due to some personal reasons. The rest - 4.2 per cent were participating in training programmes.
© On an average 21.0 per cent teachers were not in their school in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu. Of these, only 9.1 per cent teachers were not present on account of personal reasons. Personal reasons included illness, maternity leave and leave to discharge responsibilities of their family and other social obligations. Further 9.2 per cent teachers were not present due to academic reasons- their participation in training programmes being organized by government agencies. Besides, 2.7 per cent teachers were not present as they were engaged in nonprofessional work assigned to them by their authorities.
© The study reveals abundantly that teachers themselves are responsible for their absence from schools to a limited extent. Their absence is primarily caused by their participation in the training programmes being organized by the state authorities and also because of their involvement in non-professional assignments.

## Suggestions for Increasing Teaching Hours

The following are the main suggestions emanating from the present study:
© Teachers' absence from their school reduces teaching hours. To improve schooling quality, there is a need to increase teachers' teaching hours. Table 4.1 given below highlights specific reasons for teachers' absence in the states of Orissa, Uttarakhand and Tamilnadu.

## Table 4.1 Specific Reasons for Teachers' Absence from Schools

| SI. <br> No. | Name of the state | No. of teachers in sampled schools | No. of teachers not present in schools | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to reasons |  |  | Percentage of teachers not present in schools due to various reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Personal | Academic | Nonprofessio nal work |  |
| 1 | Orissa | 327 | 77 | 5.5 (18) | 14.4 (47) | 3.6 (12) | 23.5 |
| 2 | Uttarakhand | 308 | 104 | 16.0 (49) | 12.0 (37) | 5.8(18) | 33.8 |
| 3 | Tamilnadu | 505 | 58 | 7.3 (37) | 4.2 (21) | - | 11.5 |
| 4 | All the states | 1140 | 239 | 9.1 (104) | 9.2 (105) | 2.7 (30) | 21.0 |

[^0]The table reflects that teachers' absence from school on account of personal reasons ranges from 5.5 per cent in Orissa to 16.0 per cent in Uttarakhand. Teachers' absence from school due to academic reasons ranges from 4.2 per cent in Tamilnadu to 14.4 per cent in Orissa. To increase teachers' teaching hours, there is a need to reduce suitably the duration of in-service training being imparted to teachers every year under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan.

- Teachers' engagement in non-professional work is 3.6 per cent in Orissa and 5.8 per cent in Uttarakhand. Teachers should not be engaged in non-professional duties. This measure would further improve teachers' teaching hours in schools.
- In Uttarakhand state, 16 per cent teachers were not present in their school due to personal reasons. This percentage is quite high. The study conducted by Kremer et al (2004) reported that teachers' absence rate was lower in schools with better infrastructure. The State Government of Uttarakhand needs to augment infrastructure facilities in its schools. This would improve teachers' attendance in schools.
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